ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, COLLEGIAL TRUST, AND COLLEGE FACULTY TEACHING EFFICACY: A CASE STUDY

By

DESMOND OKPOGBA

Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy
Bigard Memorial Seminary (Affiliate of
Urban University, Rome)
Ikot Ekpene, Nigeria
1985

Bachelor of Science in Divinity
Bigard Memorial Seminary (Affiliate of
Urban University, Rome)
Enugu, Nigeria
1989

Master of Science in Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK
2001

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July 2011

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, COLLEGIAL TRUST, AND COLLEGE FACULTY TEACHING EFFICACY: A CASE STUDY

Dissertation Approved:

Dr. Patrick Forsyth

Dissertation Adviser

Dr. Ed Harris

Chair

Dr. Tami Moore

Member

Dr. Kathryn Castle

Member

Dr. Mwarumba Mwavita

Member

Dr. Mark E. Payton

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my profound appreciation to many who contributed to the completion of this study. First of all, the highest praises always go to God, whose grace led me through the process of research, writing, and approval. Special appreciation goes to Professor Patrick B. Forsyth, my dissertation adviser, for his invaluable contribution and support. The author will forever be indebted to him for his guidance and wealth of wisdom. Without him, this work would not have been successful. Special thanks to Prof. Ed Harris, the committee chair for his expertise, leadership, patience, support and encouragement. Professor Kathryn Castle made insightful and scholarly remarks that helped me to focus as the study progressed. Professor Mwarumba Mwavita deserves great credit for his expertise and Professor Moore too for agreeing to serve on my committee.

My profound appreciation goes to Most Rev G. O. Ochiagha (Emeritus bishop of Orlu), and the current bishop, Most Rev. A. T. Ukwuoma; and to Most Rev E. J. Slattery, the bishop of Tulsa, Oklahoma, USA for his support and making me feel the love of Christ. To my siblings and their spouses, Fide, Aloy (Tessy), Regi, Jackie, Nkechi, Ekwy, Val, Chuks, Onyi, Nelo, and Uloma - your encouragement worked!

I remain indebted to Dr. Roxan Mitchell for being such a friend and providing great support and, oftentimes, prodding me to success at difficult times. My colleagues and friends are enumerable. I thank them all for their prayers, understanding and support.

Linda Birchett worked hard formatting and arranging the document. She deserves much kudos for being such an amazing and reliable person. Special thanks go to Lisa Turrentine for years of typing and Julie Chambers-Dobson for typing and cooking, to Miles and Kathy Elliott for being supportive and generous friends, Dr. Ed Allen for proofreading. And too many friends, Patrick and Uche Nwakoby, Terry and Jane Krout, Bruce and Janet McDaniel, Deacon Rick and Alison Stookey, J.J. and Mary Ann Hight, Mike and Beverley Dodd, and many parishioners who supported me with prayers and patience; I extend God's blessings upon all.

Finally, I will dedicate this study to my late father, Chief Dan Nna-oma Okpogba Oguezuonu. He loved education and encouraged me and my siblings to aspire to academic excellence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

We live in an era in which a significant number of American students who attend college are not adequately prepared for the academic rigor that college education demands. In 1998, The Center for Educational Reform published a scathing report -- *A Nation Still at Risk* -- which said that American 12th graders scored near the bottom on the Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS). United States students placed 19th out of 21 nations in math, 16th in science and last in physics. Numerous scholars and investigators speculate that when these students go to college, they pose daunting challenges to the college faculty.

The influx of some immigrants and refugees, with their separate religions and cultures, exacerbates the problems teachers encounter in educating these students. In 2006, *The Conditions of Education Report* noted that while dropout rates declined slightly among Whites and Blacks, a troubling 23% of Hispanics, ages 16-24 do not finish college (National Center for Education Statistics, 2006).

Fives & Looney (2009) also identified grade inflation, plagiarism, academic dishonesty as issues confronting university faculty. College cheating has reached epidemic proportions (Pino & Smith, 2003, Haines Diekhoff, LaBeff & Clark 1986). Friedman (2005) stated that the dismal academic achievement of American students adds tremendous pressure as far as competing in the global market. Technological advances and broadband connectivity have become so cheap and abundant that companies are

collaborating on a global scale and using the availability of low-cost highly-skilled workers. All these are placing increasing demands on institutions of higher learning. Out-sourcing affects job-seekers greatly, as the world gets "flattened" by worldwide web communication. Zielenziger (2003) writes, "Morgan Stanley estimates the number of U.S. jobs outsourced to India will double to about 150,000 in the next three years. Analysts predict as many as two million US white-collar job, such as programmers, software engineers and applications designers, will shift to low-cost centers by 2014" (2003, p.1). Countries like China and India have become contending forces, producing college graduates in science and technology at a faster rate than the US. Friedman (2005) says that the gap in academic achievement between American educated students and students educated in China and India is widening at a rate that will soon be impossible to close.

Policy makers and educators search for ways to bridge this gap and identify factors that can lead to student achievement. They and others emphasize embracing the benefits of accountability standards and high-stakes standardized testing. On January 3, 2002, former president Bush signed into law the famous *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001(NCLB)*. This law was aimed at injecting an increased level of accountability into the public educational system. All students regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, disability or income were required by this law to meet identified high academic standards that would enable them to go to college and be successful.

Student success continues to be a major concern of stake holders in the educational process. In *Time Magazine* issue of September 20, 2010 entitled, "What Makes a School Great," Amanda Ripley rendered a blistering critique of the present

condition of the American public education and student success. She writes that a "*Time* Poll suggests that Americans have gotten more pessimistic about schools than they were just four years ago. Of those surveyed, 65% said our schools are not preparing kids well for the challenges ahead" (Ripley, 2010, p.36). She also notes that since 1971 the United States has more than doubled the money it spends per pupil, and yet it still trails most developed nations in science and math scores. Legions of schools – some Charter, some not –are succeeding while others flounder. President Barack Obama and his Education Secretary, Arne Duncan, initiated the "Race to the Top" program. This program "is pushing school districts to raise academic standards, to evaluate teachers based in part on how much their students are learning, to train teachers more effectively, and to remove those who are not cut out for the job" (Ripley, 2010, p. 35).

The implications for universities filled with low achieving students can be very overwhelming to the faculty. Most times students stand the risk of dropping out of college and university, which often contributes to a high unemployment rate. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2004), a large percentage of high school graduates require remediation during college years and a larger percentage fails to return to college after the first year. Some of these drop-outs may face poverty, unemployment, homelessness and even incarceration.

In light of the numbers of students going to college and the concerns enumerated above, low academic achievement, grade inflation, plagiarism, academic dishonesty and student drop-outs (Fives & Looney (2009) underscores the importance of looking into the motivations and beliefs of the professionals who guide the learning processes at the university level. Self- Efficacy beliefs introduced over a quarter of a century ago by

psychologist Albert Bandura (1977) refer to "beliefs in one's capacity to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997, p.3). Since then, researchers have demonstrated the power of efficacy judgments in human learning, performance, and motivation. For instance, efficacy beliefs have been related to smoking cessation, adherence to exercise and diet programs, performance in sports, political participation, and relevant to academic achievement (Goddard, Hoy & Woolfolk Hoy, 2004). Three types of efficacy beliefs have been indentified as integral to education. These are self-efficacy judgments of students (cf. Pajeres, 1994, 1997), teacher –efficacy (cf. Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998), and collective teacher-efficacy (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). Researchers have found links between student achievement and these three efficacy beliefs. Equally important, though very often overlooked, is an understanding of the effects contextual and normative environments have on student academic performances. Two concepts identified as influencing the contextual and normative environments of schools are the enabling school structure and trust (Adams, 2003; Hoy, Sabo, & Barnes, 1996; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 20001; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995).

However, while all three constructs of efficacy beliefs, enabling school structure, and trust have received a great attention from educational researchers at the primary and secondary school levels, very little research attention has focused on investigating these constructs at the university level. In fact, very few scholars have investigated the influence of teacher efficacy in the population of college level instructors (Heppner, 1992, Prieto & Meyers, 1999, Young & Kline, 1996) and the role of collective teacher-efficacy at the university level (Loup, Clarke, & Ellett, 1997, and Fives & Looney, 2009).

While the role of instructors at the college level is distinct from the role of teachers at the K-12 levels, this study is guided by the significant body of research conducted at the elementary and secondary school levels and finds linkages that may serve to improve education at the college/university level. Fives and Looney, (2009) stated that, "Research at the elementary and secondary levels has demonstrated connections between teachers' sense of efficacy and the choices they make, the teaching strategies they use, and the achievement of their students" (p.182). The theoretical leap made here is that if the findings at the elementary and secondary levels are extrapolated to the university level, instructors with high teaching efficacy beliefs who operate in enabling structural environments that are high in collegial trust will be effective teachers. They will strive to challenge their students to become critical thinkers and successful students.

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL UNDERPINNINGS

To begin, we can better understand the effects of organizational structure and collegial trust on efficacy beliefs of the university faculty by reviewing the literature of what is known currently about teacher self-efficacy, organizational (enabling) school structure and trust be explored.

Self-Efficacy

Educational literature is replete with variables that influence student learning. Researchers continue to investigate means to increase student achievement. One of these variables, that has in recent years gained tremendous attention is teacher self-efficacy, is a "teacher's belief in his or her ability 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, p.233). Efficacy has its conceptual roots in the reinforcement theories of Rotter, (1966) and social cognitive theory of Bandura (1977). Rotter's theory of reinforcement is based on the idea that an individual's response to a stimulus is determined by expectation that a predictable outcome will result from a particular behavior. For Rotter, the value placed on the expected outcome determines the reinforcement value of the outcome. He distinguished between beliefs about the internal control of reinforcements, in which reinforcements are attributed to personal actions or

characteristics such as hard work or intelligence, and beliefs about external control of reinforcements, which are attributable to external factors such as luck.

Bandura's social cognitive theory assumes that people are capable of human agency. The beliefs that individuals create and develop and hold to be true about them form the very foundation of human agency or are vital forces in their success or failure in all endeavors, including schools and universities. For Bandura (1977), self-reflection is the most uniquely human characteristic, because through it individuals evaluate their own expectations and thought processes. He posited that individuals create and develop self-perceptions of capability that become instrumental to the goals they pursue and the control they are able to exercise over their environments. In 1986, Bandura published *Social Foundations of Thought and Action,* in which he proposed a social cognitive theory that emphasized on the role of self-referent phenomena and espoused an agentive view of personality. He maintained that individuals are self-regulating, proactive, and not simply reactive organisms shaped by either internal or external events. He also stated that individuals possess beliefs that enable them to exercise a measure of control over their thought, feelings, and actions. On the importance of the thought processes in human agency, Bandura (1986) stated that, "a theory that denies that thoughts can regulate actions does not lend itself readily to the explanation of the complex human behavior" (p.15). Social cognitive theory is a cognitive process in which people construct beliefs about their capacity to perform at a given level of attainment.

According to Bandura (1986), how people behave can better be predicted by the beliefs they hold about their own capabilities than by what they are actually capable of accomplishing (Pajares, 2002). These perceptions he called self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is

defined, as "beliefs in one's capability to organize and execute the causes of action required to manage prospective actions" (Bandura, 1997, p.2). Efficacy beliefs help individuals to operate with knowledge and skills they possess. In the realm of education, it is safe to say that individuals' self-beliefs are critical forces in their academic achievement. Some studies show that students' difficulties in academic skills are often directly related to their beliefs that they can't read, write, handle numbers, or think well, that they can't learn (Pajares, 2002, p.2). Many students have difficulty in school and college, not because they are incapable of performing successfully, but because they are incapable of believing that they can perform successfully. Put succinctly, academic crises are often crises of confidence (Pajares, 2002).

