Developing Country Studies
ISSN 2224-607X (Paper) ISSN 2225-0565 (Online)
Vol.6, No.12, 2016

Social Studies Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy in Senior High Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis

Ennin John Oware
Department of Educational Leadership, College of Technology Education, University of Education, Winneba.
Ghana

Abstract
The study aimed at assessing the level of Social Studies Teacher's sense of self-efficacy and the relationship between Senior High School Social Studies teachers experience and level of self-efficacy in the Kumasi Metropolis. The quantitative data were gathered through questionnaires administered to 25 teachers and 1000 students in five selected public Senior High Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis. Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation were employed to analyze the data. The results of the study showed that Social Studies Teachers have high efficacy level. Workshops and in-service training programs by the ministry of education are recommended for all the teachers to further improve their efficacy level.

1.0 Introduction

In the midst of the movement to improve education and Social Studies subject in particular the educational reforms initiated by the Government of Ghana in 1987 brought in its wake the introduction of Social studies as a course of study at the Junior High School. In 1997, ten years after its introduction at the Junior High School level, Social Studies subject surfaced as a core subject at the Senior High Schools. According to Quartey (1985) Social Studies is the subject that equips the learner with the tools necessary for solving his personal and societal problems. These tools are relevant knowledge, positive attitudes, values and skills. As a result the subject prepares individuals to fit into the society by equipping them with knowledge about the culture and ways of life of the society, its problems, its values and hopes for the future. To achieve the objectives of Social Studies as a subject, it rests on teachers to teach effectively in realizing this and much depends on the efforts and efficacy of teachers.

The need for efficacious social studies teachers is evident by the fact that some of the Senior High Schools do not have teachers who are efficient and well versed in the appropriate pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) of teaching Social Studies .As a result the Universities of Education, Winneba and Cape Coast have been producing teachers to handle the subject efficiently, but the extent to which these teachers can handle the subject is also a matter of concern because some of the teachers look at the breadth of the subject and teach without going to the depth of the subject.

Studies have also shown that teachers are a direct link to student's achievements and teachers with a strong sense of self efficacy nurture their students toward academic accomplishments and teachers with a weak sense of self-efficacy tend to surrender in the presence of difficulty.

According to Bandura (1986), he is of the view that individuals possess a self-evaluation system that allows them to exercise some control over their thoughts, feelings, and actions. These self-evaluations help determine how much effort they will expend on any activity, how long they will persevere when confronting obstacles, and how resilient they will be in situations.

As a teacher, the number one goal is to allow students to learn. With a strong sense of skills and self-efficacy, teachers can assist students in the development of their cognitive capabilities. And as a result of this, the researcher sought to assess the level of Social Studies teachers' sense of self-efficacy in the teaching of the subject.

1.1 Problem Statement

Visits to our Senior High Schools today reveal that most of the teachers in the schools are out-of-field teachers, they are teaching subjects they don't have the appropriate pedagogical content knowledge to handle. From my personal observations in some of the Senior High Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis, Social Studies is the most affected subject because most people think that anyone can teach the subject no matter the persons professional background, in some of the Schools we have teachers trained in French and Architecture handling Social Studies, and l am of the assumption that one's a teacher is not trained in the area that he/she is teaching there is the likelihood that he/she may lack the pedagogical content knowledge in handling the subject, hence his/her efficacy in handling the subject may be low. Research has shown that there is a correlation between teachers' sense of self-efficacy and commitment to teaching (Coladarci, 1992). Another research by Berman and McLaughlin (1997) also look at teachers' sense of self-efficacy and students achievement and it was concluded that the extent to which teachers believe they are capable of influencing student performance affects their enthusiasm and persistence in working with students and ultimately their students' achievement. It is in light of this that this study is looking at Social Studies Teachers sense of self-efficacy and the relationship between Senior High School Social Studies teachers experience and level of self-efficacy in five selected Senior High Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis of the Ashanti

region.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the level of Social Studies teachers' sense of self-efficacy in the teaching of the subject and to examine the relationship between teachers' experience and sense of self-efficacy.

1.3 Research Questions

Based on the objectives of the study the following research questions were framed to guide the conduct of the study.

1. What is the level of Social Studies teachers' self-efficacy in the Kumasi Metropolis?
2. Is there a relationship between Senior High School Social Studies teachers experience and level of self-efficacy in the Kumasi Metropolis?

2.0 Theoretical Expositions

2.1 Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is an individual's personal judgment of his/her capabilities to organize and carry out actions that will result in anticipated types of performances such as improved student achievement (Bandura, 1977). Perceived self-efficacy concerns aren't merely a general belief in one's ability. As mentioned, it is much larger in scope because it is an assessment of one's capabilities in three complex and crucial areas; motivation, resources and action. In addition, self-efficacy is not a generalized trait; it is a person's belief in his or her ability to perform a specific task (Bandura1986). To be sure, one needs both skill and self-efficacy to successfully perform a task. Nevertheless, given the same level of skill, differences in self-efficacy could result in different performance outcomes (Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

For example, if two students with identical scores college entrance examinations pursued the same curriculum, they would not likely graduate with identical grade point average. Self-efficacy shouldn't be confused with confidence. Self-efficacy refers to the confidence people have in their abilities for success in a given task (Bandura, 1997). If they possess the ability to successfully perform, then that task will be attempted. The task will be avoided if it is perceived to be too difficult (Bandura, 1986, 1997).

