COLLECTIVE EFFICACY: GAINING THE PERSPECTIVE OF TEACHERS

By

Ashley R. Lankila

A Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

Committee Membership

Dr. John Y. Lee, Committee Chair

Dr. Kenny Richards, Committee Member

Dr. Elizabeth Miller, Program Graduate Coordinator

December 2020

ABSTRACT

COLLECTIVE EFFICACY: GAINING THE PERSPECTIVE OF TEACHERS

Ashley R. Lankila

The purpose of this study is to investigate teachers' view of collective efficacy at their schools, the key events teachers cite when discussing their views, and their views on how collective efficacy can be built at their schools. Certificated personnel from three rural schools in Northern California participated in this study. Key findings indicate teachers view communication, collaboration and accountability as key factors to justify their views of collective efficacy at their schools.

Keywords: collective efficacy, building collective efficacy, teacher efficacy

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Collective Efficacy, what does it mean and why does it matter? I had heard of

collective efficacy in professional discussions but wasn't really sure of what it was. It

seems fairly straight forward, the groups' belief in their ability to reach a common goal.

However, when you really start to analyze the factors, social constructs and individual

details of what impacts collective efficacy, it is anything but straight forward. Upon

researching collective efficacy, the benefits to education were numerous. I was very

interested in this idea of Collective Efficacy and how to build it. Why does it matter? As

a new administrator, I felt like collective efficacy could be a good guide to help

strengthen collaboration and morale of our school's professional community, and help me

avoid situations or actions that could hurt the collective efficacy of my site and ultimately

the students. As a leader, knowing how to build the efficacy of staff seemed to be a tool

to support staff and students alike. During the literature review, seeing many studies

which touted how collective efficacy was related to higher performing schools piqued my

interest in learning more about how to strengthen collective efficacy at my school.

Missing from the collective efficacy literature was teachers' views on the key events and

issues related to stronger and weaker collective efficacy. Since collective efficacy is a

social construct and very personal, it would seem logical to get the input of the teachers

that are experiencing the decisions of leaders and getting their feedback as to what they

felt helped build the collective efficacy of their site as well as their feedback as to what they felt helped diminish the collective efficacy of their site.

I was hoping to get an idea of where to focus my energy in support of teachers to help get the most out of my actions. Secondly, I was hoping to get an idea of what to avoid doing that could undo or hurt the goal of supporting teachers and building collective efficacy. My goal was to hear from teachers what they felt built their collective efficacy and what they felt like hurt it. Knowing that information, could help shape how I lead and the actions that I take on a daily basis to improve not only myself as a professional, but the school and staff I serve.

Literature Review

Introduction

Could Collective Teacher Efficacy, the belief in a group's ability to reach their common goal, be the cure we need for education? Collective Teacher Efficacy (CTE) is associated with higher student outcomes, higher teacher satisfaction, and stronger sense of community within schools (Bandura, 1977, 1993, 2000; Ware & Kitsantas, 2007). This chapter begins with a definition of CTE, the history of CTE and CTE measures currently being used in education. Then I examine student achievement and teacher stress/burnout/retention correlates of CTE. Finally, I review studies which have

evaluated attempts to build collective teacher efficacy using professional learning communities (PLCs), teacher leadership roles, and principal leadership.

Collective teacher efficacy

Teacher efficacy is the extent to which teachers believe that through their actions as teachers they can impact student learning (Ware & Kitsantas, 2007). Individual teacher efficacy indicates the teacher's motivation and ability to overcome challenges and celebrate success (Ware & Kitsantas, 2007). Moving from the individual teacher to a collective group of teachers, Ware and Kitsantas state that collective teacher efficacy "refers to the individual's belief in the group's capabilities" (p.303).   Collective teacher efficacy is about the group as a whole and whether or not individuals within that group believe the group is capable of reaching their collaborative goals (Bandura, 2000; Ware & Kitsantas, 2007).

The origin of collective teacher efficacy

There are two competing theories regarding the idea of self-efficacy. First, Julian Rotter proposed a version of self-efficacy that was defined as internal versus external control of reinforcement (Rotter, 1966). Rotter postulated that self-efficacy was one's ability to control reinforcement of behavior. Therefore, if student performance was strong, that would reinforce behavior of a teacher to repeat those behaviors for a similar result. In contrast to Rotter's assertion, Bandura (1977) argues that self-efficacy is an

individual's belief in their ability to gain desired outcomes. Therefore, if individuals believe they will be successful with a certain task, the more likely they are to be successful. Bandura later asserts that an individual's self-efficacy influences thoughts, emotions, and behaviors and allows them some exercise of control over the events in their lives (Badura, 1977, 1993, 1997). Within the field of education, while some studying self-efficacy have relied on Rotter's theory, Bandura's theory is much more widely accepted and used. This study is based on Albert Bandura's concept of self-efficacy and behavioral change.

Bandura (1977) argues that self-efficacy is built from four factors: performance accomplishments, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological states and that through these factors, one's self-efficacy can be strengthened. Bandura defines self-efficacy as "the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes" (p. 193).   Given Bandura's definition, the four factors he claims impact self-efficacy were shown to have different levels of impact. Performance accomplishment is the most influential given that is it rooted in personal experiences and a sense of mastery (Bandura, 1977). Through these personalized experiences, conviction grows for the belief of success across similar situations, even with small setbacks. Similarly, if one was to see a variety of models excel at a task, one's own self-efficacy regarding this same task increases through this vicarious experience (Bandura, 1977). Verbal persuasion is often used as a means to build efficacy, however, since it does "not

provide an authentic experiential base" (p. 198) it tends to not be as effective for strengthening one's self-efficacy. Similarly, with emotional arousal, having the opportunity to be successful during the situation leads to self-efficacy across a similar situation that once may have produced an emotional response such as fear or anger (Bandura, 1977).

Bandura's self-efficacy theory (1977) states that individual self-efficacy can be gained from performing adequately given a task but that people may attribute their success to outside factors rather than their own abilities. "Successes are more likely to enhance self-efficacy if performances are perceived as resulting from skill than from fortuitous or special external aids" (Bandura, 1977, p. 201). Therefore, mastery of skills across different opportunities allows for an increase in self-efficacy without the ability to attribute that mastery to other things rather than one's own capabilities. Self-efficacy can be a strong predictor for success; essentially, if a person believes that they can do something, they most likely will be able to achieve it. They will persist longer, set clear attainable goals, and put more effort forth to ensure their success (Bandura, 1977). In 1993, Bandura was the first to show self-efficacy as a social construct formed by feedback and influenced by one's ability to control their environment. He specifies three factors of efficacy: student's cognitive self-efficacy, teachers' self-efficacy and collective school efficacy (Bandura, 1993). This is the main shift from Bandura's beginning research on self-efficacy from a psychological and behavioral view point, to one of

explicitly applying his theories to students, teachers and schools. Since efficacy is built

through repeated, varied, meaningful situations designed to develop mastery; schools,

classrooms, teachers, parents, and cultures, all play a vital role in strengthening or

undermining students' self-efficacy.

Research suggests that teachers with strong self-efficacy support and develop the

efficacy of their students as well (Bandura, 1993). Teaching is a collaborative endeavor.

Teachers function in social environments where their influence on their environment

varies widely depending on the school. Bandura (1993) first applies this same idea of

self-efficacy to the idea of collective teacher efficacy. The idea of "Staffs' collective

sense of efficacy that they can promote high levels of academic progress contributes

significantly to their schools' level of academic achievement" (Bandura, 1993, p. 143).