Human efficacy beliefs are shaped primarily through three sources, which Bandura described as "triadic reciprocal causation." His position was that human choices are based on a combination of (a) behavior, (b) environmental factors or influences, and (c) personal factors such as cognitive, emotional or biological states. Human actions and thought emerge out of personal capabilities and environmental stimuli. Bandura (1986) maintained that how people interpret the results of their own performance attainments informs and alters their environments and their self-beliefs, which in turn inform and alter subsequent performance. Goddard (1998) gave a vivid description of how Bandura's triadic reciprocal causality works in the education arena stating:

> When a teacher attempts a new instructional methodology, the teacher's new behaviors at once interact with the environment (e.g., students, other teachers, administrators, and parents) and the teachers' own internal personal state (e.g., emotional reactions to the strategy, thoughts about improving the strategy). Thus,

> the cause of future behavior is assumed to be a unique blend of the teachers' internal reactions to the environment and the new behavior, environmental influences on the teacher's future behavior, and the influence of the teacher's behavior on the environment. Given the bi-directional determinism postulated in triadic reciprocal causation, whether they will use a new instructional technique in future lessons depends not only on environmental reinforcement but also on the teacher's personal internal reactions to both the behavior and the environment. (p.7)

Bandura's (1993) research delineates the effects of self-efficacy beliefs. Individuals construct beliefs about their capacity to perform at a given level of competence. Efficacy beliefs influence the choices individuals make and the courses of action they pursue. Individuals engage in tasks in which they feel competent and confidence and avoid those in which they do not. Efficacy beliefs also help determine how much effort they will expend in an activity, how they will persevere in the face of difficulties, their resilience in dealing with failures or adverse conditions, and the amount of stress and anxiety they experience in coping with demanding situations.

Bandura maintains that a strong sense of efficacy beliefs enhances human accomplishments and personal well-being in many ways. For example, persons with strong efficacy-beliefs approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. They set challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them. They bounce back to their sense of efficacy after failures or setbacks and attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficit knowledge and skills that are necessary. In contrast, individuals with low self-efficacy may believe that things are tougher than they

really are, a belief that fosters stress, depression and narrow vision of how to solve problems.

Sources of Self-Efficacy

Bandura identified four sources of efficacy beliefs: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and affective states.

Mastery Experiences

Mastery experiences are highly influential in that they are based on the actual experiences of the individual. Successful experiences increase personal self-efficacy while repeated failures, particularly early on, tend to decrease efficacy. Simply put, success increases self-efficacy; failure lowers it. In mastery experiences, past effort has produced positive results so that a person becomes convinced that "he or she has what it takes to succeed" (Bandura, 1997). In the school or college circle, students who perform well in mathematics tests, for instance, and earn high grades are likely to develop a strong sense of confidence. This strong sense of efficacy will embolden students to enroll in future math related classes. Moreover, students who are low in math self-efficacy are more than likely to avoid math related classes, because poor results and poor grades are enemies to be avoided.

Vicarious Experiences

The second source of self-efficacy is vicarious experiences. Individuals develop a sense of self-efficacy through observing the actions of others and the resulting consequences. Seeing others perform successfully, an individual gains confidence in his or her ability to execute a given task. The observer rationalizes that if people are successful in a certain task, then s/he could also be successful in that task if s/he tries it.

Individuals gauge the efforts of others actions and their interpretations of these effects help to create efficacy beliefs. A significant model in one's life can help to instill self-efficacy beliefs that will influence the course and direction that life will take. For example, pre-service teachers are likely to develop the belief that "I can teach that" when a highly regarded faculty member models excellence in and academic endeavor or action. It should be understood though that, a vicarious source is weaker than and not as dependable as mastery experience source. It is however highly influential as a source of self- efficacy propounded by Bandura (1977, 1986, 1993, & 1997).

Social or Verbal Persuasion

Social or verbal persuasion is a third way of strengthening individuals' beliefs that they have what it takes to succeed. It occurs when a person receives encouragement to believe that he or she can accomplish tasks that seemed difficult in the past. When people are persuaded verbally that they are capable to succeed in given tasks, they are ready to exert a great deal of effort to accomplish them than if they have self-doubts and dwell on the difficulties they face (Bandura, 1986). Persuasive boosts lead people to try hard to succeed, thereby developing necessary skills and personal self-efficacy. Social or verbal persuasion is a weaker source of efficacy information than mastery experiences, or vicarious experiences. Though, it is very important in the development of an individual's self-efficacy formation, Bandura was quick is in cautioning that individuals should differentiate the knee-jerk praises from effective persuasions. People raising self-efficacy beliefs in their capabilities need to create structures that bring success than unrealistic boosts that are disconfirmed by disappointing results of one's efforts (Pajares, 2002).

The most effective verbal persuasions must be accompanied by a successful personal or vicarious experience.

Affective States

The final source of self-efficacy beliefs is the affective states. Individuals often rely on their somatic and emotional states in gauging their efficaciousness. Bandura notes that stressful or taxing situations can have a negative effect on self-efficacy. Affective states such as anxiety or depression may cause an individual to shift focus inward. People interpret their stress reactions and tensions as sign of vulnerability. In activities that involve strength and stamina, people see fatigues, aches and pains as signs of physical debility. People's moods affect their judgments of their capabilities. Positive moods boost efficacy beliefs, while despondent moods attenuate them. Diminishing affective arousal can certainly reduce efficaciousness (Pajares, 2002).

Out of these four sources of efficacy beliefs, Bandura (1977, 1986, & 1997) believes mastery experiences are by far the most powerful source of self-efficacy formation. Bandura cautioned that self-efficacy should not be confused with self-esteem, self-concept or self-worth. Both of these may have overlapping characteristics but Bandura stated there are differences between self-esteem or self-concept and self-efficacy: "self-esteem pertains to the evaluation of self –worth, which depends on how the culture values and attributes one possesses and how well one's behavior matches personal standards of worthiness. Self-efficacy is concerned with the judgments of personal capabilities" that individuals make (Bandura, 1986, p.123). Pajares (2002) writes that another important difference between both constructs is that self-judgments are especially sensitive to contextual factors, even to the degree of being quite task-and

situation- specific. Compared to self-efficacy judgment, self-concept judgments are more general and less sensitive to context – they can be domain-specific but not task-specific. Self-efficacy is concerned about beliefs of personal capability and one's judgments of one's capability to given actions, whereas self-concept is measured at a more general level of specificity. Self-efficacy is context specific. For example, one might have high self-efficacy for painting, but low efficacy for soccer or football.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

The construct of self-efficacy has been studied extensively in the domain of education (Klassen & Usher, 2010). A large body of research about self-efficacy beliefs has provided a great deal of insight in teacher self-efficacy and its characteristics and correlates. Research has shown the relationship between teacher efficacy and teacher sense of effectiveness and control. Teacher efficacy beliefs influence students, teachers and school organizational outcomes. In the 1970's, both Rotter's (1966) locus of control theory and Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory began to appear in education literature and be applied in the definition of teacher efficacy (Amor et al., 1976; Barfield & Burlingame, 1974). Rotter's (1954) concept of locus of control formed the bases of premier studies on teacher self-efficacy. People tend to ascribe success and failures to internal or external factors. He developed an Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale) and measured the degree to which people attribute life events to internal or external control forces. The results of Rotter's study showed that teachers with a strong internal locus of control can better shape their students' achievements (Rose & Medway, 1981). He maintained that teachers with an internal sense of control believe their success and failure depends upon their skills and effort. They believe that achieving expected

outcomes lies with them. On the other hand, teachers with external locus of control believe that the environment has more influence on student learning than their teaching ability and are less effective in the classroom. They believe that learning and teaching outcomes are not within their control, but are rather generated by fate, accident, or an outside power. Such a view lends to teachers feeling that their own efforts have little impact on students' achievement (Rose & Medway, 1981; Rotter, 1975; Tschannen-Moran &Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, Woolfolk Hoy & Hoy, 1990).

The RAND Corporation study was the first to conduct research on teacher efficacy based on Rotter's (1966) work. They developed two items to gauge the efficacy beliefs of teachers. They are, "When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much - most of a student's motivation and performance depend on his or her home environment," and "If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students" (Amor et al., 1976). The first item questioned the teacher's sense of general control of student success, which was labeled 'general teaching efficacy.' While the second labeled 'personal teaching efficacy,' centered on the degree to which teachers personally felt that they are capable of influencing student success. RAND's study found that teacher efficacy was a powerful predictor of academic achievement (Armor, et al., 1976; Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman 1977). With this, RAND refined the definition of teacher efficacy as the "teachers' belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated" (Guskey & Passaro, 1994, p3).

In the early 1980s and 1990s, scholars struggled to reconcile the two theories of Rotter and Bandura by exploring the psychological underpinnings of teacher self-efficacy

beliefs, and understanding the extent to which efficacy-beliefs are rooted in both theories. Ashton & Webb, 1989, Gusky, (1981); Guskey & Passaro (1994); Rose & Medway (1981b); Sodak & Podell, (1996), all developed instruments to measure teacher efficacy based on Rotter's (1966) tradition. Other researchers fashioned their own measures in the tradition of Bandura's (1977, 1986) social cognitive theory and his construct of self-efficacy. These include Gibson & Dembo's (1984) Teacher efficacy scale; Riggs & Enoch's (1990) Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Scale; Ashton et al., (1984) Ashton Vignettes; and Bandura's (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale. Following Bandura's (1986) reciprocal determinism, human performance is a product of a dynamic interplay of personal, behavioral, and environmental influences. Thus, his theory suggests that teachers can work to improve students confidence and correct their faulty self-beliefs (personal factors), enrich academic skills and self-control (behavior), and alter the school and classroom systems that may impair student success (environmental factors) (Petersen, 2008).

Bandura (1977) has proposed that human behavior is shaped by two kinds of expectation for success. These are outcome expectation and self-efficacy expectation. Outcome expectation is "a person's estimate that a given behavior will lead to certain outcomes" (p.193). For the teacher, outcome expectation is confidence that her/his teaching efforts can bring about student success irrespective of student's background, home, family and socioeconomic status. A self-efficacy expectation is the individual teacher's conviction that he or she had the "capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997, p.3). Teachers who believe they have strong sense of efficacy and can produce student outcomes will

persevere in the midst of difficulties. They do employ strategies required to produce positive student outcomes. On the contrary, those who do not believe they can produce student outcomes will be hesitant to persevere amidst difficulties and give up very easily.

Since the emergence of the teacher efficacy as a school construct, many instruments have been developed to measure it. Most of these are anchored on Bandura's social cognitive theory. Gibson & Dembo (1984) attempted to blend the two theories with the aim of developing a workable teacher efficacy scale. Undoubtedly, Gibson & Dembo's (1984) instrument is the most frequently used instrument to assess teacher-efficacy (Ross, 1994, 1998). They developed 30-item questionnaire to measure the two dimensions of Bandura's theory, self-efficacy and outcome expectations. Principal components analysis with varimax rotation on 208 elementary school teachers was reported and two components surfaced which accounted for 28.8 % of the total variance. Their findings corresponded to Bandura's efficacy expectation (teacher beliefs about their teaching skills) and personal efficacy was equal to outcome expectancy (teacher beliefs about their ability to influence students). Gibson & Dembo (1984) found that teachers with high efficacy and personal efficacy had greater success in class and persisted in the work more than those teachers with lower efficacy beliefs.

Guskey and Passaro (1993) developed the Responsibility for Students Achievement Scale and questioned Gibson & Dembo's (1984) distinctions between teaching efficacy and personal efficacy. They doubted the solvency of the instruments Gibson and Dembo used. The results of their study showed that personal teachers' efficacy parceled into two ancillary parts – the teachers' responsibility for positive students and teachers responsibility for negative results. Teacher efficacy levels were

higher when students outcomes were positive than when the students produced negative results. They posited that there are two dimensions of efficacy theory – internal versus external locus of control theory – but not the teaching and personal teaching differences. Aston and Webb (1986) studied the RAND questions based on Rotter's (1966) theory and developed the efficacy vignettes which was rooted in Bandura's outcome and efficacy expectancies. The results found that efficacy vignettes did not correlate to student achievement; however, the Webb scale linked strong relationship to the first RAND item (I can…) and a significant relationship between teacher efficacy and achievement in math and language.

Woolfolk Hoy and Hoy (1990) examined the structure and meaning of efficacy from prospective teachers. They stated that Bandura's influence on expectancy theory remained strong but inaccurate. They said that his first expectancy dimension is not the outcome expectancy he originally proposed. Instead, they reasoned that the teacher's efforts to influence student success in spite of home and family orientation have more to do with efficacy expectation component because it relates more to the teacher's expectation to accomplish a task personally than with the outcome the efforts produce (Petersen, 2008). Riggs and Enoch (1990) used Gibson & Dembo's scale to develop the Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument (STEBI) to measure elementary science teaching efficacy and found positive relationship between them.

Hoy and Woolfolk Hoy (1993) demonstrated that the two constructs of general and personal teaching efficacy were separate sets of beliefs. They had examined the two specific dimensions with healthy climates. They found a discrepancy between Bandura's conceptualization of self-efficacy and outcome expectations and Gibson and Dembo's

(1984) model of teaching efficacy. They observed that the items of Gibson and Dembo's (1984) teaching efficacy factor concern the teachers' ability to overcome outside factors, which are, in fact, a self-efficacy expectation, not an outcome expectation. Second, Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) adopted the revised version of Gibson and Dembo's (1984) 16-item version of teacher efficacy scale and added four items that referred to the adequacy of the pre-service preparation. They found that teachers' beliefs when supported by good principal leadership qualities were enhanced.