2.2 Socio-Cognitive Theory of Self-Efficacy

Social cognitive theory, proposed by Bandura (1986) is a socio-cognitive perspective that enables individuals to self regulates cognitive processes and behaviors, rather than simply react to events. This perspective ascribes to the belief that "individuals are capable of exercising a degree of control over their thoughts, feelings, motivation, and actions" (Pajares, 2003, p.7) Bandura (1986, 1997) believed that behavior is more effectively predicted by the belief that individuals have regarding their capabilities rather than what they are actually capable of accomplishing. Therefore, an individual's self-belief is a driving force in his/her academic accomplishments. It is these beliefs that determine "how well knowledge and skill are acquired" (Pajares, 2003, p. 8)

2.3 Bandura's Study of Teacher Efficacy

Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory defines teacher efficacy as a teacher's belief in his or her own capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy & Hoy 1998). He indicated that self efficacy can be based on past successes and the level of competence people expect they will have in a given situation or circumstance. Self-efficacy beliefs influence people's willingness to expend effort in pursuit of their goals, persist in the face of adversity, continue to move forward in spite of setbacks, and exercise control over events that affect their lives (Bandura 1997).This theory indicated perceived self-efficacy as comprising of two concepts that determine individuals' beliefs about their ability to control the outcome of their behavior and the events that affect their lives. And these concepts are outcome expectancy and efficacy expectation (Bandura, 1993).

Efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes. Gist and Mitchell (1992) declared that self efficacy is a judgment about task capability that is not inherently evaluative. Self-efficacy is a self-perception of but not the actual level of competence. This is important since we often tend to over underestimate our abilities. Outcome expectancy is the individual's conviction that he or she can orchestrate the necessary actions to perform a given task at the expected level of competence.

2.4 Rand's Studies of Teacher Efficacy: Social Learning Theory

The conceptual framework for teacher efficacy for Rand studies was Rotter's (1966) locus of control construct (Gibson & Dembo, 1985). In which they defined Locus of control as the extent to which teachers believe that they could control the reinforcement of their actions, that is, whether the control reinforcement lay within them or in the environment (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Rotter proposed that, a person's locus of control is the perception

of where one's belief stems. And it contains two distinct areas: internal and external control. External control was defined as the belief that the reward or reinforcement is due to outside causes such as luck, fate, chance, or a higher power. Internal control on the other hand is the belief that the reward or reinforcement, as well as behaviors and actions, are the result of personal characteristics.

Rotter conceptualized teacher efficacy as teachers' beliefs that factors under their control ultimately have greater impact on the results of teaching than do factors in environment of the student, thus factors beyond the influence of the teachers (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

The main concept behind Social Learning Theory is that personality represents the interaction of the individual with his or her environment.

2.5 Teacher Self -Efficacy

Teacher self efficacy is defined as the teachers believe in their abilities to organize and execute courses of action necessary to bring about desired results (Moran, Wolfolk-Hoy, Hoy 1988). A teacher's belief that he or she can reach even difficult students to help them learn, appears to be one of the few personal characteristics of teachers that is correlated with student achievement" (Woolfolk, 2007, p. 334). In other words, teacher self-efficacy revolves around creating environments conducive to learning and cognitive development. Teacher self-efficacy beliefs relate to the structure of curriculum and forming student perceptions of their ability to learn (Bandura, 1997). Teachers with a high sense of teacher self-efficacy believe that their efforts in the classroom will leave a lasting impact on the student, no matter their background.

High efficacy teachers create an atmosphere conducive to student success and learning. The teacher with a high sense of efficacy works diligently with students who struggle with content, spends more time on academic subject matters, and praises students for succeeding and making gains. Teachers with a low sense of teacher self-efficacy feel incapable of teaching or motivating difficult children for a long period of time due to influences from the home and neighborhood environment. Low efficacy teachers spend more time in the classroom on nonacademic material, fail to provide adequate time for students to answer, and constantly criticize the struggling student (Evans, 1989).

Teacher self-efficacy has shown valuable in the area of student academic achievement over time. The higher the sense of teacher self-efficacy, the greater the choices made for student success, and the more likely student self-efficacy will increase. The dedication and personal accomplishment of teachers with a high sense of efficacy are components to the creating of an effective learning environment (Bruning, Schraw, Norby, & Ronning, 2004). Self-efficacy is found to have two distinct dimensions, efficacy and personal teaching efficacy.

Personal teaching efficacy refers to the teacher's own personal beliefs that he or she has the necessary skills and capability to improve student learning. And General teaching efficacy also refers to the belief that external factors beyond the teacher's control, such as socioeconomic status, home environment and parental involvement, limit the teacher's ability to bring about change or stimulate improvement.

2.6 Experienced Teacher Self-Efficacy

Experience as a general concept comprises knowledge of or skill of something or some event gained through involvement in or exposure to that thing or event. The concept of experience generally refers to know-how or procedural knowledge. As teachers grow in experience, studies suggest that a custodial view of classroom control with strict rules and standards to control discipline will take precedence (Bruning, Schraw, Norby, & Ronning, 2004). Bandura also suggested that the mastery of more difficult situations leads to an increase in the level of teacher efficacy (Bandura 1977). On their part Ashton and Webb (1986) also recognized that highly efficacious teachers tend to be more organized, display greater skills of instruction, questioning students, explaining, and providing feedback to students who have difficulties, and maintaining students on task. Furthermore, experienced teachers may develop a higher level of teacher self-efficacy in that they will have experienced real success with the students in the classroom (Woolfolk, 2007).

2.7 Sources of Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1977) in his writing describes four sources of personal efficacy namely, performance accomplishment, Vicarious experience, Social persuasion and Physiological and Emotional states.

2.7.1 Performance Accomplishment

This is the personal assessment information that is based on individual's personal accomplishments. This source of efficacy is based on personal mastery experiences.

The effects of failure on personal efficacy therefore partly depend on the timing and the total pattern of experiences in which the failures occur. Once established, enhanced self-efficacy tends to generalize to other situations in which performance was self-debilitated by preoccupation with personal inadequacies (Bandura, Jeffery, & Gajdos, 1975). As a result, improvements in behavioral functioning transfer not only to similar situations but to activities that are substantially different from those on which the treatment was focused. Thus, for example,

increased self-efficacy gained through rapid mastery of a specific animal phobia can increase coping efforts in social situations as well as reduce fears of other animals.