In 2000, Bandura further defines collective teacher efficacy as more than just a sum of

the parts. Collective teacher efficacy is not high because individual teachers have high

levels of self-efficacy, rather, collective teacher efficacy is increased when those involved

work well together (Bandura, 2000). Collective teacher efficacy is increased when the

group as a whole feels a sense of empowerment, as though they have command over what

their influence does within a setting (Bandura, 2000). Bandura (2000) further states that

"the higher the perceived collective efficacy, the higher the groups' motivational

investment in their undertakings, the stronger their staying power in the face of

impediments and setbacks, and the greater their performance accomplishments" (p. 78).

If higher collective efficacy leads to greater performance outcomes then how might we measure for collective teacher efficacy?

<u>Measuring collective teacher efficacy</u>

Given the complex nature of collective teacher efficacy, one could imagine that measuring for such a concept would be just as complex. Since teacher efficacy and collective teacher efficacy are social constructs and are related, the way in which we measure must be thoughtful. In their 1998 article, *Teacher Efficacy: It's meaning and measure*, authors Tschannen-Moran, Hoy and Hoy (1998) review the different measures that have formed from two different theories presented by Rotter (1966) and Bandura (1977). As discussed earlier, this review focuses on the theory of self-efficacy presented by Bandura and the measures based on his social cognitive theory. The four measures reviewed by Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) were: Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument (Riggs & Enochs, 1990), Ashton Vignettes (Ashton et al., 1982) and Bandura's Teacher Efficacy Scale (Bandura, 1997). Gibson and Dembo's Teacher Efficacy Scale has 30 items on a 6-point Likert scale. It provides a measure of global teacher efficacy given the sum of all items. Riggs and Enochs' Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument has 25 items on a 5-point Likert scale and is content specific to science. Ashton Vignettes has 50 items that describe problem solving situations of teaching. It is self-referenced and norm-

referenced. Finally, Bandura's Teacher Efficacy Scale is the most recent measure formed

and consists of 30 items on a 9-point scale.

Since Tschannen-Moran et al.'s 1998 article reviewing the different measures for

efficacy, more tools for measuring efficacy have been developed off the four previously

summarized tools above. In 2000, Goddard, Hoy and Hoy sought to develop a measure

of collective teacher efficacy based upon Gibson and Dembo's (1984) measure for

teacher efficacy. Gibson and Dembo's scale has been adapted to a "16-item version that

contains the most reliable and factorially pure items" (Goddard et al., 2000, p. 487).

Gibson and Dembo's scale measured for individual efficacy and only two categories,

positive group competence, and negative task analysis. Goddard et al. (2000) set out to

measure collective teacher efficacy using four categories: positive group competence,

negative group competence, positive task analysis and negative task analysis. Goddard et

al. (2000) submitted their survey for a preliminary review to a panel of experts from Ohio

State University and asked that they determine if the four categories were adequately

represented. The panel raised concerns that the authors addressed with changes to their

survey. Next, the survey was field tested with six teachers, asking for feedback in regard

to clarity, length, and appropriateness; no changes were suggested. The survey was then

piloted among 46 teachers at 46 different schools. The results of this pilot "supported the

validity and reliability of our collective efficacy measure, but several minor weaknesses

were revealed" (Goddard et al., 2000, p. 490). One of these weaknesses was redundancy

of items. From this pilot, Goddard et al., "reexamined our scale to determine whether

additional items could be generated that would strengthen our measure of collective

efficacy" (2000, p. 491). This led to the 21 item Collective Teacher Efficacy Survey that

is still in use today. Goddard et al. (2000) further tested this revised CTE Survey and

found that the results proved their study is valid and has a high internal reliability.

Two years later, Goddard (2002) decided to revise the CTE survey created. The

goal in revising the survey was to provide equal weight to their two main categories of

group competence and task analysis as well as develop a more streamlined measure. This

led Goddard to look at his four categories and fit each answer into one of the four

categories. Wanting to have a survey that measured the four categories of positive group

competence, negative group competence, positive task analysis, and negative task

analysis evenly he chose three questions each from the four subcategories. He chose

those three questions that had the largest structure coefficient from the four categories.

This led to the 12-item Collective Efficacy Scale which is commonly referred to as the

short form of the Collective Teacher Efficacy Scale (Goddard, 2002). Goddard reviewed

his newly created short form asserting that it reflects all categories of the Collective

Efficacy Scale (Goddard et al., 2000) but in equal proportion (2002). Also, the short

form yielded high internal consistency (alpha = .94) and highly correlated (r = .983) with

the Collective Efficacy Scale (Goddard, 2002).

When measuring something as ambiguous as perceptions of collective efficacy,

there are different approaches to take. Goddard et al. (2004) discuss four options. First,

to aggregate the score of self-efficacy to provide a group mean of individual perceptions.

Second, aggregate an individual's perception of capabilities the group possesses as an

assessment of the groups collective sense of efficacy. Third, have group members

discuss and arrive at a consensus of their collective group efficacy. This option was

stated to "undermine the validity of the assessment" (Goddard et al., 2004, p. 6). The

fourth and final approach was to determine if there was group agreement from their

individual perspectives (Goddard et al., 2004). Bandura asserts that perceived collective

efficacy is more than the sum of the groups' individual perceptions of efficacy (1997).

Goddard et al. (2004) agree with this concept by stating, "Aggregating individual

perceptions of group (as opposed to self) capability serves to assess perceived collective

efficacy as an emergent organizational property by combining individual group members'

interdependent perspectives on group capability" (p. 7). What might be the benefits from

having a strong collective teacher efficacy in schools?

Benefits of collective teacher efficacy

When teachers have a strong sense of efficacy they exhibit teaching behaviors that

promote learning and have significant impact on student achievement (Goddard, 2001).

These behaviors include organization/planned teaching, activity-based learning, deeper

levels of questioning, as well as more thoughtful and balanced discipline; which, when

combined, leads to greater student achievement (Goddard, 2001). Schools that report

high levels of collective teacher efficacy also demonstrate high levels of collaboration

between teachers, teachers that are involved in making school-level decisions, teachers

who implement more challenging tasks for students, and teachers who remain committed

to the profession (Goddard et al., 2004). A 2011 study by Gibbs and Powell

demonstrated that collective teacher efficacy impacted teachers' response to undesirable

student behavior. Furthermore, Donohoo (2018) asserts that collective teacher efficacy is

associated with job satisfaction, lower job-related stress levels and overall teacher

burnout (Klassen, 2010). While there are so many benefits, or even positive teacher

behaviors, that result from having a strong sense of collective teacher efficacy, this

review will further look at student achievement, teacher wellbeing, building of collective

efficacy and the importance of the Principal leader in collective efficacy.

Student achievement

One of the greatest benefits of a strong sense of collective teacher efficacy is the

association with student achievement (Bandura, 1993; Donohoo, 2018; Goddard, 2001;

Goddard et al., 2004; Sandoval et al., 2011). In Goddard's 2001 article, *Collective

Efficacy: A Neglected Construct in the Study of School and Student Achievement*, he

postulates that past school-level experience should be strongly related to collective

efficacy. From this study, Goddard (2001), determined that almost two thirds of the

variance between schools in collective efficacy could be explained by past student

achievement levels. Additionally, Goddard (2001) found that collective teacher efficacy

was associated with the differences between schools in the areas of student achievement.

Similarly, Sandoval et al., (2011) found that student achievement was influenced by the

staff's collective teacher efficacy, regardless of socioeconomic status of the students.

This study demonstrated that one's belief in the groups' ability to teach students,

regardless of their background, would contribute to overall better student outcomes

(Sandoval et al., 2011). This study looked at socioeconomically disadvantaged middle

schools in the state of Texas and showed that collective efficacy of the staff could still

have a positive impact on student achievement. Sandoval (2011) also reported that

teachers at schools with high collective efficacy reported a greater ownership of student's

achievement levels; that those teachers not only set goals for their students' learning, but

their own as well. Teachers with high collective efficacy believe that the extra attention,

time and resources spent helping students will help increase student achievement

(Sandoval, 2011). In 2004, Goddard, LoGerfo and Hoy released a study that looked at

the high school state level assessment and the impact collective efficacy could have.