In 1997, Bandura offered another thirty-item efficacy scale that found teacher efficacy did not automatically transfer across the multitudes of tasks teachers perform. The strengths, obstacles and choices they face may cause confidence levels to vary with the subjects they teach and tasks they perform. Hence, he suggested that in measuring efficacy, consideration should be given to the subjects taught and tasks performed.

In 1998, Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, and Hoy reviewed the literature on the factorial validity of the teacher-efficacy scales developed by previous researchers. They found some lapses and proposed a different interpretation of the multiple measures of teacher efficacy already in existence. They separated teacher efficacy into two concepts: an analysis of teacher competence and an analysis of teaching task. The first concept considers many of the elements associated with personal teaching efficacy, internal factors, and efficacy expectation. The analysis of teaching competence includes all about the perceived skills, knowledge of the teacher, and his or her empowerment to make critical instructional decisions. This concept is associated with general teaching efficacy, external factors and outcome expectancy. With this analysis, Tschannen-Moran et al (1998) created the Teachers' Sense of efficacy Scale often known as the Ohio State

Teacher Efficacy Scale (OSTES). It was a twenty-four-item instrument used to measure teacher efficacy in Student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management. This scale has been proven popular among efficacy researchers and scholars.

A review of literature reveals the correlates of teacher efficacy to include student outcomes, teacher behaviors, instructional practices and school organizational health (Anderson et al., 1988; Amor et al., 1976; Ashton and Webb,1986; Berman et al, 1977; Goddard, 1998; Hoy & Woolfolk Hoy, 1993; Meijer and Foster, 1988;Midgley et al., 1989; Moore and Esselman, 1993; Raudenbush et al, 1992; Ross, 1994,2001; 2001; Ross, 2004; Ross and Cousins, 1993; Traes and Gibson, 1986; Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 1998, 2001). Pajares (1992) contended, "beliefs are the best indicators of the decisions individuals make throughout their lives" (p.307). Thus, it follows that teachers' beliefs about their teaching efficacy should be a powerful indicator of their future behavior, decisions, and classroom organization.

Student Outcomes

Here we look at what is known from the K-12 research. The RAND studies were the first to draw the attention of researchers and education reformers to what happens in the K-12 classroom. They measured the relationship between teacher efficacy beliefs and student success with as little as two items taken from the RAND survey. Amor et al., (1976) went forth with these items, first, "when it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment." This item measures the extent that a teacher believes in a teacher's ability in general to overcome external factors. This was identified as "general

teaching efficacy." The second item, "If I try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students" was to measure the confidence that a teacher has in his/her abilities to overcome external factors. This item relies more on the internal factors and known as "personal teaching efficacy. Their study found that teachers-efficacy beliefs positively influenced student achievement in reading. Higher reading achievement correlated significantly with higher teacher-efficacy. In a parallel study, Berman et al., (1977) reported a similar significant correlation to student success. Ashton and Webb (1986) used math tests at four secondary schools and found significant correlations between teacher efficacy and student achievement in basic math and language. In their study with 1301 students as they transitioned from 6^{th} to 7^{th} grade, Midgley et al., (1989), found a significant relationship between teacher efficacy and student efficacy in math. Ross et al., (2001) found greater teacher efficacy made differences in outcomes of students, ages 6-9 in computer skills. Anderson et al., (1988) found correlations with students' achievements in reading, art, and social sciences to personal teaching efficacy.

Teacher Characteristics

Ross (1994) found that the personal efficacy of female teachers tends to be higher than that of male teachers, except in science. Meijer and Foster (1988) found that teachers with a strong sense of confidence are less likely to refer students to special education service, and highly efficacious teachers are more prepared to teach culturally diverse students (Tucker et al., 2005). In their own study, Raudenbush et al., (1992) found that efficacious high school teachers tend to teach higher grades, especially in math and science.

Hoy and Woolfolk Hoy (1993) indicated that teachers who went to graduate school for further education are more likely to have a sense of personal teaching efficacy. Results of a study with 179 elementary teachers that measured personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy predicted personal teacher efficacy. Outcomes of efficacious teachers include teachers who are confident in the tasks they are performing exhibited a more complex approach and put forth greater effort in instructional planning and classroom management (Gordon,2001; Guskey,19982; Meijer and Foster, 19888). Guskey's (1987) study of elementary school teachers who attended development program on learning instructional strategies found that efficacy was positively predictive of teachers' attitudes about the value of efficacy. As the teachers become more efficacious, they impact on students and the learning environment. This goes back to Bandura's (1989) construct of reciprocal causation. Teachers gain strength of efficacy and internal sense of mastery through successful interaction with both the students and the learning environment.

Instructional Environment

The control of classroom environment is very important. Efficacious teachers' classroom management is found to be different from that of less efficacious teachers (Gordon, 2001). In studying 189 elementary teachers, teacher efficacy was found to be directly linked to "managerial excellence" (p.30). Teachers who were positive and generous did fine jobs in creating effective classrooms, ecology and learning milieu than teachers who were cynical and penal. A successful classroom manager in dealing with misconduct sees severe punitive measures or restrictions as is less necessary.

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) reported that teachers in elementary schools tend to feel more efficacious than their counterparts in the middle or high schools. They attributed this to the ease of managing younger versus older kids, use of creative teaching strategies and the ability to work with struggling learners.

Organizational Health

According to the literature concerning teacher efficacy, it is linked with organizational health of the school. Because teachers are part of the school organization, what characteristics they bring impinge on the life of school organization. The organizational health of a school consists of the teachers' perceptions of the setting where they work. It includes their experiences; behaviors that help form the features of the organization (Petersen, 2008). Teachers with high efficacy exhibit greater enthusiasm for teaching (Allinder, 1994; Guskey, 1984); they have a greater commitment to teaching (Coladarci, 1992; Evans and Tribble, 1986; Trentham et al., 1985). Also, they are more likely to stay long in teaching. Goddard and Goddard, (2001), Newmann et al, (1989), Tschannen-Moran et al., (1998) all found a positive correlation between high teacher efficacy and collective efficacy. This concurs with Bandura's (1993) earlier position on collective efficacy, that it is school levels construct.

Comparing the sources of teachers' self-efficacy beliefs among 255 novice and career teachers, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2008) found that contextual factors such as the teaching resources and interpersonal support were more salient in the self-efficacy beliefs of novice teachers.

Siwatu (2011) recently examined the influence that contextual factors have for American pre-service teachers' sense of preparedness to teach culturally responsive

teaching self-efficacy. He found that pre-service teachers in the study felt more prepared and confident to teach in suburban rather than urban schools. In the same study, pre-service teachers felt less prepared and confident to teach English Language regardless of their enrollment in an urban or suburban school. The overarching issue here is the self-efficacy condition of the novice teachers in all levels or contexts. The collective efficacy construct will be discussed more broadly in the next chapter.

Collective Efficacy

Bandura (1997) defined collective efficacy as "a group's shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainments" (p.477). It has its roots in the self-efficacy construct. According to Bandura, a group of self-doubters cannot mold into a collectively efficacious force. A weak link that has to perform interdependently can spell group failure, while highly efficacious individuals may perform poorly if they do not work well together. The collective efficacy beliefs of a group predict its level of group performance. The stronger the beliefs a group of individuals hold about their collective capabilities, the more they achieve.

Bandura (1993) was actually the first to extend this construct to the school level. His seminal study of 79 schools found that collective efficacy of teachers is a better predictor of academic achievement than socio-economic status. He found out a trend that suggests that the stronger the faculty's shared belief s in their instructional efficacy, the better the school performed academically. Bandura obtained a school level measure by aggregating the appraisals of individual teacher self-efficacy capabilities. He differentiated between self-efficacy and collective efficacy by maintaining that teacher

efficacy is an ideographic construct by nature whereas collective teacher efficacy is a nomothetic construct. In higher education theory, ideographic and nomothetic constructs are two tracks used to explain human behavior. According to Bess & Dee (2008), "The components of these forces are the organizational system, roles, and expectations (the nomothetic side), and personality, learned beliefs, and individual needs (the ideographic side)" (p.111).

Collective teacher efficacy is relatively recently developed concept. A review of literature has shown that there is an extant research measure for the construct. Some researchers agree with Bandura's (1997) aggregation of individual appraisal (Bandura, 1993, 1997; Hoover-Dempsey, et al, 1987, Newman, Esselman and Moore 1992; Rutter & Smith *1989;* Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997*)*. Others like Tschannen-Moran, 1998, Goddard, 1998, Goddard et al., 2000, 2001, and 2002). Goddard (1998) offered a helpful example of the two styles of questions posed to teachers in measuring both beliefs. One question focuses on the individual's self-efficacy beliefs and the other centers on the teaching group self-efficacy beliefs:

1) Individual orientation: 'I am able to get through to the most difficult students'
2) Group orientation: 'Teachers in this school can get through to the most difficult students' (Goddard, 1998, p.3).

Goddard, Hoy & Woolfolk Hoy (2000) designed a more internally valid measure for the construct of collective teacher efficacy. They used a sample of 70 teachers each from 70 different schools in five states to test the psychometric properties of collective teacher efficacy. The results showed that collective teacher efficacy predicted student achievement in mathematics and reading. The results support Bandura's (1993) study

that teachers' beliefs about the capability of the faculty as a group are related to student achievement" (p.3). Collective teacher efficacy is an extension of the teacher self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, 1998), and is defined as "the perceptions of teachers in a school that the efforts of the faculty as a whole will have a positive effect on students" (Goddard et al. 2000, p.480). Recently researchers have demonstrated that collective efficacy is related to student achievement (Bandura, 1993, Goddard, 2000, 2004, Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland2002). It accounts for significant differences among K-12 schools in reading and mathematic (Goddard, 2000; Goddard & Goddard, 2001). Goddard, LoGerfo and Hoy (2004) found in their study that mastery experience is the strongest of the four efficacy sources in its relationship to building collective teacher efficacy. Mastery learning provides teachers with successful experiences that increased confidence in their abilities to effect achievement.

Adams and Forsyth (2006) examined the influence of three contextual variables: socioeconomic status, school level, and school structure on teacher perceptions of collective efficacy with a data collected from 79 elementary schools in a Midwestern state. After analyzing the data using hierarchical multiple regression, they found that the combined effects of contextual variables account for a significant amount of variability in teacher perceptions of collective efficacy. They conclude that, "This finding lends empirical support for the theoretical proposition that contextual factors are sources of collective beliefs" (p.469).

Schools characterized by high collective efficacy set challenging goals and are persistent in their effort to meet these goals (Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2008). Goddard, LoGerfo, and Hoy (2004) suggest that schools which set high expectations create a

normative press that encourages all teachers to do what it takes to excel and discourage them from giving up when faced with difficult situations. Skaalvic and Skaalvic (2008) developed a Norwegian scale for measuring teacher efficacy. Their study included 2249 teachers. They examined the relationship between individual teacher efficacy, collective teacher self-efficacy and external control. They posited that schools with cultural contexts that promote student achievement enhance both individual and collective teachers' self-efficacy. It seems that being part of a strong team always increases self-efficacy for all members.

Knoblauch and Woolfolk Hoy (2008) investigated student teachers' efficacy beliefs, collective teacher efficacy beliefs, and perceived cooperating teachers' efficacy beliefs. These beliefs were examined with the focus on context, primarily the school setting (i.e., rural, suburban, and urban), to determine whether setting played a role in the development of student teacher efficacy beliefs. The research participants included 102 student teachers. After a semester of student teaching all the three groups exhibited significant increases in teachers' sense of efficacy following student teaching. Urban student teachers exhibited significantly perceived collective efficacy. Whereas perceived cooperating teachers' efficacy was predictive of and positively related to the student teachers' teacher-efficacy scores. These findings are consistent with those of Chester and Beaudin (1996), and Rushton (2003), which indicated that self-efficacy beliefs were mediated by teacher characteristics (such as age and experience) and school practices such as opportunities to collaborate with peers, frequent observations of their supervisor, and the availability of instructional resources.

Siwatu (2011) recently examined the influence that contextual factors have for American pre-service teachers' sense of preparedness to teach culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy appraisals. He found that pre-service teachers in the study felt more prepared and confident to teach in suburban schools compared to an urban school. In the same study, pre-service teachers felt less prepared and confident to teach English language regardless of their enrollment in an urban or suburban school. The overarching issue here is the self-efficacy condition of the novice teachers in all levels or contexts.