2.7.2 Vicarious Experience

This is gained by observing others perform activities successfully. This is often referred to as modeling and it can generate expectations in observers that they can improve their own performance by learning from what they have observed. They persuade themselves that if others can do it, they should be able to achieve at least some improvement in performance (Bandura & Barab, 1973).People do not rely on experienced mastery as the sole source of information concerning their level of self-efficacy. Many expectations are derived from vicarious experience. Seeing others perform threatening activities without adverse consequences can generate expectations in observers that they too will improve if they intensify and persist in their efforts.

2.7.3 Social Persuasion

This is where people are led through suggestion into believing that they can cope successfully with specific tasks. Coaching and giving evaluative feedback on performance are common types of social persuasion. Although social persuasion alone may have definite limitations as a means of creating an enduring sense of personal efficacy, it can contribute to the successes achieved through corrective performance. That is, people who are socially persuaded that they possess the capabilities to master difficult situations and are provided with provisional aids for effective action is likely to mobilize greater effort than those who receive only the performance aids. However, to raise by persuasion expectations of personal competence without arranging conditions to facilitate effective performance will most likely lead to failures that discredit the persuaders and further undermine the recipients' perceived self-efficacy. It is therefore the interactive, as well as the independent, effects of social persuasion on self-efficacy that merit experimental consideration.

2.7.4 Physiological and Emotional States

People rely partly on their state of physiological arousal in judging their anxiety and vulnerability to stress. Because high arousal usually debilitates performance, individuals are more likely to expect success when they are not beset by aversive arousal than if they are tense and viscerally agitated. Fear reactions generate further fear of impending stressful situations through anticipatory self-arousal.

As will be appraisals of one's physiological state might be energizing, whereas other appraisals of the same state might not (Weiner, 1972). Moreover, many forms of physiological arousal are generated cognitively by arousing trains of thought. When motivation is conceptualized in terms of cognitive processes (Bandura, 1977; Weiner, 1972), the informational and motivational effects of arousal are treated as interdependent rather than as recalled from the earlier discussion, desensitization and massive exposure treatments aimed at extinguishing anxiety arousal produce some reductions in avoidance behavior. Anxiety arousal to threats is likewise diminished by modeling, and is even more thoroughly eliminated by experienced mastery achieved through participant modeling (Bandura & Barab, 1973; Bandura et al., 1969; Blanchard, 1970a).

Social learning theory, on the other hand, emphasizes the informative function of physiological arousal. Simply acknowledging that arousal is both informative and motivating by no means resolves the issue in dispute, because these are not necessarily two separate effects that somehow jointly produce behavior. Rather, the cognitive appraisal of arousal to a large extent determines the level and direction of motivational inducements to action.

3.0 The Method

3.1 Research Design

The current research employed the use of quantitative research method. Descriptive statistics was also used. It determines and reports the way things are done. Descriptive research thus involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or answer research questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study (Gaye, 1992).
The current study employed the use of quantitative method to assess the level of social studies teachers' sense of self-efficacy in the Kumasi Metropolis.

3.2 Participants

The sample size was all the Social Studies teachers in the Public Senior High Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis, simple random sampling was used to select 5 schools and the total number of the Social Studies teachers in the schools were fifty six (56), again simple random sampling was used to select five teachers from each of the five schools making up twenty five (25) as the sample for the study to find out Social Studies teachers sense of self-efficacy.

3.3 Data Collection

A questionnaire was used to collect the information that would allow for the achievement of the research objectives. . Robson (2002) indicates that the best quality of answers is likely to be gained from specific questions about important things. The questionnaire consisted of two sections, section A and B. Section A elicited personal background information of the teachers and section B consisted of subsections, efficacy to influence decision

making, efficacy to influence school resources, instructional self efficacy, disciplinary self efficacy, efficacy to enlist parental involvement, efficacy to create a positive school climate and factors that affects a teachers sense of efficacy.

The distribution of the teachers who responded to the interview is presented in Table 1 below

Table 1 Socio-demographic variables of teachers in the various schools

Variable	School Category N (%)				
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
Gender					
Male	0(0.0)	3(60.0)	3(60.0)	2(40.0)	3(60.0)
Female	5(100.)	2(40.0)	2(40.0)	3(60.0)	2(40.0)
Age (in years)					
20-25	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
26-35	2(40.0)	3(60.0)	0(0.0)	3(60.0)	3(60.0)
36-45	3(60.0)	1(20.0)	3(60.0)	2(40.0)	2(40.0)
46-55	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
Highest Degree Attained					
Bachelors	3(60.0)	4(80.0)	3(60.0)	4(80.0)	3(60.0)
Masters	1(20.0)	1(20.0)	2(40.0)	1(20.0)	2(40.0)
Other	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
Institution Attended					
	3(60.0)	1(20.0)	2(40.0)	1(20.0)	2(40.0)
UEW	2(40.0)	4(80.0)	3(60.0)	3(60.0)	3(60.0)
KNUST	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)
UG	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
Years in Teaching Social Studies					
0-2	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
3-5	1(20.0)	3(60.0)	0(0.0)	2(40.0)	3(60.0)
6-8	2(40.0)	2(40.0)	3(60.0)	1(20.0)	2(40.0)
9-11	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(40.0)	0(0.0)
12-14	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
Area of Specialization					
Economics	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
French	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
Geography	3(60.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)
Religious Studies	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)
Social Studies	2(40.0)	3(60.0)	3(60.0)	5(100.)	3(60.0)
Rank					
Principal superintendent	5(100.)	5(100.)	4(80.0)	3(60.0)	3(60.0)
Assistant Director II	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	2(40.0)	2(40.0)
Assistant Director I	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)

Source= Researcher's field data

3.4 Questionnaire data

Out of the 25 questionnaires distributed, all the 25 were returned and were analyzed. The responses of the respondents to each questionnaire were analyzed using the SPSS statistical program for windows. The resultant descriptive data from the analysis of the two research questions were organized into descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation.