"Indeed, our results suggest that developing a school in which teachers believe in their

collective capabilities to educate students is important in meeting the challenges posed by

helping all students learn rigorous academic content" (Goddard et al., 2004, p. 420).

Their "results suggest that a 1-SD increase in collective efficacy is associated with a gain

of about .25 SD in terms of the number of students who pass high-stakes assessments in 12th grade." (Goddard et al., 2004, p.420)

<u>Teacher well being and retention</u>

In Robert Klassen's 2010 article, *Teacher Stress: The Mediating Role of Collective Efficacy Beliefs*, he draws a distinction between job satisfaction and job stress, while not similar they need to be clearly defined. He defines job satisfaction as the fulfillment from the day to day activities associated with your job and job stress as "the experience of negative emotions resulting from a teacher's work" (Klassen, 2010, p. 343). These two terms can have a similar impact on performance, commitment, well-being, mental health, physical health, and absenteeism (Klassen, 2010). Furthermore, teacher stress can lead to burnout, depression, low job satisfaction, and eventually leaving the profession (Klassen, 2010). Klassen further identifies teacher stress as being multifaceted but that the primary factors contributing to teacher stress are workload and student behavior (2010). Skaalvik and Skaalvik's 2007 article identified four main strain factors that impact teacher's job satisfaction and stress: students with behavior problems, conflicts with parents, conflicts among teachers, and having to teach in a way that one did not believe in. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2007) describe teacher burnout as based on three measures: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. While Klassen's 2010 article addresses the mediating factors of collective efficacy on teacher stress due to student behavior and workload, Skaalvik and

Skaalvik's 2007 article studied the correlation between teacher and collective efficacy on teacher burnout. Klassen (2010) states "collective efficacy of teachers is related not only to student achievement but also serves as a job resource that mediates the effect on stress from student behavior on job satisfaction" (p. 349). While both articles look at varying types of stress or burnout what they both agree on is that having a strong sense of collective efficacy as a school helps to mitigate the negative impact of teacher stress (Klassen, 2010; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007).

While collective efficacy is shown to have a positive impact on student achievement and is shown to help mitigate the negative pressures associated with teaching, it is clear that we need a strong collective efficacy within all our school sites. How then do we build or create this collective mindset? Goddard et al.'s 2004 study demonstrated that the collective efficacy of a staff is influenced by many different sources and that collective efficacy can be changed. This is of significant importance when we aspire to increase collective teacher efficacy within specific schools.

Building collective teacher efficacy

When we look to increase collective teacher efficacy within schools it is important to consider how those collective beliefs are shaped. There are four primary sources that help to shape a groups collective belief: mastery experiences, social persuasion, vicarious learning experience, and affective states (Brouwer, 2018; Mayo-Brown, 2018). While it is important to know the sources that help to shape collective

beliefs, it is even more important to know to increase those sources within a group, so that their collective efficacy can increase as well. In education, the person with the greatest ability to help shape their staff's collective efficacy is the school leader or principal.

<u>Importance of principal leaders</u>

With the positive effects of a strong sense of collective efficacy being increased student achievement, and an increase in teacher satisfaction, a principal may want to prioritize and build collective teacher efficacy amongst their staff. In 2007, Brinson and Steiner found four actions that principals could implement to help build collective efficacy: build instructional knowledge and skills, create opportunities for collaboration and shared experiences, provide actionable feedback to teachers, and involve teachers in school decision making. These four actions are the foundation to which any leader should look to build efficacy amongst staff. When leaders provided "frequent, structured opportunities for teachers to focus on instructional practices, teachers translated this new knowledge into more effective teaching" (Brinson & Steiner, 2007, p. 3). Given what we know so far about collective teacher efficacy, this opportunity to transfer their knowledge into teaching directly impacts student achievement which directly impacts collective efficacy. The second action recommended by Brinson and Steiner's (2007) article was about creating collaboration for teachers. Principals that create opportunities for the teachers to collaborate, most often in professional learning communities or PLCs, provide

staff with the ability to grow through vicarious experiences. Another action a principal

might take to build the collective efficacy of their staff is providing feedback to teachers.

"High quality, detailed performance feedback is necessary to build an organization with

high collective efficacy that recognizes that it can face the challenges ahead" (Brinson &

Steiner, 2007, p. 4). Finally, it is important to build teacher leadership, involving

teachers in school decision making helps to build the collective efficacy of the group

(Brinson & Steiner, 2007).

In 2017, Nordick examined the specific attitudes, practices and behaviors that

principals who build collective teacher efficacy share. Nordick (2017) surveyed schools

to see their collective efficacy score. The four schools that had the highest collective

efficacy scores were then selected for further case study.   Nordick (2017) found a shared

set of attitudes, practices and behaviors by principals whose schools all scored high when

given the collective efficacy survey. The shared attitudes were: student success as the top

priority, professional responsibility for teachers, caring, confidence, shared purpose, and

collaboration (Nordick, 2017). The shared practices among administrators were:

established an environment of openness and support, established shared expectations,

goals and purposes, facilitated teacher voice and teacher leadership, provided

opportunities for collaboration, and promoted continuous improvement (Nordick, 2017).

The shared behaviors among administrators were: they knew their teachers, supported

teachers, communicated with teachers and modeled desired behaviors (Nordick, 2017).

While it is important to have the right attitudes, practices and behaviors as an administrator that can help to build collective teacher efficacy, it is also critically important to consciously act. In each case study included in Nordick's 2017 research, every school used professional learning communities and had consciously built teacher leaders. The next two sections will look more specifically at how professional learning communities and building teacher leadership can help to improve Collective Teacher Efficacy.

Building teacher leadership

While it has been shown that one way to increase collective efficacy at a school is by having strong teacher leaders, how do we go about building leadership among teachers? There is a negative correlation between teacher efficacy and when a principal simply picks a lead teacher (Derrington &Angelle, 2013), while doing nothing to build the belief in the group's capability to move student learning forward. However, having lead teachers is associated with higher collective efficacy. So how can we build leadership among teachers to improve collective efficacy? Research by Derrington and Angelle (2013) suggests supporting principals are associated with higher CTE. Principals are critical to the support and success of teacher leadership. "Schools with the greatest extent of teacher leadership are led by principals who are most willing to share power and release control" (Derrington & Angelle, 2013, p. 4). Principals who empower their staff to become leaders help build active participation, collegiality, communication, and

collaboration (Derrington & Angelle, 2013). Second, by creating opportunities for involvement. "Teacher involvement is clearly an indicator of teacher leadership practices recognized by colleagues and likely to contribute to collective efficacy" (Derrington & Angelle, 2013, p. 6). By allowing time and opportunity for teachers to contribute outside of the classroom, we are building up their leadership potential in a natural way. "Teacher leadership matters more than the shape of that leadership" (Berry, Daughtrey, Wieder, 2010, p. 7) meaning, it is not so much the leadership assignment that teachers undertake, as much as the fact that they are taking on a leadership role to help increase collective teacher efficacy. Third, by creating meaningful collaboration. Teacher leaders share their knowledge, mentor others, and focus on student learning (Derrington & Angelle, 2013). Since "a rise in personal competence did little to affect their beliefs of their colleague's competence to operate at a high level and achieve goals" (Zambo & Zambo, 2008, p. 167). In order to really get the most impact out of having, creating or building teacher leaders, they need time to collaborate, share their knowledge, mentor others, and keep the focus on student learning (Derrington &Angelle, 2013). One of the most common and successful ways for creating this collaboration is through professional learning communities.