Faculty Self-Efficacy at the College Level

Fives and Looney (2009) pointed out many issues (such as grade inflation, plagiarism, academic dishonesty, and high drop-out rates) university faculty face as they deal more and more with students coming to the university. They state that as these issues persist, it is "becoming more salient, it seems pertinent that we look at the motivations and beliefs of the professionals who guide the learning process on this level" (Fives & Looney, 2009, p.1). There are a few studies that have examined the beliefs of faculty, whether as individual faculty or collective faculty at the college level. Most of what is known so far about the efficacy beliefs of university instructors' teaching self-efficacy is largely the product of research on graduate teaching assistants (Heppner, 1994; Loup, Clarke, & Ellett, 1997; Prieto & Altmaier, 1994; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007, Young & Kline, 1996). Quite a few on faculty self-efficacy studies include those by Blake & Rost (2002), Fives & Looney (2009), and Morris & Usher (2010).

Heppner (1994) investigated the role of self-efficacy in improving university teaching faculty. They found that a three-credit course for graduate teaching assistants

in teaching psychology improved teaching self-efficacy. About seventy-five percent of the influences on efficacy described by Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA) were forms of feedback instead of the mastery experiences as theorized by Bandura. Young and Kline investigated the role of teacher efficacy in university teachers' motivation to improve their teaching. They found that outcome expectancy and self-efficacy beliefs were related to motivation.

Other researchers focused on Academic Efficacy, which is the individual's belief in his or her abilities to carry out the task required for an academic position, namely research, teaching and service (Landino & Owen, 1988; Schoen & Winocur, 1988). Results of their study showed that there is some evidence that efficacy beliefs are related to gender; however, socialization processes, role expectations, and the age at time of entry to the field may have played a role for which gender served as a proxy variable.

While investigating teacher self-efficacy and organizational efficacy in terms of motivation towards the achievement of organizational goals in schools, social workers and university faculty, Loup et al.(1997) found evidence of a significant teacher –efficacy factor, but a lack of collective "we" (collective efficacy) factor. The authors reasoned that the higher education setting is an organizational context characterized by greater academic freedom among the faculty and less organizational cohesion than K-12 school organizations. Higher education institutions are generally much more loosely coupled than elementary or secondary institutions; hence the self-efficacy beliefs of college faculty would not be measured by the Collective Teacher Self-Efficacy scale, but modified teacher self-efficacy instruments instead.

There is reason to believe the saliency of self-efficacy beliefs at the university level. Previous research state that self-building experiences are most salient to K-12 teachers, but whether the university faculty can mirror these has yet to be investigated. This idea was subtle in Woolfolk Hoy's (2004) observation about Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) and finding the influence of teacher self-efficacy as they transition to the teaching career, since not all GTAs become professors at universities, and those who eschew academia altogether may do so because they lack self-efficacy.

Fives and Looney (2009) provided an exploratory investigation of measuring the college instructors' sense of teaching and collective efficacy. They included a series of variables such as experience, professional level, age, gender, and academic domain for teacher efficacy only, and academic department for collective efficacy. Data were collected from 117 graduate students and faculty members and analyzed. They found differences in teacher-efficacy with respect to gender and academic domain. Differences in collective efficacy across departments, experience levels, or professional levels were not found. Predictably, individual teacher self-efficacy was significantly correlated with collective efficacy. Fives & Looney (2009) concluded that their findings are consistent with those of Goddard and Goddard (2001) and suggested that these two belief systems can help establish and maintain each other.

Morris and Usher (2010) did a qualitative study to "explore the ways in which award-winning professors at research universities developed and maintained their sense of teaching efficacy" (p18). These "12 associate and full professors' (6 women and 6 men) from 5 universities in the southeastern United States were identified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as high research activity

universities" (p.6) . Their teaching self-efficacy beliefs were assessed through Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory. They used semi-structured interviews like, "What experiences related to teaching did you have prior to teaching in at the college level, or "I ask you to rate your confidence in teaching undergraduate classes in your domain" (p.8). The responses were taped and transcribed. They used Merriam's (1998) case study framework and coded the data along Bandura's (1986) efficacy sources, mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasions, and affective states. Data were analyzed. The findings were that "mastery experiences, social persuasions, or a combination thereof" (Morris& Usher, p.10) accounted for the award-winning professors' strong teaching efficacy beliefs. At least, some indicated that their past instructional successes and student evaluative feedback were the most powerful sources of their teaching self-efficacy. For example, one of them was asked how he thought efficacy was critical to his teaching, he responded, "I did it. Experience. I had never had the experience before. I did it and learned I did it well" (p.19). Morris and Usher (2007) asked this professor how he knew he did well, he responded, "They told me I did well. Students told me. Those who observed me told me that I did well" (p.19). Negative experiences did not in any way affect or cost their beliefs. Finally, the "professors reported that their self- efficacy beliefs had generally stabilized within their first few years of assuming a tenure track position" (p.2). These findings are in line with other researches that focused primarily on K-12 teachers' mastery experiences (e.g., Chacon, 200; Palmer, 2006; Tschannen-Moran, 2007; Woolfolk Hoy & Burke Spero, 2005). They reflect Bandura's (1997) position that mastery experiences are the strongest source of

self-efficacy and powerful predictor of instructors' confidence (Morris & Usher, 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

Morris and Usher's (2010) study is the first real faculty self-efficacy study which has been solely based on individual college faculty member as unit of analysis.

Enabling School Structure

Schools and universities are bureaucratic organizations. Bureaucracies can have both positive and negative connotations (Watts, 2009). Structure, rules and procedures define every school's or college's organizational life for faculty members and students. It does not matter whether these educational organizations are public or private. Schools and universities have to adhere to rules, teach set curricula, and have extensive policies and procedures governing students and faculty behavior. The pertinent question about schools and universities is not whether schools and universities are bureaucratic, but whether they have structures that would account for differences in their effectiveness. Richard Hall (1999) writes that, "All organizations have characteristics that allow them to be considered as one type of social phenomenon" (p.26). A social phenomenon could be enabling or coercive or hindering. Marsden, Cook, and Knoke (1994) observed that many surveys show that the vast majority of employees work in establishments with extensive formal procedures: over 74 % have written job descriptions, and 80% have rules and procedures manuals. Mintzburg (1979) provides details in his theory of organizational configurations, how coordinating mechanisms, design parameters, age, and size, technology environment, and power contribute to differences between organizations. Applying this framework to school and university systems helps to explain why public and private institutions differ within and between districts and states. The construct of

enabling school structure is a way to talk about organization structure; it was developed first in the literature of business organizations and later adapted and refined for use in schools and universities.

Adler and Borys (1996) proposed a new paradigm for looking at organizational structures in the business world. Organizational research has two conflicting views – negative and positive- of the human, or attitudinal, outcomes of bureaucracy. The negative view upholds the belief that the bureaucratic form of organization stifles creativity, fosters dissatisfaction, and demotivates employees. On the other hand the positive view states that bureaucracy "provides needed guidance and clarifies responsibilities, thereby easing role stress and helping individuals be and feel more effective" (Adler and Borys, 1996, p. 1). Against the general belief that all bureaucracy was by its nature undesirable, they pointed out that many of the features of bureaucracy, such as clear authority structures and helpful policies and procedures, served useful functions. Instead of characterizing all bureaucracy as bad, these authors distinguished between bureaucratic structures that enabled organizations to function effectively and those that hindered capable functioning (Adler & Borys, 1996; Adler, 1999, 2003). Adler and Borys (1999) reviewed the literature on the bureaucratic characteristics of organizations and discovered that workers were ambivalent toward bureaucratic characteristics within and between organizations. Bureaucratic features tended to either alienate workers or lead to greater job satisfaction (Adler, 1999; Arches, 1991; Rousseau, 1976; Hoy, Blazovsky, & Newland, 1983; Kakabadse, 1986; Johnson & Landman, 2000).

Arches (1991) found that formalization negatively associated with job satisfaction in studies conducted among social service workers. Kakabadse (1981) found

formalization was positively associated with feeling of powerlessness and self - estrangement, whereas, Bonjean and Grimes (1970) stated in their own studies among a sample of blue-workers, that formalization of rules and procedures is positively related to self-estrangement, anomie, and a general measure of alienation.

Other studies aligned themselves with these negative assessments of formalization. Roussau (1978), studied several departments in an electronics firm and a radio station and found "formulization to be positively related to absences, propensity to leave, physical and psychological stress, and negatively related to innovation and job satisfaction" (Adler and Borys, 1996, p.2). Burns and Stalker (1961), Thompson (1965), Bennis (1966) had argued earlier in favor of same negative assessment of bureaucracy that it was an ineffective form of organization for dealing with innovation, change, and environmental complexity. (Hirschorn, 1997).

Adler and Borys (1996) equally highlighted the literature on the technical function of bureaucracy. The authors see bureaucracy as positive. Work on bureaucratic organization can be fulfilling, rather than a disunity and organization can be experienced as a cooperative endeavor rather than an abrogation of autonomy. The employees embrace formal work procedures that are appropriately designed and implemented. The assumption is that well designed procedures would facilitate task performance and thus augment employee's pride of workmanship (Deming, 1986, Schonberger, 1986).

Adler and Borys (1996) examined role stress theory, which posits that there is a positive relationship between formalization and attitudinal outcomes. Some studies showed that formalization reduces role conflict and ambiguity, thereby increasing work satisfaction and reducing feelings of alienation and stress (Kahn et al, 1964; Jackson &

Schuler, 1985; Podsakoff, Senatra, 1980; Williams & Todor, 1986). Nicholson and Goh's (1983) study among supervisors in data processing and manufacturing found that formalization was negatively correlated with role conflict and ambiguity. Michaels et al, (1988) found positive association with commitment and negative association with alienation among industrial sales. Other studies found positive relationship with job satisfaction among forest rangers, physicians, and daycare programs (Snizek and Bullard 1983; Stevens, Diedriks & Philipen, 1992; Maslach & Pines, 1978). Adler and Borys examined two central characteristics of bureaucracy, formalization and centralization.

Hoy and Sweetland (2001) posited that "Formalization refers to the rules, regulations, procedures that guide behavior within an organization; it is the degree to which the organization has written rules, regulations, procedures, and policies" (p. 297). Whereas centralization is "the locus of control for organizational decision making; it is the degree to which employees participate in decision-making" (Hoy, et al. 2001, p. 299). Adler and Borys' (1996) set out for their work by looking at Gouldner's (1954) contrast of three patterns of bureaucracy. The first pattern Gouldner called representative bureaucracy, which obtains when rules serve the interests of both the managers and workers. The second pattern he called "punishment-centered bureaucracy, which prevails when rules serve as a means of legitimating one's right to sanction the other in areas of conflict" (Adler, 1996, p.5). The final pattern was mock bureaucracy where rules and procedures are ignored by both parties. Gouldner (1954) drew inspiration from Max Weber"s (1947) concept of bureaucracy which he thought was a " Janus-faced organization, looking two ways at once, since in one hand, it was administration based on discipline , and on the other, an individual obeys because the rule of order is felt to be the

best known method of realizing some goal" (p.22-23). Instead of characterizing all bureaucratic features as bad, Adler and Borys (1996) decided to distinguish between formalization that enabled workers to accomplish tasks, and formalizations that were designed to coerce. They posited two types of formalization as representative- and punishment-centered rules.

Adler and Borys (1996) suggested a more comprehensive and contemporary theoretical analysis of formalization, which they labeled enabling and coercive. They observed that workers liked "good" structure, rules and procedures, and disliked "bad" ones, and attempted to formulate a theory that would explain what distinguished "good" from "bad" formalization. They used theories of equipment technology to differentiate two generic types of organization—"formalization designed to enable employees to master their tasks, and formalization designed to coerce effort and compliance from employees" (p.2). They examined Cusumo's (1991) study of Toshiba's factory and Jelinek and Schoonhoven's (1993) studies of United States electronic firms to show that high creativity could thrive in the midst of formal procedures where workers embrace the goals of their organizations as their own. In the development of copiers at Xerox, they found that as copier technology became more and more robust, technology developers moved away from trying to formulate features that were "user-proof", in favor of designs that were transparent to the user. The designers tried to illuminate features to the user so that the user could customize and repair the copier without having to call in the experts. The goal at Xerox was to design a successful interaction between men and machine, rather than to make machine fool-proof.