3.5 Data Analysis

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to analyze the background data of respondents. The quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation and Pearson Correlation to show distribution of responses. Tables were used to show responses to make responses clear and give a quick impression of values without having to read long sentences.

4.0 The Results and Discussion

In an attempt to identify the level of social studies teachers' sense of efficacy, the researcher looked at it in five ways (a) distribution of efficacy level scores of individual Social Studies teachers, (b) efficacy level of Social

Studies Teachers in the various schools, (c)distribution of Social Studies Teachers self-efficacy level on decision making, resources and instruction in the various schools categories (d)distribution of Social Studies Teachers self-efficacy level on disciplinary and parental involvement in the various school categories and (e)distribution of Social Studies Teachers efficacy to create a positive school climate in the various school categories with a five likert scale type, beginning from 'Very Little' 1mark, 'Little' 2 marks, 'Some Influence' 3 marks, 'Significantly' 4 marks and 'Great Deal' 5 marks and this is how it is presented. First it was done on individual teacher basis and secondly for all the teachers together.

Table 4.2 Efficacy Level Scores of individual Social Studies Teachers on Decision making, Resources and Instruction

Teachers	Score	Efficacy Level	Percentage Score (%)	Rank
AT1	44	4.00	80.0	4th
AT2	39	3.55	71.0	9th
AT3	42	3.82	76.4	6th
AT4	46	4.18	83.6	2nd
AT5	45	4.09	81.8	3rd
BT6	46	4.18	83.6	2nd
BT7	44	4.00	80.0	4th
BT8	46	4.18	83.6.	2nd
BT9	42	3.82	76.4	6th
BT10	44	4.00	80.0	4th
CT11	37	3.36	67.2	11th
CT12	42	3.82	76.4	6th
CT13	30	2.73	54.6	13th
CT14	43	3.91	78.2	5th
CT15	51	4.64	92.8	1st
DT16	34	3.09	61.8	12th
DT17	44	4.00	80.0	4rd
DT18	40	3.64	72.8	8th
DT19	41	3.73	74.6	7th
DT20	41	3.73	74.6	7th
ET21	43	3.91	78.2	5th
ET22	40	3.64	72.8	8th
ET23	41	3.73	74.6	7th
ET24	38	3.45	69.0	10th
ET25	39	3.55	71.0	9th

**1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Some* Influence; 4= Significantly; 5= Great Deal *Number of respondents*
Source= Researcher's field data

Table 4.2 reported on the efficacy level Scores of individual Social Studies Teachers on Decision making, Resources and Instruction. Five likert scale was used and marks were assigned to each scale beginning from 'Very Little' 1mark, 'Little' 2 marks, 'Some Influence' 3 marks, 'Significantly' 4 marks and 'Great Deal' 5 marks. This section consisted of 11 questions and each question was having five options, and the options corresponded with marks and the total marks for answering all the questions were 55. Based on their responses, a table was generated to find their efficacy level on decision making, resources and instruction. According to the table, the highest score was 51 out of 55; with efficacy level of 4.64 and a percentage score of 92.8 and the lowest marks were 30, with efficacy level of 2.73 and a percentage score of 54.6.From the foregoing it can be concluded that, in finding the efficacy level of teachers in decision making, resources and instruction in the various school categories the respondents reported they have high efficacy which confirms what Ashton and Webb said, that highly efficacious teachers tend to be more organized, display greater skills of instruction, questioning students, explaining things well to students, and providing feedback to students who have difficulties, and maintaining students on task(1986).

Table 4.2.1 Efficacy Level Scores of individual Social Studies Teachers on Disciplinary and Parental Involvement

Teachers	Score	Efficacy Level	Percentage Score (%)	Rank
AT1	21	3.50	70.0	7th
AT2	14	2.33	46.6	14th
AT3	24	4.00	80.0	4th
AT4	23	3.83	76.6	5th
AT5	23	3.83	76.6	5th
BT6	23	3.83	76.6	5th
BT7	24	4.00	80.0	4th
BT8	23	3.83	76.6	5th
BT9	22	3.67	73.4	6th
BT10	15	2.50	50.0	13th
CT11	20	3.33	66.6	8th
CT12	22	3.67	73.4	6th
CT13	17	2.83	56.6	11th
CT14	28	4.67	93.4	1st
CT15	28	4.67	93.4	1st
DT16	25	4.17	83.4	3rd
DT17	26	4.33	86.6	2nd
DT18	22	3.67	73.4	6th
DT19	19	3.17	63.4	9th
DT20	18	3.00	60.0	10th
ET21	26	4.33	86.6	2nd
ET22	22	3.67	73.4	6th
ET23	25	4.17	83.4	3rd
ET24	16	2.67	53.4	12th
ET25	22	3.67	73.4	6th

**1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Some* Influence; 4= Significantly; 5= Great Deal *Number of respondents*
Source= Researcher's field data

Table 4.2.1 reported on the efficacy level Scores of individual Social Studies Teachers on Disciplinary and Parental Involvement in the Schools. This section consisted of six questions and each question was having five options, 'Very Little' 1mark, 'Little' 2 marks, 'Some Influence' 3 marks, 'Significantly' 4 marks and 'Great Deal' 5 marks and the total marks for answering all the questions were 30. Based on the responses of the respondents, a table was generated to find their efficacy level on Disciplinary and Parental Involvement in the schools. According to the table, out of the 30 marks the highest score was 28 with efficacy level of 4.67 and a percentage score of 93.4. The teacher with the lowest score was 14, efficacy level of 2.33 and a percentage score of 46.6. This means that Social Studies teachers in the Kumasi Metropolis have a high sense of efficacy in the area of discipline and parental involvement in the school.