Professional learning communities

There is a strong positive relationship between professional learning communities and collective efficacy (Hardin, 2010; Nordick, 2013; Robertson, 2011). Professional

learning communities (PLCs) have an emphasis on relationships and improvement

(Robertson, 2011). PLCs have three major themes: "a foundation consisting of

collaboratively developed and widely shared mission, vision, values and goals;

collaborative teams that work interdependently to achieve common goals; a focus on

results as evidenced by a commitment to continuous improvement" (Robertson, 2011, p.

3). As reviewed earlier, practices that principals from schools with high collective

efficacy include: creating an environment of openness and support, establishing shared

expectations, facilitating teacher voice, providing opportunities to collaborate, and

promoting continuous learning (Nordick, 2017). These practices of principals cumulate

during implementation of professional learning communities. Professional learning

communities provide an opportunity for collaboration. They are an authentic way for

teacher leaders to demonstrate and share their knowledge and be a mentor to teachers

while focusing on student success (Derrington & Angelle, 2013). Furthermore,

professional learning communities promote continuous improvement. During PLCs, all

members contribute beyond their traditional roles, which allows for greater improvement

within staff, as well as the development of teacher voice and building of collective

efficacy (Hardin, 2010). Hardin hypothesized that the impact of professional learning

communities on collective efficacy would be higher at the elementary level because of

the assumed isolation of high school teachers within their subjects (2010). However,

conversely, Hardin found that professional learning communities' impact on collective

efficacy at the high school level was stronger than those at the elementary level (2010).

While professional learning communities are an ideal way to build collective

efficacy, they are also part of an interdependent relationship among many other variables.

While it could be "professional community and collaboration or leadership that drives

more effective teaching – the relationship is nonetheless clear and compelling" (Berry et

al., 2010, p. 3). In order to help build collective efficacy within schools we must focus on

building opportunities for natural teacher leaders to shine and for all members of our

school community to collaborate in a professional manner.

Conclusion

This study set out to investigate the relationship between efficacy and education.

The literature reviewed reflects a strong correlation between self-efficacy of teachers,

collective efficacy of staff and student achievement, as well as job satisfaction of

teachers. Collective efficacy might be the cure we need in education. If principals make

a conscious effort to build collective efficacy through professional learning communities,

and giving opportunities to teacher leaders, then, according to the literature reviewed, it is

likely that student outcomes will improve and job satisfaction of staff will improve as

well. This review of the literature yielded a positive relationship of efficacy to student

outcomes and job satisfaction within education. The implications of building efficacy

within education are limitless. It is a tool that leaders and teachers can use to help

improve students and personal outcomes within the profession.   However, one area that

the research did not yield significant findings was in regard to the perspectives of

teachers and how they felt the Collective Efficacy had been built and/or diminished at

their site. If knowing how collective efficacy is built or diminished according to teacher

perspectives, then it can also be a guide for administration as to how to improve

collective efficacy at their specific sites and in turn help support student outcomes, and

retain teachers in the profession. These are areas for future research in regard to self-

efficacy and collective efficacy.

METHODS

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate teachers' views of collective efficacy at their schools, the key events teachers cite when discussing their views, and their views on how collective efficacy can be built at their schools.

Study Participants

This study was given approval from the Humboldt State University Institutional Review Board and given IRB approval number 19-158. This survey was sent to all certificated employees, among four different school sites, in a small town in Northern California. During the two-week window for responses, one of the sites was removed from the study due to the Teacher Union's request not to have the site participate. After discussing it with the Superintendent, I removed the site and all relevant data from the study. The remaining three schools in the same small town remained in the study and we moved forward with the study. The three remaining schools are all within the same district. The district has three different schools, a TK through Second grade school, a 3rd through 5th grade school and a 6th through 8th grade school serving approximately 1,100 students, with approximately 60 certificated staff. The district offers a Science,

Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math (STEAM) program and a Spanish Immersion

program at the two elementary sites and a Spanish class at the middle school site.

Among the three sites 60 teachers were invited to participate in this Study. As shown in

Table 1, of the 21 certificated staff from Site A invited to participate, 8 responded giving

Site A a response rate of 38% and a Collective Efficacy Score of 46.5. Of the 17

certificated staff from Site B invited to participate, 7 responded giving Site B a response

rate of 41% and a Collective Efficacy Score of 54. Of the 22 certificated staff from Site

C invited to participate, 7 responded giving Site C a response rate of 32% and a

Collective Efficacy Score of 45.

Table 1. Response Rate and Collective Efficacy Score for Participating Sites

Site	Collective Efficacy Score	Number of Responses	Total Invited to Participate	Response Rate
A	46.5	8	21	38%
B	54	7	17	41%
C	45	7	22	32%
Overall	-	22	60	37%

Materials

This study uses both a researcher constructed Key Events and Issues Influencing

CTE Survey as well as the Collective Efficacy Survey (Goddard, 2002). I have included

both surveys into the same Google Form but included them in different sections. This

study used a six section Google Form survey. Section 1 was the introduction to the survey and only contained a definition of collective efficacy. Section 2 was the Informed Consent section that outlined the purpose, goal, and details of the survey for participants. At the end of Section 2 is a check box that participants must check before moving on to the next section stating that they have read and understood the consent information and agree to participate in the survey. Section 3 is the Demographic Section which collected information on teaching site, years spent at that site and years as a teacher. Section 4 was the Collective Efficacy Survey –Short Form (Goddard, 2002). The Short Form has 12 questions and uses a 6 point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree) which consists of four subscales: Positive Task Analysis, Negative Task Analysis, Positive Group Competence and Negative Group Competence. Section 5 of the survey consists of the researcher developed Key Events and Issues Influencing CTE Survey with 8 long answer questions designed to reveal why teachers rate their sites collective efficacy the way they do and what specific events caused the ratings. This section of the survey was discussed with an expert in the field for face validity. The last section, Section 6, is a simple note thanking them for their time in completing their survey.

Procedure

An email was sent out to all certificated staff within a small town in Northern

California that contained the link for the online survey. The teachers were asked to

complete the online survey over the next two weeks. Email reminders were sent out at

the end of the first week, with three days left and on the final day to complete the survey.

The survey should have only taken participants about 10-20 minutes to complete. The

informed consent form was attached to the email as well as the second section of the

survey so that participants must check a box that they understand the informed consent

and agree to participate in the survey before moving on. The CTE responses were tallied

and a school CTE score was calculated by averaging the individual teacher responses.

The Key Events and Issues Influencing CTE Survey results were coded for themes using

Braun's thematic analysis.

Participants

Among all three sites surveyed, 16 or 73% of teachers reported being at their sites

for ten years or less while 6 or 27% of teachers reported being at their sites for 11 or

more years. Among all three sites surveyed, 8 or 36% of teachers reported their years of

teaching as 10 years or less while 14 or 64% of teachers reported their years of teaching

as 11 or more years. See Table 2 for specifics.

Table 2. Demographic Data Collected Among the Participants

Years Teaching at that Site

Site	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
A	4	2	1	-	1
B	2	3	-	-	2
C	3	2	-	1	1
Overall	73%		27%		

Years as a Teacher

Site	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
A	-	3	1	1	3
B	2	1	-	1	3
C	-	2	-	3	2
Overall	36%		64%		

Important information about these three sites is that while they are all within the

same district Site A and Site B went through a "Reconfiguration" about 7 years ago.