Viewed from a sociological perspective, when employees embrace organizational goals, they see formalization not as a coercive restriction of individual autonomy, but a desirable means to an end. These findings are in line with the distinction between cultures of commitment and cultures of compliance developed by Walton (1985).

Hoy and Sweetland (2000, 2001; Hoy, 2003) used the construct of enabling bureaucracy theory found in business and other social organizations and applied it into the analysis of school structures. Using the previous work of Adler& Borys (1996), they set out to describe and measure the positive and negative aspects of schools. Their focus was on the two aspects of bureaucracy, formalization and centralization. These two characteristics provide the foundation for a bureaucratic structure. For Hoy and Sweetland (2000), formalization is coercive when the aim is regulating employee conduct and punishing non-compliance; it is enabling when the aim is to assist employees perform their jobs. Enabling formalization includes two-way communications, seeing problems as opportunities, respecting differences, engendering trust, learning from mistakes, and welcoming the unexpected.

Hoy and Sweetland (2001) developed a conceptual model of bureaucracy by cross-breaking formalization and centralization aspects of bureaucracy. In this way, they arrived at four theoretical types of bureaucracy: enabling, rule-bound, hierarchical, and hindering. An enabling bureaucracy consists of enabling formalization and enabling centralization. Here the rules, regulations, and procedures are helpful and lead to problem solving among members rather than rigid, coercive activities that demand conformity. Complementing enabling formalization is enabling hierarchical structure or enabling bureaucracy that helps rather than hinders subordinates in their jobs. On the

other hand, a hindering bureaucracy maintains coercive formalization and hindering centralization structures. A hierarchical bureaucracy has an enabling formalization and hindering centralization, while a rule-bound bureaucracy has a coercive formalization and enabling centralization.

Hoy and Sweetland (2000) designed measures to determine if these theoretical types of school structure exist empirically. They found that formalization and centralization varied together, but that "enabling bureaucracy" was able to be quite clearly distinguished from "hindering bureaucracy" when typing schools. The authors concluded that the nature of school bureaucracy was important. Instead of seeing all bureaucratic structures at schools as harmful it is important to identify those bureaucratic structures that enabled the work and enhanced teachers from those that hindered it (Hoy& Sweetland, 2000).

The contrasting characteristics of enabling and hindering centralization are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Contrasting Enabling and Coercive Formalization

Characteristics	
Enabling	Coercive
Rules and Procedures	Rules and Procedures
Two-way communication	One-way (top-down) communication
Viewing problems as opportunities	Viewing problems as constraints
Encouraging differences	Suspecting differences
Promoting trust	Promoting distrust
Learning from mistakes	Punishing mistakes
Delighting in the unexpected	Fearing the unexpected

Hoy (2001) notes that a school's structure is ambivalent in nature. It has both negative and positive consequences. It can either negatively or positively affect teachers' attitudes. It is therefore important that school leaders and teachers create positive structural elements in schools that can reduce unnecessary conflicts, alienation, and rigidity and boost the morale of the faculty.

Watts (2009) studied the relationship of an enabling school structure and mindfulness toward teacher empowerment. Mindfulness is ongoing scrutiny of existing expectations, continuous refinement of those expectations based on new experiences, appreciation of the subtleties of context, and identification of novel aspects of context that can improve foresight and functioning (Hoy, 2003). Teacher empowerment is the process whereby teachers develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems (Short, 1994a). He hypothesized that a structure that supports mindfulness should combine with some 1,100 teachers at 23 schools responded to surveys that measured an enabling school structure (Enabling School Structure), mindfulness (Mindfulness Scale) and teacher empowerment (School Participant Empowerment Scale) in the 2008-2009 school year. Reliabilities for all measures, including the subscales of teacher empowerment, ranged from .71 to .92, indicating acceptable levels of reliability (Watts, 2009).

Higher Education Organizational Structure

According to Carnegie Foundation 2006, there are more than 4,300 institutions of higher education in the United States of America. Each falls under a community college or a research institution. Every educational institution has its unique "goal, clients served, control (public versus private), and funding. For example, community colleges,

which have two year curricular programs most commonly aim at vocational preparation of students as well as general education to improve academic skills of incoming students and/or to prepare students for transfer to the four-year sector for baccalaureate degree opportunities" (Bess & Dee, 2008, p.20). The other kind of institution is the research university. Research University provides education for undergraduate students through a broad based basic and applied scholarship. It could be a public or private research institution.

The funding for a community college comes in part from the state, and from the local communities. While the funding for research colleges and universities come from state government appropriations. Often times state governments do not meet up with their fiduciary responsibilities. State institutions would be left the choice of raising the tuition levels to make up the difference and organize some endowment programs. Private research colleges and universities generate their own revenues through student tuitions. Additional revenues for both Private and public institutions come from federal government, foundations and corporations institutions (Bess & Dee, 2008, p.20).

Organization of College and University

All colleges and Universities fall under the oversight of every one of the 50 states of the United States. There is difference in the management any of the private or public university. According to Bess & Dee (2007), "State-governed institutions tend to be more bureaucratic, with more rules, and regulations. Policy decisions are made at the state level and carried out by the state agencies in consultation with the institutional administrative personnel (not usually with the faculty) of the state institutions" (p. 21). The legislators have a lot of say so in what happens at the state government institutions.

However, university presidents, trustees and administrators often have the discretion of implementing policies.

As far as the curriculum is concerned, the faculty have authority over curricular and departmental decisions. The faculty personnel determines the terms of employment, salaries, and fringe benefits, and faculty roles. When a new faculty is being hired, he or she often signs a contract that may last for 6 years. After 6 years, a decision is taken after a review board to determine whether the faculty deserves tenure or dismissal. If the review becomes positive, tenure is awarded if that college or university is a tenure-awarding institution. But where review turns out negative, the faculty may be dismissed. In some institutions tenure is replace by a long term renewable contracts.

Tenure is designed to do a number of things for the recipients. First, it ensures faculty members' academic freedom of expression in the classrooms and scholarship. Second, tenure ensures faculty members continued employment, except there are financial problems and, finally, if the faculty is becoming grossly incompetent in accomplishing academic and professional responsibilities.

Public and private institutions have their internal organizations and structures. Most colleges and universities are governed by coordinating boards, or governing boards, often called the Regents. They have authority over K-12 education and universities or a different board for each (Bess & Dee, 2007). There is the board of trustees, responsible for policy at the lower level. The role of presidents are stated which is more of external affairs- talking to alumni, donors, legislators, community leaders, parents, and other issues. The executive vice presidents or often called provosts concentrate on the day-to-day administrative and academic responsibilities.

Faculty Roles

Faculty members in colleges are typically involved in the administration of the institutions through membership in academic departments and decision making bodies. They volunteer to work in collaborative fashion in research endeavors and arrive at decisions by consensus and not by mandate that is characteristic of K-12. It is pertinent to point out here that the involvement of faculty in some decision making issues depends to a large extent at the discretion of administrative leaders of various institutions concerned.

The fact that this study is conducted at a private, church affiliated university, it is pertinent that this study discusses church related organizations. According the Carnegie Foundation Classification for Advancement of Teaching in 1987, there are different categories of church related institutions, 2-year institutions, research and doctorate granting institutions and comprehensive institutions (Guthrie, 1992, p. 4). There were 720 of these the United States. This number was slightly below 25 percent of all 2- and 4 year institutions. According to Sandin's (1991) account, there were 7 research 1 & 2 universities, 22 Doctorate grading 1& 2; 234 Comprehensive colleges and universities 1 & 2; 394 Liberal Arts Colleges 1& 2; and 61 two year institutions.

The largest percent of church related institutions are Roman Catholics (33.1 %), followed by the Methodists (15.7 %); Baptists (11 %); and the Presbyterians (9.6 %). Among these, Catholics and Methodist had more institutions that confer doctoral degrees than all others (Guthrie, 1992, p. 5).

Enrollment Profile

The church related universities enrolled a little less than 10% (about 1.4 million) of the undergraduate students (Sandin, 1991). Catholics and Methodists were higher with

43.5 % and 17.2% respectively. The range of enrollment varied from institutions. About 40 % enrolled in less than 2000 students, while close to 75% had less than 2000 enrollment (Guthrie, 1992). The tuition range was also noticeable. Catholics range was between $6,000 and % 9,000 per year and others range at $4000 and $7000.

Classification of Church Related Colleges and Universities.

Several researchers have developed taxonomies to classify church affiliated higher education institutions. This based on the activities of various institutions. The most recent taxonomy by Guthrie, (1992) is described here.

1. Pervasively Religious Institution: this is characterized by the ultimate principles of faith and life.
2. Religious Supportive Institution: this type of institution is shaped by its affiliations with churches. The hiring practices, enrollment patterns, program decisions, and leadership are strongly shaped influenced by institutions denominational connections.
3. Nominally: Nominally related institution views its religious affiliations as an essential symbol of historic associations, but those associations do not control it educational missions.
4. The Independent Institution: This is a church affiliated institution that has historical ties with a sponsoring denomination, but currently confesses no religious sponsorship of any kind.

This information will certainly be useful as this study progresses at St Elsewhere, in the Midwestern United States.

Trust

Related to enabling structure is the concept of trust. Trust has gained increased recognition as a vital element to organizational survivability and success. The emergence of the post bureaucratic trend at the turn of the 21st century has led researchers and practitioners to give much attention to the role of trust associated with an organization. Kramer (1999) observed, "Trust has rightly moved from bit player to center stage in contemporary organizational theory and research." (p.594). Recent corporate scandals (e.g. Enron, WorldCom Arthur Anderson, AIG Insurance, and Bernard Madoff Investment Securities Ponzi scheme) have challenged the trust worthiness of social organizations in general. As Smith and Shoho (2007) observed, "uncertainty heightens, and interpersonal encounters become stressed as society grows more complex. In addition, organizational interactions also prove challenging as stakeholders jockey for accurate and authentic information from public and private systems" (p.1). Trust "often constitutes an important resource within social systems" (Kramer & Cook, 2004, p.1). Lewicki and Bunker (1996) underscore the importance of trust by stating that trust among organizational stakeholders lessens disinformation and reduces ambiguity. It serves to moderate uncertainty in a complex world and critical to social functioning (Luhmann, 1979; Solomon & Flores, 2001; Smith & Shoho, 2007).

Extant literature shows that trust has been evaluated within interpersonal and organizational perspectives (Deusch, 1958; Dirks, 1999; Geist & Hoy, 2003; Goddard et al., 2001; Hoffman et al., 1994; Hoy et al., 2006; Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Hoy et al, 1992, 2002; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, 2003; Smith et al., 2001; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998, 2000). Trust is a key element in formulating and maintaining positive

interpersonal communication and organizational effectiveness (Axelrod, 1984; Gambetta, 1988; Good, 1988; Mayer et al., 1995; McAllister, 1995; Solomon & Flores, 2001). Research has indicated the relevance of trust in the development of healthy and purposefully directed school environments (Hoy et al., 1996; 1992; Hoy & Tscannnen-Moran, 1999; Smith & Birney, 2005, Smith et al., 2001; Tarter et al, 1989, 1995). Trust affects administrator behaviors (Henderson & Hoy, 1983; Hoy & Kuppersmith, 1985) Tschannen-Moran (1999, 2003); and Smith and Shoho (2007) theorized that enabling bureaucracy should promote a sense of trust between teachers and administrators. Trust is also found to be crucial in collegial interactions, healthy and open learning environments. It is expected to promote a climate in which enabling bureaucracy could function effectively. Tschannen-Moran (1999) stated that trust is a critical element in all human learning.

Many studies have demonstrated the importance of trust in the K-12 educational arena, as a plausible construct that can affect students' achievement, faculty efficacy, and institutional health. Faculty trust in administrators, colleagues and students are also salient aspects of effective school systems (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Smith et al, 2001). However, faculty trust at the university level has received very little research (Shoho & Smith, 2004, 2007).

Definition of Trust

In essence, trust means many things. No wonder its definition has remained elusive. Researchers and theorists point out that "everyone knows what it is, yet articulating a precise definition of trust is no simple matter, whether the context is interpersonal, organizational, or societal" (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p.185). In

their review of extant literature, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1999), found that definitions of trust are multifaceted as opposed to a unidimensional definition. Some organizational studies have identified the importance of trust within organizations, claiming that trust provides the foundation for effective interdependent relationships within an organization and the external constituents of the organization. For example, Bennis and Nanus, (1985) posited that trust is a critical aspect of organizational life. It is critical for productivity because it enables organizations to function effectively (Covey, 1990).