Table 4.2.2 Scores of Individual Social Studies Teachers' Efficacy to create a positive School Climate in the schools.

Teachers	Score	Efficacy Level	Percentage Score (%)	Rank
AT1	27	3.86	77.2	7th
AT2	19	2.71	54.2	12th
AT3	31	4.43	88.6	3rd
AT4	29	4.14	82.8	5th
AT5	28	4.00	80.0	6th
BT6	28	4.00	80.0	6th
BT7	27	3.86	77.2	7th
BT8	25	3.57	71.4	9th
BT9	26	3.71	74.2	8th
BT10	25	3.57	71.4	9th
CT11	25	3.57	71.4	9th
CT12	25	3.55	71.4	9th
CT13	18	2.57	51.4	13th
CT14	30	4.29	85.8	4th
CT15	32	4.57	91.4	2nd
DT16	28	4.00	80.0	6th
DT17	34	4.86	97.2	1st
DT18	26	3.71	74.2	8th
DT19	25	3.57	71.4	9th
DT20	23	3.29	65.8	11th
ET21	29	4.14	82.8	5th
ET22	24	3.43	68.6	10th
ET23	30	4.29	85.8	4th
ET24	24	3.43	68.6	10th
ET25	24	3.43	68.6	10th

**1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Some* Influence; 4= Significantly; 5= Great Deal *Number of respondents*
Source= Researcher's field data

Table 4.2.2 also reported on the efficacy level Scores of individual Social Studies Teachers on how to create a Positive School Climate in the schools**.** This section consisted of seven questions and each question was having five options,'Very Little' 1mark, 'Little' 2 marks, 'Some Influence' 3 marks, 'Significantly' 4 marks and 'Great Deal' 5 marks. And the total marks for answering all the questions were 35. Based on the responses of the respondents, a table was generated to find their efficacy level on how to create a positive school climate. According to the table, out of the 35 total marks the highest score was 34, efficacy level 4.86, and a percentage score of 97.2 .The lowest mark obtained by a teacher was 18, efficacy level of 2.57 and a percentage score of 51.4.This means that Social Studies teachers in the Kumasi Metropolis have a high sense of self-efficacy on how to create a positive school climate. A school's climate contributes to the academic success of its students and predicts the degree to which they actively participate in learning, including how consistently they attend school, how attentive they are in class, how carefully they complete their class assignments, and how committed they are to staying in school and doing well there. Students who attend schools with a more positive climate tend to have more positive attitudes towards school and school subject which lead to higher achievements (Kos, 1990; Krall, 2003; Lehr, 2010).

Table 4.2.3 Efficacy Level Scores of Individual Social Studies Teachers' Efficacy in the schools.

Teachers	Score	Efficacy Level	Percentage Score (%)	Rank
AT1	132	4	80.0	8th
AT2	113	3	60.0	17th
AT3	136	4	80.0	6th
AT4	138	4	80.0	4th
AT5	136	4	80.0	6th
BT6	134	4	80.0	7th
BT7	127	4	80.0	10th
BT8	129	4	80.0	9th
BT9	122	3	60.0	12th
BT10	122	3	60.0	12th
CT11	125	4	80.0	11th
CT12	121	3	60.0	13th
CT13	93	3	60.0	20th
CT14	145	4	80.0	2nd
CT15	156	4	80.0	1st
DT16	116	3	60.0	16th
DT17	141	4	80.0	3rd
DT18	121	3	60.0	14th
DT19	109	3	60.0	18th
DT20	108	3	60.0	19th
ET21	117	3	60.0	15th
ET22	111	3	60.0	17th
ET23	137	4	80.0	5th
ET24	109	3	60.0	18th
ET25	122	3	60.0	12th

**1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Some* Influence; 4= Significantly; 5= Great Deal *Number of respondents*
Source= Researcher's field data

Table 4.2.3 reported on the individual efficacy level scores of Social Studies teachers. This was aimed at finding the individual teachers level of self-efficacy based on the questionnaire they answered, This section consisted of thirty four (34) questions and each question was having five options, 'Very little' 1 mark, 'Little' 2 marks, 'Some Influence' 3 marks, 'Significant' 4 marks and 'Great Deal' 5 marks, and the total marks for answering all the questions were 170. Out of the 170 marks, the highest score was 156 with an efficacy level of 4 and a percentage score of 80 and the lowest score was 93 and efficacy level of 3 and a percentage score of 60.This means that all the respondents have a high sense of efficacy which implies all the Social Studies teachers in the Kumasi Metropolis have a high sense of self-efficacy. From the foregoing it can be concluded that all the Social Studies teachers in the Kumasi Metropolis have a high sense of self-efficacy when it comes to the teaching of Social Studies

Table 4.3 Social Studies Teachers' Self Efficacy level on Decision making, Resources and Instruction in the schools.