Prior to the reconfiguration Site A and Site B were both K-5 programs that offered

different instructional programs, a traditional program and a language immersion

program. Following the reconfiguration Site A became a primary program that teaches both the traditional instructional program as well as the language immersion program. Site B became an elementary program that teachers both the traditional instructional program as well as the language immersion program. While it would be unfair to say that Site C wasn't impacted by the reconfiguration, it was not a school involved in the reconfiguration of grade levels or instructional programs offered.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

      While the purpose of this study was to gain the teacher's perspective on how they felt the collective efficacy of their site was either built or diminished, my secondary purpose was that teachers would express how they felt it should be built. For my own professional growth, the secondary part of this research was what I was really excited about, and about potentially using it to inform my practice moving forward. When beginning to analyze the data, there were so many different sites, teachers and input that the data didn't seem to connect. I chose to look at the data of each site separately. However, as I began coding the data of each site it was clear that relationships were an overarching theme in the data among all three sites. With that in mind, and upon discussion that efficacy is a social construct, I decided to look at my data through a relationship lens. Using the construct of relationships gave me an overarching lens to view the data through that connected all three sites.

Results

<u>Collective Efficacy Survey</u>

I began my survey with the Collective Efficacy Short Form Survey (Goddard, 2002). I wanted to use this survey to get a score for each site. I thought it might be helpful to see how each site scored overall and compared to the Key Events and Issues Influencing CTE Survey results.

The collective efficacy survey short form asks 12 questions using a Likert-scale of 1-6; 1 being that they strongly disagreed and 6 being that they strongly agreed. The twelve questions are listed in Table 3 for your reference. The twelve questions are broken into four groups, positive task analysis (TA+), negative task analysis (TA-), positive group competence (GC+) and negative group competence (GC-), with three questions falling into each group.

Table 3. Collective Efficacy Short Form Survey

Question Number	Survey Question	TA +	TA -	GC +	GC -
1	Teachers in this school are able to get through to difficult students.			X	
2	Teachers here are confident they will be able to motivate students.			X	
3	If a child doesn't want to learn teachers here give up.				X
4	Teachers here don't have the skills needed to produce meaningful learning.				X
5	Teachers in this school really believe that every child can learn.			X	
6	These students come to school ready to learn.	X			
7	Homelife provides so many advantages the students here are bound to learn.	X			
8	Students here just aren't motivated to learn.		X		
9	Teachers in this school do not have the skills to deal with student disciplinary problems.				X
10	The opportunities in this community help ensure that these students will learn.	X			
11	Learning is more difficult at this school because students are worried about their safety.		X		
12	Drug and alcohol abuse in the community make learning difficult for students here.		X		

In scoring the responses from each site, you take the negatively associated questions and transverse the response. You take the sum of all the scores and then take the average to give you the site collective efficacy score. For Site A the score was 46.5, for Site B the score was 54 and Site C the score was 45. Site A had a total of 8 responses out of 21 teachers that were invited to participate so the response rate for Site A was 38%. Site B had a total of 7 responses out of 17 teachers invited to participate so the response rate for Site B was 41%. Cite C had a total of 7 responses out of 22 teachers invited to participate so the response rate for Site C was 32%. Overall, there were 22 responses out of 60 invited teachers for an overall response rate of 37%. The scores are fairly close but Site B clearly had a greater ratio of teachers invited to those that responded and the overall collective efficacy score of Site B was higher. See table 1.

Key events and issues influencing CTE survey

For the qualitative section of the survey I asked teachers 8 open ended questions shown in Table 4. Questions 1-4 were grouped together for analysis in that they asked a positive and a negative each and focused on past experiences, events or people. Questions 5-8 were grouped together for analysis in that they asked what could be done by different people at their site to increase collective efficacy. For questions 1-4 I analyzed the data using a relationship lens, categorizing the response as positive or negative and whether it was a large event or small event.

Table 4. Key Events and Issues Influencing CTE Survey

Question Number	Survey Question
1	Please describe, in as much detail as possible, a time where you felt like your entire school site was working together to achieve a common goal. What was the goal? What made you feel as though everyone was on the same page/working together? How did that feel?
2	Please describe, in as much detail as possible, a time where you felt like your school site was not working together to achieve a common goal. Was there a goal? What made you feel as though everyone was not on the same page/working together? How did that feel?
3	What events or people do you feel have helped build collective efficacy at your site, if any?
4	What events or people do you feel have helped diminish collective efficacy at your site, if any?
5	What steps could be done by fellow teachers to help improve the collective efficacy of your site?
6	What steps could be done by your site administrator to help improve the collective efficacy of your site?
7	What steps could be done by your district administration team to help improve the collective efficacy of your site?
8	If you were the principal of your site, what steps would you take to help improve the collective efficacy among staff?

Questions 1-2.   Question 1 asks teachers to describe a time when they felt

that their whole site was working together to achieve a common goal while Question 2

asks teachers to describe a time when they did not feel like their whole site was working

together to achieve a common. These two questions are important because it gets

teachers talking about specifics within their sites, what they felt was positive, and what

they felt was negative for their sites.

For Site A, when asked questions 1-2, four big events came up in their responses;

the Pandemic/distance learning, Implementation of Curriculum, Site Reconfigurations,

Instructional Programs offered. The Pandemic was in full swing and half the teachers at

Site A brought that up as an example of when their site was really working well together.

The other half brought up implementing curriculum (such as a Language Arts or Positive

Behavioral Intervention and Supports curriculum) as a time when their site came

together. Both of these big events were brought up in a positive way for building

collective efficacy. As far as the negative events or the time when they felt like their site

wasn't on the same page was the Reconfiguration of Sites and the Instructional Programs

offered. Approximately 6 years ago, the sites were reconfigured to accommodate the

instructional programs offered and attempt to provide balance between the two programs.

As shown in Table 5 half of the responses mentioned reconfiguration as a negative

impact on their site's collective efficacy and the other half mentioned having the two

instructional programs offered to students as having a negative impact on their site's

collective efficacy. It is important to mention that some comments did express smaller

events related to these 4 general categories including collaboration and division. 88% of

responses mentioned positive collaboration, 12% of responses mentioned lack of

collaboration, 75% mentioned a sense of division creating negative CTE for their site.

Table 5. Site A's Percentage of Responses in Cited Themes

	Events				Feelings	
	Pandemic and Distance Learning	Curriculum Implementation	Reconfiguration of Site A and Site B	Instructional Programs Offered	Collaboration	Sense of Division
Positive	50%	50%	-	-	88%	-
Negative	-	-	50%	50%	12%	75%

For Site B, when asked questions 1-2, three larger topics came up as positive or

building their site's collective efficacy; Pandemic/Distance Learning, Curriculum,

Leadership, and Instructional Programs Offered. Two larger topics came up as negative

or diminishing their site's collective efficacy; Leadership, Instructional Programs

Offered. Of those that responded, 57% stated that Pandemic/Distance Learning, 14%

stated that Curriculum Implementation and 29% stated that Leadership contributed to

their site building collective efficacy. When asked what teachers felt diminished their

site's collective efficacy, 14% chose to decline, of those that responded, 50% stated

Leadership, and 50% stated Instructional Programs offered were what they felt

diminished collective efficacy at their site, see Table 6. It is also important to mention

that feelings of collaboration, lack of support, and communication/miscommunication came up as well. Leadership came up as a positive and negative theme within this site. When teachers were talking of Leadership contributing to building their site's collective efficacy they spoke of partnering with administration. One participant stated, "During our current situation of providing meaningful Distance Learning, our staff and administrator are working together to give our students the best we have." Another participant shared, "I feel that due to leadership we are always included as part of the team with almost everything that comes up."   When describing Leadership contributing to diminishing collective efficacy of their site, responses centralized around a theme of lack of communication that led to misunderstanding of events from the administration on behalf of the teachers. One participant stated, "The reasons behind a goal were not shared with everyone working towards this goal and a lot of miscommunication was happening." While another participant spoke of a specific event in which a newer teacher was let go, "for no apparent reason…Those who supported her were called on the carpet by admin…Everyone was walking on eggshells and distrustful of who would be next." These two opposite themes of positive leadership and negative leadership, with regards to collective efficacy, are prime examples of how specific events and the leadership within those events can impact specific sites. It is not so much that the event took place, rather, how it makes staff feel. You can't control a global pandemic impacting your site

instructional models and having to switch to distance learning; however, you can control

the way in which you communicate and unit your staff during the pandemic.