The early studies on trust emerged from the level of distrust that prevailed during the cold war era. The world community was beginning to be concerned about the level of arms race and the tensions swirling around the super powers in their quest for dominance in the global politics. These tensions prompted the early investigations of trust. Deutsch (1958) posited that " a person has trust in the occurrence of an event if they expect the events occurrence and their expectations lead to behavior, which is perceived to greater negative consequences if their expectation is not confirmed than positive motivational experiences if confirmed"(p.266). In the 1960s, the study of trust was an endeavor to examine the skepticism and disillusionment brought by civil rights movement and institutional authority. This prompted Rotter (1967) to describe trust "as an expectancy held by an individual or group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group could be relied upon" (Smith & Shoho, 2007, p.126). The rising divorce rates and the redefinition of family structures contributed to more interest in the construct of trust in the 1960s (Baier, 1985; Bradach and Eccles, 1989; Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Johnson-George and Swap, 1982, Rempel et al., 1985). The 1970s and 1980s assumed interpersonal trust assessments of relationships. Gambarro

(1978) then defined trust as openness that exists between two people where by " the degree to which one person feels assured that another will not take malevolent or arbitrary actions, and the extent to which one person might expect predictability in other's behavior through what is normally expected of a person acting in good faith" (p.298). In the 1990s and 2000s witnessed trust research on social and economic justice, as they relate to subordinate-management relationships (Fukuyama, 1985, Kramer & Tyler, 1996; Schoorman et al., 1996; Solomon & Flores, 2001, and Warren, 1999). Mayer, Davis & Schoorman (1995), accordingly defined trust as " a willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control the party" (p.712). Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999, 2003) sifted through extant literature and defined trust as "an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open. This trust construct has been applied in educational settings (Hoy et al., 1992, 2002; Smith & Shoho, 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000, 2006).

Early definitions associated trust with constructs such as expectancy (Rotter, 1967), confidence (Coleman, 1990; Kee & Knox, 1970), risk (Coleman, 1990; Deutsch, 1958), and vulnerability (Baier, 1994; Coleman, 1990). Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) used Rotter's (1967) expectancy attribute to define trust "as an expectancy held by an individual or a group that the word, promise, and written or oral statements of another individual or a group, or an organization can be relied on" (p.444).

Williamson (1993) defined trust as follows:

> When we say we trust someone or that someone is trustworthy, we implicitly mean that the probability that he [or she] will perform an action that is beneficial or at least not detrimental to us is high enough for us to consider engaging in some form of cooperation with him [or her]. (p. 463)

Mishra (1996) was the first to move from a unidimensional definition of trust to a construct that incorporates the concepts which extant literature provided. He defined trust as " one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is (a) competent, (b) open, (c) concerned, and (d) reliable" (1996, p.265) . This definition led Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1999) to state that interdependent relationships provide the reason to trust. When interdependence is lacking then there is no trust. Interdependence creates individual's or group's vulnerability. Vulnerability is an essential attribute of trust. The depth of a trustor is measured by the size of the trustee's vulnerability.

Hoy and colleagues (1999) while appropriating Mishra's definition of trust, replaced the "concerned" attribute with "benevolence," and added "honesty," which "speaks of character, integrity, and authenticity" (Hoy&Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p.188). They proposed a working definition of trust as "an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confident that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open" (p189). Benevolence is the "confidence that one's well-being or something one cares about, will be protected and not harmed" (Baier, 1986); Hoy & Tschannen-Moran 1999; Mishra, 1996). Reliability, or dependability, is the sense that one can count on others to meet their commitments (Butler & Cantrell, 1984). Competence is the aspect of trust that recognizes that good intentions are not

enough. To trust someone, the person must be able to perform his or her role in a way that will meet expectations. In honesty, the hallmark of trust is truth-telling (Baier, 1986, Butler and Cantrell, 1984; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Openness is the willingness to share information. People who are open exhibit vulnerability to others, which engenders reciprocal, trust (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) reviewed the literature on the measurement of trust at the individual level. Their findings show that a number of the studies measured trust in the organizational context with one or a few of the "Five faces of Trust" (Athos & Gambarro, 1978; Cook & wall, 1980; Cummings & Bromily, 1996). Tschannen-Moran and colleagues grouped all the measures of trust as to whether they measured generalized trust, organizational trust or trust in intimate relations. Later, they extended trust study to the school level.

Trust in Schools

Schools are organizations. As with business organizations, they possess similar working dynamics that require interrelationships between internal and external stakeholders. Internal relationships involve students, teachers, administrators, and other faculty members. The external relationships involve parents, community leaders, businesses, politicians, and the general public. The research on trust in schools dwells primarily on trust between teachers, teacher trust of principal and teacher trust in clients, that is, parents and students (Hoy, Sabo & Barnes, 1996, Hoy & Tarter & Witoskie, 1992, Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Not surprisingly, Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) found that faculty trust in principal was related to principal behavior. A supportive leadership style was responsible for faculty trust in the principal at the secondary level. Teacher

professionalism and leader authenticity also is related to faculty trust in the principal. Teacher trust of students and parents has been shown to predict student achievement. For scholars like Bryk & Schneider (2002), Goddard and colleagues (2001) and Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), trust is an important school characteristic that makes a difference in student learning. Many other studies show that faculty trust is associated with healthy climates (Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001; Tarter, Sabo & Hoy, 1995), teacher efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998), and enabling school structure (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

Adams and Forsyth (2007) investigated the effects of formalized and centralized school structures; two emergent concepts in school reform were identified: trust and collaboration. These concepts were examined through the perspective of parents. They found that rules and formal control structures can be applied in ways that foster a culture supportive of parent trust and collaboration. While these two concepts, school structure and trust, may predict the school climates underscored above, their effects on teacher efficacy in the college setting have not been demonstrated.

Tschannen-Moran (2009) studied the role of leadership orientation and trust in fostering teacher professionalism. Faculty perceptions of colleagues were found to be related to a professional orientation in the exercise of authority by administrators, as well as to the faculty trust in the principal. Expressing the significance of her findings for research and practice, Tschannen-Moran (2009) argued that for schools to foster greater teacher professionalism, school leaders could do well to resist adopting a bureaucratic orientation that is implicitly distrustful.

Trust in College and University

Shoho and Smith (2007) admit that there is paucity of research on faculty trust at the college and university levels. Just as trust is important in K-12 public and private schools and in the business sector, so it is a necessary construct for the higher educational institutions. As Smith and Shoho (2007) stated, "The prospects of continued fiscal constraints, expanding institutional responsibilities, and emerging federal and state pressures for higher education accountability highlight the need for stakeholder trust in colleges and universities" (p.129). The federal government of the United States demands accountability from higher institutions. This has led to a bipartisan effort among the government, legislators and higher education institution administrators to find ways of maximizing student performance (United States Department of Education 2006)).

Smith and Shoho (2007) studied faculty trust in a large southwestern institution. Because there has not been any instrument designed for the measure of trust in the college and university level, they identified a reliable instrument, the Higher Education Faculty Trust Inventory (HEFTI). The hypothesis that guided their "study is that higher education faculty trust will be related to academic rank, and race" (p.130). Thirty five departments were invited for the study. However, 32 departments that consisted of 217 professors of varying academic ranks across the institution participated. About 53% of tenure and tenure- track participated. The Higher Education Faculty Trust Inventory is a 28-item Likert-type instrument that measured various aspects of faculty trust in professors of varying academic rank (i.e., adjunct, assistant, associate, and full professors): a 9-item scale measures trust in colleagues, an 11-item scale measured trust in dean, and 8-item scale measured trust in students. The sample alpha coefficients of

reliability were .93 for collegial trust; .96 for trust in dean; and .84 for students' trust. (p.131). Sample questions include: "Faculty in this college trusts each other"; 'The dean in this college is competent in doing his or her job." In essence, this instrument is a modified version of Hoy &Tschannen-Moran's (1999) trust scale. Even as a measure of trust at the higher education level, all five facets of the trust's scale (benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness) are represented in each trust referent (Colleagues, students, and the dean)" (Smith & Shoho, 2007, p. 131).

The results of this study showed no significant differences among races. However there was found an inverse relationship between trust and academic rank in that "the lower the academic rank, the higher the trust in colleagues" (p.132). Smith and Shoho (2007) surmised that the "finding may be germane to higher education cultures, where individual autonomy and academic freedom are highly valued" (p.132). Tenured faculty were less trusting and this can be explained by the fact that trust appears to erode as faculty members ascend the academic ladder. In sum, Smith &Shoho (2007) maintained that issues that can attenuate trust may include "prospects of high turnover in deanship, the socialization process to institutional politics in general, and an academic culture that nurtures autonomy and independence may arrest the development of trust" (p.133). As for the junior colleagues that show high trust, it could because "assistant professors who are relatively new to the university and striving for tenure, align themselves with greater levels of trust in the dean due to what Kramer (1999) referred to as role-based trust" (p.133). Role-based trust is one that is extended to another simply because of their position and not because of their capabilities. It is a desire for getting ahead.

Research studies find that high levels of faculty trust among colleagues, clients, and administrators improve institutional efficiency and productivity (Hoy et al., 2002; smith et al., 2001, Smith & Shoho, 2007). Trust is identified with effective leadership styles (Bass, 1985; Harris, 2006), to influence job satisfaction, affect subordinate commitment and citizenship behavior (Bycio et al, 1995).

Harris (2006) delineates the importance of trust by stating that, "with the trust of those you are seeking to lead, you have the potential to excel beyond your expectations. Work it out, to borrow a cliché, your days as a leader is numbered. With trust, policy changes have much better chance of being accepted…. How you handle these situations – your openness and candor, comfort with certainty, willingness to listen and lead, and confidence – will play an important role in your ability to sustain the trust you need" (p.80).

Problem Statement

Albert Bandura (1993) defined the concept of self efficacy as "beliefs in one's capacity to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (1993, p.3). Researchers have since demonstrated the power of efficacy perceptions in human learning, performance, and motivation. (Woolfolk Hoy, 2009). Teacher efficacy is a judgment about capabilities to influence student engagement and learning. Quite recently, this concept has been operationalized as a school level measurement by Goddard, Hoy, Woolfolk Hoy (2000). Collective teacher efficacy became an extension of individual teacher efficacy, a view that identifies a faculty's beliefs in its collective efficaciousness. Before Goddard, et al., (2000) developed the collective teacher efficacy scale; researchers were aggregating the individual perceptions

of teaching efficacy to obtain school scores. Scholars argue that aggregating perceptions of individual efficacy does not represent the efficacy of the collective, but merely the average self-efficacy of a group of individuals

Several studies have confirmed that collective teacher efficacy and teacher self-efficacy are theoretically and empirically related. However, most of the studies using these constructs were conducted at the K-12 levels. Moreover, the analysis of the influence of context and norms on teacher self-efficacy or collective teacher efficacy at the college level has not been investigated. One reason few studies have reported collective self-efficacy on the college faculty is that universities are loosely-coupled.

Prieto (2006) developed an instrument meant to be used to study teacher self-efficacy in the college setting; it has been used in a few studies. Given the general lack of cohesion among college faculty, it may well be that both the concept and measure of collective efficacy among college faculty would be relatively meaningless. Thus, neither the collective efficacy model developed by Goddard et al, (2000, 2001) nor Prieto's (2006) instrument will not be used in this study, which instead will focus on college faculty self-efficacy. This investigation uses the concepts of enabling structure, trust, and teacher self-efficacy, as well as the theories underlying these concepts, to explore the possible empirical relationships existing among these variables.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study will be to explore the structural and trust-related antecedents of college teacher self-efficacy. Its significance will be to explore the extent to which the normative and contextual college environment has consequences for faculty self-efficacy. While structure is the foundation of a university contextual environment,

faculty trust in colleagues is theoretically an essential social norm contributing to the climate of an educational organization. This study will examine the relationship that exists among university's structure, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty self-efficacy. There is a reasonable body of evidence supporting a relationship among these variables in elementary and schools (Adams, 2003, McGuigan, 2005). This research will investigate if those findings can be extrapolated to the university setting. This study, then, will contribute to the structure literature conceptualized by Hoy & Sweetland (2000, 2001), trust literature, and above all, will enhance the knowledge base of faculty self- efficacy and the antecedents to its formation. Examining college trust norms and collective beliefs about college bureaucratic structures will be a necessary precursor to improving faculty self-efficacy and ultimately producing student achievement gains.