Statement	VL N(%)	L N(%)	SI N (%)	S N (%)	GD N (%)	Total N (%)
How much can you do to influence decisions social studies teaching?	1(4.0)	0(0.0)	8(32.0)	12(48.0)	4(16.0)	25(100)
How much can you express your views on social studies teaching matters?	1(4.0)	1(4.0)	6(24.0)	13(52.0)	4(16.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to make instructional materials for teaching?	1(4.0)	3(12.0)	9(36.0)	11(44.0)	1(4.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to influence the class size in social studies lessons?	4(16.0)	3(12.0)	2(8.0)	11(44.0)	5(20.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to get through the most difficult students?	2(8.0)	4(16.0)	3(12.0)	10(40.0)	6(24.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to promote learning of social studies?	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	7(28.0)	13(52.0)	5(20.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to keep social studies students on task on difficult assignments?	0(0.0)	1(4.0)	5(20.0)	14(56.0)	5(20.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to increase students' memory of what they have been taught?	0(0.0)	1(4.0)	2(8.0)	13(52.0)	9(36.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in social studies?	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(16.0)	13(52.0)	8(32.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to get students to work together in social studies class?	0(0.0)	1(4.0)	6(24.0)	9(36.0)	9(36.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to get students to do their homework on social studies?	0(0.0)	1(4.0)	7(28.0)	11(44.0)	6(24.0)	25(100)

**VL=Very Little; L=Little; SI=Some* Influence; S= Significantly; GD= Great Deal *Number of respondents*
Source= Researcher's field data

Table 4.3 shows a summary of all the respondents views on their efficacy level on decision making, resources and instruction in the schools, eleven (11) questions were asked and respondents responded to all the questions and it can be concluded that, in finding the efficacy level of teachers in decision making, resources and instruction in the schools therespondents reported significantly to all the variables which confirms the argument of Ashton and Webb(1986), that highly efficacious teachers tend to be more organized, display greater skills of instruction, questioning students, explaining things well to students, and providing feedback to students who have difficulties, and maintaining students on task.

Table 4.3.1 Social Studies Teachers' Self Efficacy level on Disciplinary and Parental Involvement in the Schools.

Statement	VL N(%)	L N(%)	SI N(%)	S N(%)	GD N(%)	Total N(%)
How much can you do to get students to follow classroom rules during social studies lessons?	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(8.0)	12(48.0)	11(44.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in social studies classroom?	1(4.0)	0(0.0)	5(20.0)	14(56.0)	5(20.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to prevent problem behavior on the school grounds?	3(12.0)	0(0.0)	8(32.0)	12(48.0)	2(8.0)	25(100)
How much you do to get parents to become involved in school activities?	2(8.0)	3(12.0)	7(28.0)	12(48.0)	1(4.0)	25(100)
How much can you assist parents in helping their children do well in social studies?	2(8.0)	2(8.0)	9(36.0)	9(36.0)	3(12.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to make parents feel comfortable coming to the school?	0(0.0)	3(12.0)	7(28.0)	11(44.0)	4(16.0)	25(100)

**VL=Very Little; L=Little; SI=Some* Influence; S= Significantly; GD= Great Deal *Number of respondents*
Source= Researcher's field data

Additionally Table 4.3.1 also reported on Social Studies Teachers' Self Efficacy level on Disciplinary and Parental Involvement in the schools, six(6) questions were asked and respondents answered all the questions

and it is clear that almost all of the respondents reported significantly to all the variables which means that self-efficacious teachers are able to maintain discipline and involve parents in their work.

Table 4.3.2 Social Studies Teachers' Efficacy to create a positive School Climate in the school categories.

Statement	VL N(%)	L N(%)	SI N(%)	S N(%)	GD N(%)	Total N(%)
How much can you do to make the school a safe place?	1(4.0)	1(4.0)	6(24.0)	13(52.0)	4(16.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to make students enjoy coming to school to learn social studies?	0(0.0)	1(4.0)	5(20.0)	11(44.0)	8(32.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to help other teachers with their teaching skills in social studies?	1(4.0)	1(4.0)	8(32.0)	11(44.0)	4(16.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to enhance collaboration between teachers and the administration to make the school run effectively?	1(4.0)	5(20.0)	9(36.0)	9(36.0)	1(4.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to reduce students' disinterest in social studies?	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	8(32.0)	11(44.0)	6(24.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to reduce absenteeism during social studies lessons?	1(4.0)	0(0.0)	5(20.0)	12(48.0)	7(28.0)	25(100)
How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in social studies?	1(4.0)	0(0.0)	5(20.0)	10(40.0)	9(36.0)	25(100)

**VL=Very Little; L=Little; SI=Some* Influence; S= Significantly; GD= Great Deal *Number of respondents*
Source= Researcher's field data

Table 4.3.2 also looked at Social Studies Teachers' Efficacy to create a Positive School Climate in the schools, seven (7) questions were asked and respondents reported that they can significantly help in creating a positive school climate. This confirms what Miskel, McDonald and Bloom (1983) said that teacher efficacy is related to more positive attitudes toward school.

From the foregoing it is clear that on the level of Social Studies teachers' sense of self-efficacy, all the teachers have a high efficacy level and this is in line with what Ware and Kitsantas (2007) said that highly efficacious teachers are more likely to adopt an open style of teaching where they allow students to contribute actively in the teaching process by asking questions or attempting to solve problems with the teacher's supervision. These teachers motivate students intrinsically, thus building a strong foundation for students to understand and never shy away from a challenging problem.

4.4 Relationship between Teachers' Experience and Level of Self-Efficacy

In finding the relationship between teachers experience and level of efficacy, four sub themes were used. The first one was Pearson's correlation between teachers experience and instructional and disciplinary self efficacy in the schools and Pearson's correlation between teachers experience and efficacy to create positive school climate and parental involvement in the schools.