Table 6. Site B's Percentage of Responses in Cited Themes

	Events				Feelings		
	Pandemic and Distance Learning	Curriculum Implementation	Leadership	Instructional Programs Offered	Collaboration	Lack of Support	Communication and Miscommunication
Positive	57%	14%%	29%	-	86%	-	14%
Negative	-	-	50%	50%	-	83%	17%%

For Site C when asked questions 1-2, three larger topics were brought up as what

has built and diminished their site's collective efficacy. Of the responses 14% stated

Grade Level Teams, 57% stated Pandemic/Distance Learning and 29% stated Curriculum

Implementation, in regard to BASE curriculum and the beginning of PBIS, as helping to

build their site's collective efficacy. Of the responses 100% stated that Curriculum

Implementation, in regard to PBIS, Grading Policies, Conferences, as helping to diminish

their site's collective efficacy. It is important to mention that when talking about

Curriculum Implementation diminishing collective efficacy, it was the lack of holding

teachers accountable to that curriculum that made teachers rate it as a negative. One

participant stated, "Even with admin stating the guidelines that needed to be followed –

they still just ignore it and do whatever they want…It also means that we never see the

full potential of a plan and change doesn't happen and/or it doesn't translate effectively to

students." While another participant said, "staff have excuses to not refer to the binder,

and do not talk the talk." Finally, another participant shared, "It felt frustrating to be

doing more than others and to feel like the end goal was not important to everyone." It is

important to note that teachers also brought up feelings of collaboration (57%) as a

positive and lack of follow through by teachers (57%) as a negative, see Table 7. It is

also important to note that Site C did not mention Reconfiguration or Instructional

Programs Offered like Sites A and B did. Sites A and B were the only two schools

reconfigured 6 years and they are the only two sites in the district that offer two different

Instructional Programs. It makes sense that Site C did not cite either topic in the

responses.

Table 7. Site C's Percentage of Responses in Cited Themes

	Events			Feelings	
	Pandemic and Distance Learning	Curriculum Implementation	Grade Level Teams	Collaboration	Lack of Follow Through by Teachers
Positive	57%	14%%	-	86%	-
Negative	-	-	50%	-	83%

Questions 3-4.   Question 3 asks teachers what events or people they felt

have helped build collective efficacy at their site and Question 4 asks teachers what

events or people they felt have helped diminish collective efficacy at their site. It is

important to note that at the beginning of this research, we had 4 sites participating. It

was due to Question 4 that the 4thsite chose to pull out of the research. The Union

Representative of the 4th site thought that the question was asking for teachers to call each

other out and could be detrimental to staff. The Union Representative asked that their

site not participate in the study and, after discussing with the Superintendent, the entire

site's data was removed from the study. In the future, if this study was to be used again, I

would change the wording to question three and four to avoid other sites feeling this way,

or remove the questions from the study. What is encouraging is that every single

response, even those removed from the study, were positive in that they did not single out

any specific teacher as a negative. They respected their colleague's privacy and

confidentiality. I am so thankful that the participants understood the intention of the

question and were willing to still answer. However, upon looking at the data, much of

the data is a repeat of the previous two questions. In analyzing the data of Questions 3

and 4, I used that data to help inform the relational aspect of the data but did not analyze

it any further. I do believe that if this study is to be used further, Question 3 and 4 should

be removed.

Questions 5-8.   Questions 5-8 ask teachers to think about how the different

roles at their site could work on building collective efficacy and how if they were the

principal at their site what would they do to build collective efficacy. When asked these

questions, teachers had a myriad of responses, in order to analyze the data, I tally marked

each time a topic was brought up and for what role.

For Site A, participants thought that their fellow teachers could improve collective

efficacy at their site by having transparency, increasing communication, only having one

instructional program, collaborating more, and participating in professional development,

some did say that improving collective efficacy was above their ability and that it would

require higher level than that of a teacher; stating "The steps needed are above the ability

of individual teachers and small groups of teachers. Continued fractured interests and

program choices have stopped the ability to improve the collective efficacy of my site."

While other participants describe the opportunity for teachers to work together as a way

of how teachers can help improve collective efficacy; stating "Calm down. Children

before programs. Continue to develop professionally and accept the fact that no one is

ever 'done' learning. We can all grow." Or as others stated, "This next school year is

going to be crucial for teachers in both programs to work together with a common goal to

educate our students via in person and distance learning."

Participants also thought that the principal could improve collective efficacy by

being more transparent, improving communication, having one instructional program,

increasing collaboration, setting clear expectations, providing feedback/support, being

approachable and listening, and building trust/respect. Again, that same participant also

thought that the principal wasn't necessarily the one to improve the collective efficacy

and that it was a higher-level admin that could make the necessary changes to improve

their site's collective efficacy; stating "The site administrator has no power to improve

the collective efficacy of my site. Middle management site administrators suffer the fate

or poor program choices and can never improve a whole site." While other participants

again spoke of collaboration and support; stating "Our new site administrator will have

some big shoes to fill. First, our new administration is going to need to gain the trust and

respect of our staff. Second, I think they should have a game plan ready with ideas to

help our staff in both programs work together and efficiently. Third, I think our

administrator should be able to listen to our concerns and give appropriate support and

feedback." The stark difference in these two responses signals the challenge building

collective efficacy can be. So, the themes teachers highlight are based on different views

of what is going on and their perceptions of what can be done about it. Some people

believe that situations can be improved and are willing to work together as a team to

achieve their goals, while others seem to be of the mindset that nothing can be done

individually or even site based to improve the site.

Participants thought that their District Administrator could improve their sites

collective efficacy by only providing one instructional program, more time to collaborate,

being approachable and listening, and getting input from staff. One participant stated,

"Give sites to build these type relationships that will help improve collective efficacy."

Another said, "must be willing to listen to teachers," while another said, "stop making

huge changes without asking staff input." It is interesting that while some of the

participants stated that each of the previous positions would need a higher-level position

to improve collective efficacy by eliminating the two instructional programs offered

down to one, they did not believe that to be true of the District Administrator role.

However, the District Administrator would need the approval of the School Board before

taking away an instructional program, which participants said that they wanted all three

levels to do, and yet not one person believed that it didn't fall to the Superintendent or

District Administrator role.

When asked if they were the principal of their site what would they do to improve

CE among their site, teachers reported increased transparency, increased communication,

having only one instruction program, increasing collaboration, providing more

professional development, setting clear expectations, providing feedback/support to

teachers, and being approachable and listening. Some stated, "I would provide more

support for teachers," or "offer opportunities for the staff to grow and learn more about

teaching," or "provide chances to build relationships with staff and families," or "work to

create a sense of community through whole school celebrations of different achievements

and shared experiences," or "more positive feedback in the moment," or "be explicit

about my expectations regarding what needed to be taught. I would provide support for teachers who were not reaching expectations." One person said that even if they were the principal, they wouldn't be able to improve the collective efficacy of their site because it was out of that position's control. See Table 8.

Table 8. Site A's Suggested Steps Each Role Could Implement to Improve Site CE

What steps?	one instructional program	collaboration	communication	feedback/support	be approachable and listen	transparency	above our ability - to the next level	professional development	clear expectations	increase trust and respect	input from staff
As Teachers	3	3	2	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-
As Site Admin	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	-	1	1	-
As District Admin	4	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	1
You as Principal	2	2	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	-	-
Overall	10	9	5	5	5	4	4	3	2	1	1

For Site B participants thought that their fellow teachers could improve collective efficacy at their site by having better problem-solving skills, increasing communication, having positive messaging to the community, being more respectful, advocating for

students more, and rotating both instructional programs so all students get the same instruction.