Research Questions

The following research questions flow from the purpose of this study and inform its design:

1) Will organizational structure be related to Faculty self-efficacy? If there is a relationship found between organizational structure and faculty self-efficacy, how is it manifested?
2) Will faculty trust in colleagues be related to faculty self-efficacy? If there is a relationship found between faculty trust and faculty self-efficacy, how is it manifested?
3) What effects do institutional type; institutional mission and organization; and faculty roles and appointment type have on efficacy and trust in this higher educational setting?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the design and the details of the procedures used for the conduct of this study are presented. The purpose of this research was to investigate whether there are relationships between organizational structure and collegial trust and the university faculty's sense of self-efficacy as defined by Bandura (1977, 1986, & 1997) in a particular Catholic university in the Midwestern U. S. The study was carried out in two phases. A mixed methods approach was employed in this investigative case study. This chapter describes the methods and the rationale behind the use of such methods. The descriptions of the procedures and the analyses of the quantitative and qualitative research methods will be discussed separately. Similarly, the descriptive and correlational data analysis will be presented.

Population

This research was conducted at St Elsewhere University, in a Midwestern state. It is a private, nonprofit, coeducational university that offers associate, Bachelors, and Master's degrees. It was founded in 1875 with a campus size of 600 acres of land, and has a total of 700 undergraduate and 44graduate and professional students. I t has three campuses and welcomes students from a variety of backgrounds. The student population represents 12 states, and eight countries. Sixteen percent of the student body comes from outside the state; it is 60% female and 40% male. The student body is 28% ethnic

minority and 11% international. St Elsewhere University has advertised admissions criteria that require prospective students to obtain two out of the following, 2.75 High School Cumulative GPA (on a 4.00 scale), 21 on ACT or 1500 on SAT for test takers after 2005; and Class rank in the upper half of graduating class. But under it site it says, "Students who do not meet these criteria are encouraged to apply and may be considered for admission." U.S. Report on college and University ranking stated that St Elsewhere has 97 percent of acceptance rate, 60 percent of retention and 59 percent of graduation. .

St Elsewhere has 33 regular faculty members (16 females and 17 males). It has 16 faculty members with doctorate degrees, 16 masters' degrees and one Bachelor of Arts degree. Eight of the faculty members are tenured. Few others are on tenure track. This study included only regular faculty, not the adjunct faculty.

The general research method used can best be described as an explanatory mixed methods approach. According to Creswell and Plano (2011), the rationale for such an approach is that

> Research problems suited for mixed methods are those in which one data source may be explained, exploratory findings need to be generalized, a second method is needed to enhance a primary method, a theoretical stance needs to be employed, an overall research objective can be best addressed with multiple phases or projects. (2011, p.8)

The study was conducted in two phases. In the first phase, the investigator sought to determine if there were any systematic relationships between college instructors' sense of teaching efficacy and the normative and contextual environments of the university such as collegial trust and organizational structure. In the second phase, the investigator

used interviews to investigate and to explain the relationships found or not found in the survey data.

In the fall of 2010, permission to conduct this study at St Elsewhere University was requested in a letter by the Catholic bishop of the state to the president of the university. The president directed the provost of the university to look into the possibility of conducting this research. The provost requested explanation concerning the purpose and process of the research. Accordingly, the investigator put together a set of documents including the Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval letter, the approved dissertation proposal, and copies of instruments and consent forms for the provost's examination (see Appendices A-E). This information packet was followed by a personal visit of the researcher to the provost on November 12, 2010. The provost expressed interest in the study and promised to meet with the faculty members to discuss their interest and willingness to participate.

In December14, 2010, the provost communicated in writing that the faculty had given their consent to the research project. A faculty member was designated to serve a link between the faculty and the investigator. However, ultimately the University's secretary would handle most of the communications between the researcher and study participants. Initially, a list of faculty members, including their demographic information such as gender, age, ethnicity, and the degrees held, and appointment type was requested for this study.

In February 13, 2011, an e-mail document was sent to faculty explaining the purpose of the research and requesting their participation in the research. They were also told to expect surveys in the near future. The researcher promised confidentiality in the

handling of the survey responses. A few days later, copies of the research instruments and consent forms were mailed to the university. Each faculty member received a set of instruments with a consent form and a self-addressed return envelope. Faculty members were requested to complete the surveys, insert it in in the self-addressed envelope, and seal it to protect confidentiality.

Two weeks after the initial distribution of the surveys, the investigator sent additional requests for returns. In the end, a total of 29 responses were received. These accounted for about 88 percent of eligible respondents. Four faculty members declined to participate. Out of the 29 responding faculty, 8 are tenured and 21 are not tenured. All but two respondents are White; there are 15 males and 14 females.

Phase One: Quantitative Research Procedures

Operational Measures

Teaching Self-Efficacy. Teaching self-efficacy was measured with a revised version of Gibson and Dembo's (1984) 22-item version of the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES). This scale is the most frequently used instrument to assess teacher efficacy (Ross, 1994, 1998). It has been shown to have high internal reliability (alpha = 85). In their seminal study, Gibson and Dembo (1984), set out to measure the two aspects of Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy and outcome expectations theory. Principal component analysis with varimax rotation on their sample of 208 elementary school teachers yielded two factors that accounted for 28.8 % of the total variance.

For the present study, the individual items of the TES were slightly modified to better match the conditions of the college environment. Items, 4, 6, 9, 13, 16, 18, and 21 on the long form of the 22-item scale were removed because they made references to

family and classroom issues typical of the K-12 faculty role, but not appropriate for university faculty. For example, university faculties seldom interact with the parents of their students. Words like "effective teacher" or "teachers" as in "Teachers are not a very powerful influence on students" were changed to "Faculty members are not a very powerful influence on student achievement." The teaching self-efficacy instrument is included in the appendices at the end of this report. The responses to the newly adapted 15-item instrument were measured on a six-point, Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The reverse scored items on the 15-item version are numbers 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 15. Individual respondent's scores were aggregated to quantify their relative, overall sense of efficacy, which Woolfolk Hoy (2004) defined as "a judgment about capabilities to influence student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated" (p.1).

Organizational structure. Hoy and Sweetland (2000, 2001) conceptualized bureaucratic structure in terms of how it is viewed by members of an organization who are affected by it. They defined and operationalized enabling structures as those (rules, regulations, procedures, and the distribution of decision-making) that enable problem solving among members. A high total scale score suggests that those who work in an organization see existing rules and hierarchy as "enabling" their work rather than hindering it. Conversely, a low score means the see the structure as them in their work. The use of this instrument is warranted because there has not been any other instrument known to the researcher for the measure of organizational structure at the university level. However, just as the instruments for the other variables were modified, so will this instrument be modified to suite the university organizational structure context.

A short version of the scale consists of 12 Likert-type items, 6 of which describe an enabling bureaucracy and the remaining 6 describe a hindering bureaucracy. The response set of items ranges from "never" (coded as 1) to "always" (coded as 5). The aggregate scale range theoretically varies from 12 to 60 with a larger value indicating enabling structures. The reliability of this scale is consistently high. The construct and predictive validity have been supported by a number of studies (Hoy and Sweetland, 2000, Hoy and Sweetland 2001). Some of the items were modified to reflect the measurement in a university setting (see attached). For example, "school" was changed to "university" and "teachers" to "faculty." Sample items measuring enabling formalization include, "Administrative rules in this university are guides to solutions rather than rigid procedure." The measurement of hindering formalization includes questions such as, "In this university, red tape is a problem." Sample items measuring hindering centralization include "The administrative hierarchy of this university obstructs innovation." An example of an item probing enabling centralization is "The administrative hierarchy of this university facilitates the mission of this university."

There is ample evidence that the short version of the enabling structure scale is valid and reliable in the psychometric tests performed by Hoy and Sweetland (2001). The independent reliability tests among three sets of high school teacher samples numbering, 61, 116, and 97, yielded alpha coefficients of .90, .93, and .95 respectively. The study showed that each of the values was statistically significant. Items 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11 are reversed scored. The higher the cumulative score on the scale, the more enabling the university structure is perceived to be (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000).

Collegial trust. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2005) proposed a working definition of trust as "an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open" (p.189). Trust plays an important role relative to the organizational structure of educational organizations. For example, according to Bryk and Schneider (2003), good schools depend heavily on the cooperation of faculty members. They describe trust in relational terms as "the connective tissue that binds individuals together to advance the education and welfare of students. Improving schools [and universities] requires us to think harder about how best to organize the work of adults and students so that this connective tissue remains healthy and strong" (Bryk & Schneider, 2003, p. 189).

The operational measure of collegial trust at the Higher Education level used in this research was The Higher Education Faculty Trust Inventory (HEFTI) developed by Shoho and Smith (2004). The measure targeted the five facets of trust embedded in the definition proposed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999, 2003). The measure is consistent with those measures developed for K-12 schools by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran and is based on the same conceptual work. The Higher Education Faculty Trust Scale is a 28-item Likert instrument that measures faculty trust in colleagues, in the dean, and in students. However, because this study focused on faculty trust in colleagues, only the 8-item scale measure for collegial trust was used. Examples of collegial trust items are: "Faculty in this university trust each other," "Faculty in this university are suspicious of each other," and "When faculty in this university tell you something, you can believe it." The modified Hoy & Tschannen-Moran (1999) version of Higher Education Faculty Trust will be used and can be found in the appendix.

The alpha coefficient of collegial trust in this study was .85. The response set for the scale varies along a six-point Likert-type continuum from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." All the five facets of trust (benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty and openness) are represented. Only item 3, "Faculty in this university are suspicious of each other" was reverse scored. The higher the cumulative score on the scale, the more trusting the collegial trust is (Shoho and Smith, 2007).

Data Analysis

In order to answer the research questions guiding the study, data were first entered into an Excel spreadsheet or database for the purposes of tracking missing cases. These data were later imported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, which was used to analyze the quantitative survey data. Four out of 33 faculty members did not return their surveys. A few respondents did not respond to all questions or items. Missing values were replaced by one of the conventional replacement techniques available in SPSS; less than 15 percent of the individual data were missing. If more than 15 percent of data are missing, it is recommended that cases be eliminated (George & Mallery, 2002). A total score on each measure was recorded for each individual faculty member. Standard SPSS tools were used to determine the means and standard of deviations of all the variables. Variables such as gender, rank, appointment types and tenure were also determined coded and analyzed. Correlational statistics were calculated using the Pearson r as to determine the bivariate relationships between the pairs of variables; teaching self-efficacy was viewed as the consequent variable (while keeping in mind that correlational techniques do not reveal causality) and enabling organizational structure and collegial trust were viewed as the antecedent variables.

Correlation coefficients linking the principal variables with gender, rank, appointment type and tenure were also calculated. Neither multiple regression analyses nor the analysis of variance (ANOVA) were conducted because of the small size of the research population.

Phase Two: Qualitative Research Procedures

Survey methods were inadequate to elicit data that could provide answers to the research questions. Qualitative approaches, such as interview, are often most appropriate for seeking the answers to "why" questions.

The second phase of this study consisted of interviews with 10 faculty members. To explore the effects of individual differences with respect to principal antecedent variables, subjects were selected for interview based on relatively extreme scores, either high or low mean scores on enabling structure and collegial trust. These cases were identified by examining the distributions within the survey scale scores. In the interviews, the researcher explored in greater detail the personal meaning and the extent to which characteristics of organizational structure and collegial trust had on faculty self-efficacy and the role these variables played in the formation of faculty teaching self-efficacy. The importance of using a mixed method approach has been described thoroughly by Johnson & Onwuegbuzie (2004, p. 17), as the "the class of research where the researcher mixes and combines quantitative and qualitative research technique, methods, approaches, and concepts of language into a single study." Creswell (1998) opined that the use of qualitative research builds a "complex, holistic picture." It allows the investigator to answer "how" and "why" questions and combine a detailed view and

narration of the research (Creswell, 1998). In a recent work, Creswell & Plano Clark (2007) stated clearly the saliency of mixed method:

> It involves philosophical assumptions, the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches, and the mixing of both approaches in a study. Thus, it is more than simply collecting and analyzing both kinds of data; it also involves the use of both approaches in tandem so that the overall strength of the study is greater than either qualitative or quantitative research. (p.4)

In essence, this method affords the researcher the opportunity of having the research questions answered more clearly and fully.

After the identifying faculty with the highest and lowest scores, 10 faculty members (5 men and 5 women) were identified and invited to participate in the interviews. The aim was to further probe the results of the quantitative analysis and also to explore some additional variables such as the effects of institutional type, mission and faculty role on faculty trust and teaching self-efficacy. Initially, some of the identified faculty invited for interview declined participation in this phase. One individual simply wrote back, "No, thank you. Good luck with your research." Another said, "I have so many meetings and administrative issues. I cannot make it for Friday. I am sorry." In the morning of one of the days of the interview another individual texted, that she fell sick and cancelled the interview. Others did not even respond to numerous email appeals for their participation. Ultimately, faculty with mixed scores that is, high on one or two of the three variables, structure, collegial trust or teaching self-efficacy were recruited for interview.