Table 4.5 Pearson's correlation between teachers experience and instructional and disciplinary self efficacy in the schools

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Teaching experience	1.000													
2.Influence decisions	-.148 (.480)	1.000												
3.Provide instructional materials	-.175 (.404)	.064 (.760)	1.000											
4.Influence class size	-.409* (.042)	.095 (.653)	.629** (.001)	1.000										
5.Get through to difficult students	-.126 (.549)	-.263 (.205)	.570** (.003)	.606** (.001)	1.000									
6.Promote learning	-.079 (.706)	.029 (.889)	.042 (.841)	.077 (.714)	.053 (.802)	1.000								
7.Keep students on task	.240 (.247)	.089 (.673)	-.144 (.493)	-.008 (.970)	-.212 (.308)	.300 (.145)	1.000							
8. Increase memory of student	.400 (.040)	.637** (.001)	.024 (.908)	.197 (.345)	-.121 (.564)	.342 (.092)	.532** (.006)	1.000						
9.Motivate students	-.268 (.196)	.212 (.309)	.065 (.415)	-.332 (.104)	-.492* (.013)	.286 (.165)	.584** (.002)	.492* (.013)	1.000					
10.Get students to work together	-.135 (.520)	.120 (.568)	-.423* (.035)	-.488* (.013)	-.281 (.174)	.272 (.188)	.375 (.064)	.233 (.262)	.330 (.107)	1.000				
11. Students to do their homework	-.024 (.418)	.178 (.396)	-.381 (.060)	-.246 (.236)	-.410* (.040)	.125 (.550)	.445** (.026)	.170 (.416)	.544** (.005)	.401* (.040)	1.000			
12. Students follow classroom rules	-.170 (.418)	.038 (.856)	-.336 (.101)	.066 (.754)	-.209 (.315)	-.026 (.902)	-.406* (.040)	-.274 (.185)	.338 (.098)	-.194 (.853)	.024 (.244)	1.000 (.001)		
13. Control disruptive behavior	-.454* (.023)	-.098 (642)	.354 (.082)	.280 (.175)	.175 (.401)	-.353 (.084)	-.015 .943	-.149 (.478)	-.036 .865	-.047 (.824)	-.020 (.923)	.302 (.142)	1.000	
14. Prevent problem behavior	-.211 (.311)	-269 (194)	.377 (.068)	.223 (.284)	.349 (.088)	.099 (.638)	.142 (.498)	.001 (1.000)	-.090 .670	.113 (.591)	-.269 (.194)	.024 (.909)	.359 .079	1.00

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level of probability (2-tailed)*
***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level of probability (2-tailed)*

Table 4.5 reported on Pearson correlation between teachers experience and instructional and disciplinary self efficacy in the schools, all the 14 variables, were not statistically significant at 0.05 level of probability with respect to teacher experience and instructional and disciplinary self efficacy in the schools. This means that there is no relationship between teachers experience and instructional and disciplinary self efficacy in the schools

Table 4.5.1 Pearson's correlation between teachers experience and efficacy to create positive school climate and parental involvement in the schools

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Teaching experience	1.000									
2.Involve parents	-.202 (.333)	1.000								
3.Parents feel comfortable	-.144 (.589)	.203 (.330)	1.000							
4.Make school a safe place	-.637** (.001)	.521** (.008)	.367 (.071)	1.000						
5.Students enjoy coming to school	-.243 (.241)	083 (.692)	.511** (.009)	.174 (.407)	1.000					
6.Help other teachers	-.286 (.166)	.494* (.012)	-.108 (.607)	.537** (.006)	-.085 (.685)	1.000				
7.Enhance collaboration	-.195 (.350)	.514** (.009)	.119 (.572)	.528**	-.219 (.294)	.577** (.003)	1.000			
8. Reduce students' disinterestt	-.073 (.727)	-.131 (.532)	.440 (.028)	.084 (.688)	.332 (.105)	-.099 (.637)	.077 (.715)	1.000		
9.Reduce absenteeism	-.459* (.021)	.580** (.002)	.179 (.392)	.653** (.001)	.002 (.992)	.639** .001	.622* (.001)	.230 (.268)	1.000	
10.Make students believe they can do well	.093 (.657)	.239 (.251)	.392 (.052)	.013 (.952)	.353 (.084)	-.029 (.892)	-.143 (.496)	.285 (.167)	.002 (.993)	1.000

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level of probability (2-tailed)*
***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level of probability (2-tailed)*

Table 4.5.1 also reported on Pearson's correlation between teacher experience and efficacy to create

positive school climate and parental involvement in the schools. From the table it is clear that all the ten (10) variables were not statistically significant at 0.05 level of probability with respect to teacher experience and efficacy to create positive school climate and parental involvement, which means there is no relationship between teachers experience and level of self-efficacy. In looking at the relationship between a teachers experience and sense of self-efficacy, the respondents reported that there is no relationship between teachers experience and level of self-efficacy.

Conclusion and Recommendations

From the present study the following conclusions can be made:

1. The main purpose of this study was to assess the level of Social Studies Teachers sense of self-efficacy in the teaching of social studies in the senior high schools in the Kumasi metropolis and according to the respondents; Social Studies Teachers in the Kumasi Metropolis have a high sense of self-efficacy in the teaching of social studies.
2. The respondents reported that there is no relationship between a teachers experience and level of self-efficacy in the teaching of social studies.

Workshops and in-service training programmes are therefore recommended to help our teachers in the teaching of Social Studies to further improve upon their efficacy.

References

Allinder, R. M. (1994).The relationship between efficacy and instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. Teacher education and special education

Ashton, P., Olejnik, S., Crocker, L., McAuliffe, M.(1982). Measurement problems in the study of teachers sense of efficacy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Research Association, New York n.17:86-95

Ashton, P.T., Webb, R.B., & Doda, N. (1983). A study of teachers' sense of efficacy. National Institute of Education

Ayaaba, D. A. & Odumah, L.K (2007). Skills and techniques of teaching social studies. Cape Coast: Yaci Publication

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

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

Bandura, A. (1995). Self-efficacy in changing societies. Cambridge, UK. Cambridge University Press.

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

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84 (2), 191-215

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. Annual Review of Psychology, 52, 1-26

Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. Perspectives on Psychological Science 1:2

Bandura, A. (2007). Much ado over a faulty conception of perceived self-efficacy grounded in faulty experimentation. Journal of social and Clinical Psychology, 26 (6), 641-658

Berman P., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change. vol VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation (Report No.R-1589/7 HEW). Santa Monica, CA.