Participants also thought that the principal could improve collective efficacy by having better problem-solving skills, increasing communication, having positive messaging to the community, being more respectful, assuming positive intent, supporting teachers, allowing for feedback or input from teachers and increasing collaboration. One participant stated, "Be willing to take some criticism without being defensive, have private conversations with negative people, advertise the positive to the public." Others stated, "keep an open mind," work to understand" "make sure teachers, even struggling ones, feel the admin support they will need to build their instructional confidence." Through these quotes, it is clear that teachers want to be understood and supported by administration and that they believe that will help increase the collective efficacy of their site.

Participants thought that their District Administrator could improve their sites' collective efficacy by employing better problem-solving skills in regard to budget, increasing communication, continuing to support teachers, and allowing feedback and input from teachers. Stating, "being straightforward with staff when communicating," "listen to and get input from staff and actually take it into consideration for decision-making," "keep up the atmosphere they have built in the last eight weeks," "I feel incredibly supported in what is, obviously, the most challenging situation of my career."

It is clear that the participants at this site have positive things to say regarding their

district administration team and believe that to better build collective efficacy at their site

it would take continuing to do the things they are already doing, as well as continue to

encourage and listen to input when new situations arise.

When asked if they were the principal of their site what would they do to improve

CE among their site, teachers reported increasing communication, advocating for more

student support, supporting teachers, allowing for feedback/input from teachers and

increasing collaboration. Participants stated, "constant support," "being honest and

keeping staff in the loop of changes that pertain to them," "actually using the input to

guide the decision making process." Participants echoed what they stated earlier,

support, communication, input from staff. See Table 9.

Table 9. Site B's Suggested Steps Each Role Could Implement to Improve Site CE

What steps?	communication	support teachers	allow for feedback/input	advocate for more student supports	positive messaging to community	respect	better problem solving	assume positive intent	collaboration	rotate both programs so all students get the same thing
As Teachers	4	-	-	1	3	1	1	-	-	1
As Site Admin	8	7	5	6	3	5	1	3	1	-
As District Admin	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
You as Principal	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Overall	15	9	8	7	6	6	4	3	3	1

For Site C participants thought that their fellow teachers could improve collective efficacy at their site by, increasing accountability of teachers, increasing collaboration, increasing support for teachers, and having consistent follow through. Participants stated, "consistently follow through on team decisions," "I don't know how to say this diplomatically: fellow teachers need to assume responsibility for the greater good and do what is needed, not just what they want to do or are comfortable doing," and "be

supportive of each other when new systems arise." They want teachers to be held accountable and supported at the same time.

Participants also thought that the principal could improve collective efficacy by increasing accountability of teachers, increasing collaboration, increasing support for teachers, having consistent follow through, increased professional development, increased decision making, giving teachers voice, and being approachable. Participants spoke of "more opportunities for training and collaboration," "asking for advice and discussion beforehand is great, but at the end, we need the site administrator to make hard decisions that we must follow," "being approachable to staff as things come up," "a system of holding people accountable would be great."

Participants thought that their District Administrator could improve their sites collective efficacy by, increasing accountability of teachers, increasing collaboration, having consistent follow through, increased professional development, increased decision making, narrowing the focus of District Goals, having transparency, positive contract negotiations and more acknowledgment or appreciation of hard work. Participants stated, "find focus on one thing that we need to put our energy into per year or trimester," "be transparent," "more team building opportunities," "choose one or two important things and vie them consistent staff PD time instead of sending out too many goals and follow them for a month or two," "be okay making hard decisions and hold staff to high expectations to complete the task."

When asked if they were the principal of their site what would they do to improve CE among their site, teachers reported increased accountability for teachers, increased collaboration, increased support for teachers, consistent follow through, increased professional development, increased decision making, giving teachers a voice, narrowing the focus of District Goals and acknowledging and appreciating hard work. Participants stated, "provide a clear goal with steps and expectations to reach the goal," "seek advice and opinions, and then make big decisions," "divvy the work and hold those who fall short accountable," "more team building opportunities," "show teachers the positive changes that are occurring," "be present and communicate." See Table 10.

Table 10. Site C's Suggested Steps Each Role Could Implement to Improve Site CE

What steps?	accountability of teachers	collaboration and team building	support for teachers	professional development	narrowing focus of District Goals	consistent follow through	decision making	giving voice to teachers	appreciation of hard work	approachable	transparency	positive contract negotiations
As Teachers	4	2	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
As Site Admin	2	4	2	3	-	1	2	1	-	1	-	-
As District Admin	1	2	-	2	2	1	1	-	1	-	1	1
You as Principal	4	2	3	1	4	2	2	1	1	-	-	-
Overall	11	10	9	6	6	5	5	2	2	1	1	1

Relationship lens

I also decided to look at the data through a relationship lens. In coding my

responses, I looked at each response and coded it as either a positive or negative and

tallied which relationship it would fall under. I considered the following relationships:

district administrator to teacher, site administrator to teacher, teacher to teacher, teacher

to students, teacher to parents, and school to community. I then took a percent of the

number of positive comments to the number of negative comments for each relationship.

The percentages are shown in Table 8 below. From the data, it was interesting that the

relationship of teacher to teacher was 50% positive to 50% negative for all three sites.

For Site A and Site B, their ratio of negative comments outweighed the ratio of positive

comments in regard to District Administrator to Teacher relationship. Site C did not have

any comments in this relationship area, one could infer that this may be due to the fact

that Site C did not have to go through the reconfiguration process several years ago and

don't offer the two instructional models that the other sites offer. For Site A they had a

higher negative percentage when looking at the Site Administrator to Teacher

relationship, but Site B and C had higher positive percentages when looking at the Site

Administrator to Teacher relationship. All Sites had higher positive percentages when

looking at the Teacher to Student relationship. For the Teacher to Parent relationship,

Site A had a high negative percentage for that relationship, while Site B had an extremely

positive percentage for that relationship and Site C did not have any comments that

touched on that relationship. Lastly, Site A had an extremely negative percentage when looking at the School to Community relationship, while Site B was split 50/50 between positive and negative and Site C did not have any comments that touched on the School to Community relationship. From this data, we can see that Site B, which had the highest collective efficacy score, had the highest positivity rate among all relationships compared to the other sites, and had those positive percentages of comments in every category of relationship examined.

Table 11. Relationship Data by Site

Site	Relationship	District Administrator to Teacher	Site Administrator to Teacher	Teacher to Teacher	Teacher to Students	Teacher to Parents	School to Community
A	Positive	25%	43%	50%	67%	25%	-
	Negative	75%	57%	50%	33%	75%	100%
B	Positive	33%	60%	50%	100%	100%	50%
	Negative	67%	40%	50%	-	-	50%
C	Positive	-	67%	50%	100%	-	-
	Negative	-	33%	50%	-	-	-