Billingsley, B. S., Cross L.H. (1992). Predictors of commitment, job satisfaction and intent to stay in teaching: A comparison of general and special educators. The Journal of Special Education, 25,453-471

Billingsley B, Carlson E, Klein S. (2004). The working conditions and induction support of early career special educators. Exceptional Children, 70,333-347

Boe, E. E., Barkanic G., Leow C. S. (1999). Retention and attrition of teachers at the school level National trends and predictors. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education, Centre for Research and Evaluation in Social Policy. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED436485

Brookover, W., Schweitzer J., Schneider J., Beady C., Flood P., & Wisenbaker J.(1978). Elementary school climate and school achievement. American Educational Research Journal 15,301-318

Brophy, J. E., & Everston, C(1977). Teacher behaviors and student learning in second and third grades. MA: Addison-Wesley

Chwalitsz, K., Altameyer E. M., Russel D. W (1992). Causal attributions, self-efficacy, Cognitions and coping with stress. Journal of Social and Clinical Research 11:377- 400

Dembo, M. H., & Gibson S. (1985). Teachers sense of efficacy: An important factor in school improvement. Elementary School Journal, 86,173-184

Denzine, G. M., Cooney J.B., & McKenzie R. (2005). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Teacher Efiicacy Scale for prospective teachers. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 689-708

Emme,r E. T. & Hickman J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51(3), 755-765

Enochs, L. G., Smith P. L., & Huinker D. (2000). Establishing factor validity of the mathematics teaching efficacy beliefs instrument. School Science and Mathematics, 100, 194-202

Friedman, I. A., & Kass E.(2002). Teacher self-efficacy: a classroom-organization conceptualization. Teaching and Teacher Education, 18, 675-68

Gaye, J.Y. (2002). A short guide to research writing in the social sciences and education, Accra: Ghana Universities Press

Guskey, T. R. (1984). T he influence of change in instructional effectiveness upon the affective characteristics of teachers. American Educational Research Journal 21(2) 245- 259

Heneman, H.G.,Kimball, S.,& Milanowski, A. (2006). The teacher sense of efficacy scale: Validation evidence and behavioral prediction. University of Wisconsin- Madison, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research. Retrieved July 25, 2012

Henson, R. K. (2002). From adolescent angst to adulthood: Substantive implications and Measurement dilemmas in the development of teacher self-efficacy research. Educational Psychologist, 37,137-150

Kearns, D. T. (1988). Winning the brain race: Bold plan to make our schools competitive.ICS Press 172.

Labone, E. (2004).Teacher efficacy: Maturing the construct through research in alternative Paradigms. Teaching and Teacher Education,20, 341-359

McLaughlin, M. W. & Marsh, D. (1978). Staff development and school change. Teachers college record, 80(1), 70-94

Morrison,G. M., Walker, D., Wakefield, P., Solberg, S. (1994). Teacher preferences for collaborative relationships; Relating to efficacy for teaching in prevention-related Domains. Psychology in the Schools.31: 221-231

Moore, W., & Esselman, M. (1992). Teacher efficacy, power, school climate and achievement: A desegregating districts experience. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco

Mulholland, J. & Wallace, J. (2001).Teacher induction and elementary science teaching enhancing self-efficacy. Teaching and Teacher Education, 17, 243-261

Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). Questionnaire design and attitude measurement. London: Printer J. C.

Pajares, F. (1997).Current direction in self-efficacy research. In M. Maehr &P.R Pintrich (Eds.). Advances in motivation and achievement, 10, 1-49.175

Pajares, F. (2002). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic contexts: An outline. Retrieved July 30 2012 from http//www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/efftalk.html/

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. Reading and Writing Quarterly, 19 (2), 139-158

Poulou, M. (2007). Personal teaching efficacy and its sources: Student teachers perception educational Psychology, 27(2), 191-218

Quartey, S. M. (1984). *A Method Book for Social Studies Teachers*. Lagos: Orit Egwa Ltd

Riggs, I. M., & Enochs, L. G. (1990).Toward the development of an elementary teachers science teaching efficacy belief instrument. Science Education, 74,625-637.176

Roberts, J. K. & Henson, R. K. (2001). A confirmatory factor analysis of a new measure of efficacy: Ohio state teacher efficacy scale. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association.

Rose, J. S. & Medway, F. J. (1981). Measurement of teacher's beliefs in their control over outcome. Journal of Educational Research 74(3), 185-190

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effects of coaching on student achievement Canadian Journal of Education, 17(1), 51-65

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectations for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychology Monographs, 80, 1-28

Rushton, S.P. (2000). Student teacher efficacy in inner-city schools. The Urban Review, 32(3) 365-383

Rushton, S.P. (2003). Two pre-service teachers growth in self-efficacy while teaching in an inner-city school. The Urban Review, 35(3). 167-185

Schwarzer, R., Hallum, S. (2008). Percieved teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. Applied Psychology: An Internatioal Review. 57,152-171

Soodak, L.C., & Podell, D. M (1996). Teacher efficacy: Toward the understanding of a multi- faceted construct.Teaching and Teacher Education,12 (4),401-411

Smylie, M. A. (1990). Teacher efficacy at work. In P. Reyes (Ed), Teachers and their workplace (pp. 48-66). Newbury Park: Sage

Tschannan-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W.K (1998). Teacher efficacy: It's meaning and measure. Review of Educational Research, 68(2), 202-248

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. Teaching

and Teacher Education, 17,783-805

Usher, E.L., & Pajares F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the literature and future directions. Review of Educational Research,78, 751-796

Ware, H., & Kitsantas, A. (2007). Teacher and collective efficacy beliefs as predictors of professional commitment. Journal of Educational Research. 100, 303-310.179

Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA

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