These long answer questions allowed an opportunity to get teacher input on what built or hurt their site's collective efficacy as well as provided teachers an opportunity to share what they felt could be done at their sites by the different levels to improve their site's efficacy and finally it gave teachers an opportunity to share what they would do if

they were in the site leader role for their site. While the data is lengthy, there are good

inferences that can be made. When looking at questions 5-8, asking teachers to talk

about the steps to be done to improve their site's collective efficacy, there are some

strong similarities among each site. The biggest that is shared among the sites is

communication, collaboration and accountability. While these are themes that the

teachers speak of needing, the same themes can be applied to support students. Since we

are looking at how to build collective efficacy, and a strong site collective efficacy has

been shown to have a positive impact on student outcomes, it stands to reason that by

analyzing the themes expressed by teachers and finding a way to increase

communication, increase collaboration and increase accountability on all levels, would

translate into more positive student outcomes, stronger teacher retention and overall

increased collective efficacy. In my role as an administrator, I think following these three

themes that emerged would help me to increase the collective efficacy of any site,

particularly the theme of communication. With differing perceptions about situations

having an impact of collective efficacy, being clear and communicating to staff can help

narrow the varied perceptions that teachers may have around a topic and could potentially

help improve collective efficacy.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study looked to gain insight on how teachers perceived their collective efficacy had been built or diminished within their current sites. As discussed in the results section the three major themes that emerged as having the greatest potential to build or diminish efficacy were communication, collaboration and accountability. When done well, teachers perceived these three themes as building their collective efficacy. However, when not done well, teachers also considered these three themes as detrimental to their collective efficacy. While we can infer this from the results of this particular study, it is difficult to infer this beyond these specific sites. As discussed in the literature review, Bandura (1993) showed efficacy as a social construct formed by feedback and influenced by the ability to control their environment. For these reasons, generalizing results beyond this study would be difficult since these teacher's collective efficacy and their perceptions of how to build the efficacy of their site are skewed by the social construct within their specific sites, within their district and within their larger community as well. While we may not be able to use the specific results of this study in a broad way, we can generalize some of the emerging themes teachers perceived as building their collective efficacy. Teachers in this study spoke of communication, collaboration and accountability as contributing to Collective efficacy. From the research, we know that efficacy is built through repeated, varied, meaningful situations

designed to develop mastery. So, we could infer that repeated, varied and meaningful

communication, collaboration and accountability could help increase collective efficacy.

We could also infer the reverse of that, a lack of repeated, varied and meaningful

communication, collaboration and accountability would diminish efficacy.   While these

inferences help to inform this study, they do not take into account the myriad of other

social constructs informing teachers actions, decision making and perceptions.

When designing this study, I felt as though Site A would have the lowest CE, Site

B would have the next and that Site C would have the highest CE score. My rationale

was that Site C had very strong teachers who appeared, to me, to have very high

collective efficacy. When the results came in and Site B actually had the highest CE

score I was a little surprised. However, Bandura (2000) reminds us that Collective

Efficacy is not high because individual teachers have high levels of self-efficacy (like

Site C), rather, collective efficacy is increased when those involved work well together

(like Site B). In reading the quotes from Site B, they are working very hard, together,

especially during this unprecedented Pandemic. Site C, while they have strong teachers,

demonstrated a desire to have accountability for their counterparts meaning that they did

not believe that as a group they were doing well.

One major takeaway from this study is that while there could be multiple factors

that teachers identify as building or diminishing the collective efficacy within a site, the

major themes identified require repetition of those actions, repeated communication,

repeated collaboration, and repeated accountability to help build efficacy. As a young administrator starting off as a leader, I would use this idea to inform my practice. I cannot do something once and expect it to help build the efficacy of my staff. My biggest lesson learned that can be applied to my profession is to build the habits of communication, collaboration and accountability and allow as many positive opportunities in these areas as possible for staff.

While I was able to gather good data from the perspective of teachers as to what has built or diminished the collective efficacy of their specific sites, future studies would need to be conducted to generalize these findings to the larger profession of education. The broad themes that these teachers describe as communication, collaboration and accountability could be further areas of study to determine more specific social constructs that impact collective efficacy. Based on my findings, I would ensure that my staff has repeated, varied and meaningful opportunities to communicate with me, and I to them, that my staff has repeated, varied and meaningful opportunities to collaborate and that there are repeated, varied and meaningful opportunities for accountability within our structure.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1977, March). Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral
Change. *Psychological Review*, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning.
Educational Psychologist, 28(2), 117-148.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* Stanford, CA: WH
Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co.

Bandura, A. (2000, June). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current
Directions in Psychological Science*, 75-78.

Berry, B., Daughtrey, A., & Wieder, A. (2010). *Teacher Leadership: Leading the Way to
Effective Teaching and Learning.* Chapel Hill: Center for Teaching Quality.

Brinson, D., & Steiner, L. (2007). *Building Collective Efficacy: How Leaders Inspire
Teachers to Achieve.* Washington, DC: Center for Comprehensive School Reform
and Improvement.

Brouwer, J. L. (2018). *Relationship between Self-Efficacy Perceptions of the Principal
and Collective Teacher Efficacy Perceptions in Four Midwestern States* (Doctoral
Dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC. (Accession No. ED 587087)

Derrington, M. L., & Angelle, P. S. (2013, Fall). Teacher Leadership and Collective
    Efficacy: Connections and Links. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership, 4*,
    1-13.

Donohoo, J. (2018, August). Collective Teacher Efficacy Research: Productive Patterns
    of Behaviour and Other Positive Consequences. *Journal of Educational Change,
    19*, 323-345.

Gibbs, S. &. Powell, B. (2011). Teacher efficacy and pupil behaviour: The structure of
    teachers' individual and collective beliefs and their relationship with numbers of
    pupils excluded from school. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 564-
    584.

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

Goddard, R. D. (2001, Sep). Collective Efficacy: A Neglected Construct in the Study of
    Schools and Student Achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*, 467-
    476.

Goddard, R. (2002). A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of the Measurement of
    Collective Efficacy: The Development of a Short Form. *Educational and
    Psychological Measurement, 62*, 97-110.

Goddard, R. D., LoGerfo, L., & Hoy, W. K. (2004, July). High School Accountability: The Role of Perceived Collective Efficacy. *Educational Policy, 18*, 403-425.

Goddard, R., & Skrla, L. (2006). The Influence of School Social Composition on Teachers' Collective Efficacy Beliefs. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*, 216-235.

Goddard, R., Hoy, W., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*, 470-507.

Goddard, R., Hoy, W., & Hoy, A. W. (2004). Collective Efficacy Beliefs: Theoretical Developments, Empirical Evidence and Future Directions. *Educational Researcher, 33*, 3-13.

Hardin, J. (2010). *A Study of Social Cognitive Theory: The Relationship Between Professional Learning Communities and Collective Teacher Efficacy in International School Settings.* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC. (Accession No. ED517953).

Klassen, R. (2010). Teacher Stress: The Mediating Role of Collective Efficacy Beliefs. *Journal of Educational Research, 103*, 342-350.

Mayo-Brown, M. (2018). *The Lived Experiences of Principals in Urban Turnaround Schools: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis Study Examining Teacher*

Collective Efficacy (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC. (Accession No. ED584957)

Nordick, S. (2017). *Fundamental Features of Fostering Teacher Collective Efficacy: Principals' Attitudes, Behaviors, and Practices* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC. (Accession No. ED580018).

Prelli, G. E. (2016). How School Leaders Might Promote Higher Levels of Collective Teacher Efficacy at the Level of School and Team. *English Language Teaching, 9*, 174-180.

Robertson, D. S. (2011). *The Relationship of Teachers' Perceptions of Collective Efficacy and Perceptions of Professional Learning Communities* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC. (Accession No. ED533447)

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 80*, 1-18.

Sandoval, J. M., Challoo, L. B., & Kupczynski, L. (2011, May-Jul). The Relationship between Teachers' Collective Efficacy and Student Achievement at Economically Disadvantaged Middle School Campuses. *Journal on Educational Psychology, 5*, 9-23.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007, August). Dimensions of Teacher Self-Efficacy and

   Relations with Strain Factors, Perceived Collective Teacher Efficacy, and Teacher

   Burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*, 611-625.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. (1998, Sum). Teacher efficacy: Its

   meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*, 202-248.

Ware, H., & Kitsantas, A. (2007, May). Teacher and Collective Efficacy Beliefs as

   Predictors of Professional Commitment. (H. Publications, Ed.) *Journal of

   Educational Research, 100*, 303-310.

Zambo, R., & Zambo, D. (2008). The Impact of Professional Development in

   Mathematics on Teachers' Individual and Collective Efficacy: The Stigma of

   Underperforming. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*, 159-168.