A comfortable room was provided so that participants felt free to express their candid opinions in response to the questions asked. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) suggest, "good interviews are those in which the subjects are at ease and talk freely about their points of view…. Good interviews produce rich data filled with words that reveal the respondents' perspectives" (p.97). Savenge and Robinson (2001) delineated the guidelines for conducting interviews. They describe the

> … researcher as data-gathering instrument and the respondents are human beings with their various strengths and foibles at communicating. The cornerstone is to be sure that one truly listens to respondents and records what they say, rather than to the researcher's perceptions or interpretations... It is best to maintain the integrity of raw data, using respondents' words, including quotes, liberally. (p. 1177)

On the day of the interview, faculty members who participated signed the interview consent form. (See Appendix). The interviews were semi-structured and open-ended. According to Savenge and Robinson (2001) structured interviews "may be conducted in which the researcher follows a sort of script of questions, asking the same questions, and in the same order, of all respondents" (p.1182).

Interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed for accuracy and control of investigator bias. Questions were asked to elicit information regarding organizational structure, collegial trust and faculty sense of teaching self-efficacy. Questions related to mission, choice of teaching at the particular university, and appointment type were asked to each of the participants.

Data were analyzed in the style of Yin's (2009) explanation building technique. This is a "special type of pattern matching" (p.141). According to Yin (2009), "To "explain," a phenomenon is to stipulate a presumed set of causal links about it, or "how," or "why" something happened" (p.141). This process involved text coding, identification of thematic and patterned responses, which emerged from the interview transcriptions.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

Three research questions were developed to guide this study:

1) Will faculty organizational structure be related to faculty self-efficacy? And if there is a relationship found between faculty organizational structure and faculty self-efficacy, how is it manifested?
2) Will faculty trust in colleagues be related to faculty self-efficacy? If there is a relationship found between faculty trust in colleagues and faculty self-efficacy, how does is it manifested?
3) What effects do institutional type; mission and organization; and faculty roles and appointment type have on faculty self- efficacy and trust in this higher educational setting?

Data collection for the study was carried out in two phases using a mixed methods research approach. Likert-type scales were used to collect quantitative data regarding faculty members' teaching self-efficacy, perceptions of organizational structure, and collegial trust. In the second phase, interviews were conducted to provide a deeper understanding and interpretation of what contributes to the formation of teaching self-efficacy among faculty at this private, liberal arts university. This chapter includes a presentation of the descriptive statistics for all the study variables and the results of the analysis of the quantitative data that identified the degree of faculty members' self-

efficacy beliefs, collegial trust, and organizational structure perceptions. The data are analyzed using the three research questions to structure the discussion. Finally, there follows an analysis of the qualitative data obtained through interviews with ten faculty members who were identified with high, medium, and low scores on key variables and who agreed to participate in the qualitative phase of the study.

Descriptive Statistics

All 33 faculty members of the Catholic university that was the venue of the study were invited to participate in the study. Twenty-nine responses were returned to the investigator, producing a response rate of 88%. One person who declined to participate in the study explaining that she/he is not a member of the teaching faculty.

Conceptually and analytically, teacher self-efficacy was treated as a dependent variable while organizational structure and trust were treated as independent variables or at least antecedents. The means, standard deviations, and ranges were examined. The reliability coefficients for the scales were all above the conventional criterion of .70 for adequate reliability: for the organizational structure scale alpha was .85, for the faculty self-efficacy scale alpha was .87, and alpha was .85 for the collegial trust scale. The descriptive statistics of the research variables are summarized in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics for Composite Measures

Variable	*Range*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Enabling School Structure	24 – 59	28	44.32	6.42
Faculty Self-efficacy	36 – 79	28	59.70	9.65
Collegial Trust	19 – 41	29	33.41	5.53

Teaching Self-Efficacy

To collect data on individual instructor perceptions of their teaching efficacy, participants were asked to complete a modified version of Gibson and Dembo's (1984) teacher efficacy scale. The scale consists of fifteen statements designed to assess the teaching efficacy beliefs of faculty. Four questions addressed the teaching task of each individual faculty member. The original Gibson and Dembo (1984) instrument was designed to measure teaching self-efficacy of K-12 teachers. In adapting it for use with college faculty, questions directed to parent-teacher interactions, for example, were excluded. Sample statements used to assess faculty competence include, "I have enough training to deal with almost any learning problem" and "When I try hard I can get through to the most difficult students." The entire revised instrument is included in the appendices of this report. Sample teaching task items include, "The hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their outside environment" and "The amount a student can learn is primarily related to family background." Faculty members were asked to respond to each statement on a six-point Likert scale with response choices ranging from "strongly agree" (1) to "strongly disagree" (6). As indicated above, this scale had a reliability of .87 (Cronbach's alpha).

A total individual score was calculated for each respondent. Some of the items were written so as to require a reversal of the score. For example, a score of 1 on "I have enough training to deal with almost any learning problem" was reversed to be a 6, etc. Thus, a high score reflects a high value on the variable (high teacher efficacy beliefs), a

practice that is consistent with social science measurement. The 15 item scores when added together provided a total score for each faculty member; the maximum score was 90 while the minimum score was 15.

Organizational Structure (Enabling Structure)

This study assessed the organizational structure perceptions of the faculty by using a modified version of the 12-item instrument developed by Hoy and Sweetland (2000, 2001), which has been shown to have a high reliability (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Sinden, Hoy, & Sweetland , 2004; Smith &Shoho, 2007). Sample items include "Administrative rules in this university enable authentic communication between faculty and administration" and "In this university the authority of the provost is used to undermine faculty." Faculty were asked to respond to each statement on a five-point Likert type scale from "never" (1) to "always" (5). In this study, an analysis of the item responses using principal component factor analysis produced an internal reliability estimate of .85 (Cronbach's alpha).

A score for each subject on organizational structure perceptions was calculated in a manner similar to the previous scale, that is, individual responses to 12 items were added together to create a quantitative indicator of the extent to which each individual regarded the organizational structure of the college as enabling his or her work. The scores of negatively worded questions were reversed. For example, a score of 1 (Never) on a Likert item like, "In this university the authority of the provost is used to undermine faculty" was reversed to be a 5, etc., resulting in a total high score indicating a perception of the university's structure as enabling rather than hindering. The maximum score was

60 while the minimum score was 12. The entire scale is included in the appendixes of this report.

Collegial Trust

To measure the level of collegial faculty trust, the investigator administered a modified version of the Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) trust scale. Again, modification of the indicator was necessary because the instruments were designed to measure the collegial trust of teachers at elementary and secondary education levels. The validity and reliability of this scale have been supported in several studies (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2003 and Hoy et al, 2005). In fact, this modified measure has been used previously by Smith and Shoho (2007) as part of their formulation of a Higher Education Faculty Trust Inventory (HEFTI). The collegial trust scale used here has 8-items designed to measure a faculty member's willingness to be vulnerable to colleagues in the confidence that they are trustworthy and will not exploit the vulnerability (Hoy, et al, 2006). Sample items include, "Faculty in this university are suspicious of each other" and "Even in difficult situations, faculty in this university can depend on each other." A six-point Likert scale response set ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (6). This scale has a reliability of .85. The collegial trust level for each respondent was calculated by totaling the eight items that make up the scale. As discussed above, scores on negatively worded statements such as, "Faculty members in this university are suspicious of each other" were reversed to obtain an aggregate score by adding items scored in the same direction. The eight item responses were then totaled; the maximum score for each person is 48 and minimum is 8.

Originally, the data for each respondent were entered into an Excel spreadsheet for examination. In preparation for statistical analysis, the Excel data were imported into SPSS and a data set was constructed with values for every quantitative variable included for each respondent, including the primary variables of interest: teaching self-efficacy, organizational structure, and collegial trust. A very minimum number of missing values were replaced with the series mean, a typical approach in this situation.

The research method used for this case analysis relied on two phases of data collection and a similar pattern will be used in the analysis. Below, the researcher reports the analysis of the quantitative data obtained through the initial survey of the college faculty. First, the approaches the researcher used to explore the relationships among the primary concepts of interest to this study are presented. Later, the qualitative data collected through interview of some of these same faculty members were probed to help explain and interpret the quantitative findings.

Research Question 1

The first research question was "Will enabling structure be related to faculty teaching self-efficacy? If there is a relationship, how does it emerge?" Part one of the question can be answered through quantitative analysis of these two variables. Pearson's product moment correlational coefficient, the mostly used correlation coefficient in social science research (Schumacher, 2009), was calculated to determine the specific relationship between individual faculty member perceptions of bureaucratic structure and that faculty member's beliefs about his or her teaching efficacy (see Table 4, which contains the correlation matrix). The computation produced a Pearson *r* of .34 and a significance level of .09. This correlation coefficient suggests a low to moderate

relationship between an instructor's perception of the degree to which the college's rules and power structure enable teaching, and his or her beliefs about personal ability to succeed in the classroom. Statistical significance is of little importance here since no hypothesis was being tested and there is no attempt to claim that the relationship found in this population is systematic and generalizable to other samples or populations. The r square of .34 is .12. Here, the r square indicates that, knowing a respondent's score on enabling structure, 12 percent of variance in faculty self-efficacy can be predicted, or vice versa. The correlation coefficient nonetheless provides an estimate of the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the two variables.

Research Question 2

The second research question was, "Will faculty trust in colleagues be rel ted to faculty self-efficacy? If there is a relationship found between faculty trust and faculty self-efficacy, how is it manifested?" Correlating the two variables included in this question produced a Pearson *r* of .35 and a significance level of .07. As with the previous procedure, this was a moderate correlation, approaching statistical significance. This finding suggests the moderate importance of collegial trust as an antecedent to an instructor's beliefs about his or her personal ability to succeed in the classroom. As in the discussion of research question 1, statistical significance is of little importance here since no hypothesis was being tested and there is no attempt to claim that the relationship found in this population is systematic and generalizable to other samples or populations. The r square is .12. Thus, if a respondents college trust score is known, 12 percent of variance in faculty self-efficacy can be predicted, or vice versa. The correlation

coefficient nonetheless provides an estimate of the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the two variables.

Table 4.2

Correlational Analysis (N = 29)

		ES	FacSE	CollTrust
ES	Pearson Correlation	1	.34	.53*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.09	.00
	N	28	27	28
FacSE	Pearson Correlation	.34	1	.35
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.09		.07
	N	27	28	28
Coll. Trust	Pearson Correlation	.53	.35	1
	Sig (2-tailed)	.00*	.07	
	N	28	28	29

ES = Enabling Stricture; FacSE – Faculty Self-efficacy; CollTrust = Collegial Trust
*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Research Question 3

The third research question asked, "What effects do institutional type, mission and organization, and faculty roles and appointment type have on faculty self-efficacy and trust in this higher educational setting?" Four quantitative variables were explored related to this question through data collected by survey: (1) ethnic/racial identity, (2) gender, (3) tenure, and (4) status of employment (full- or part-time). The ethnic/racial identity could not be analyzed quantitatively because all but two respondents indicated their identity as White. The other three variables were explored through correlation analyses and there were no statistically significant correlations between gender, tenure, employment status and any of the three principal variables of the study, collegial trust, enabling structure and faculty self-efficacy.

However, the two highest correlations were as follows. With respect to gender, female instructors had higher teaching self-efficacy than men (r = .29) and, somewhat

ironically, non-tenured instructors had higher teaching self-efficacy levels than tenured instructors (r = -.28). These relationships will be discussed in more detail later. Question 3 will be best examined through the presentation of interview data that follows. Table 4.3 below reports the correlation coefficients for all quantitative variables collected through the survey.

Table 4.3

Correlation Matrix, All Variables

		TrustCol	FacSE	ES	Gender	Tenure	Full-Part
TrustCol	Pearson Correlation	1	.352	.534**	.212	.031	-.182
	Sig. (2-tailed)		066	.003	.270	.872	.344
	N	29	28	28	29	29	29
FacSE	Pearson Correlation	.352	1	.336	.294	-.281	.196
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.066		.087	.128	.148	.317
	N	28	28	27	28	28	28
ES	Pearson Correlation	.534**	.336	1	.208	.171	-.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.087		.289	.384	.997
	N	28	27	28	28	28	28
Gender	Pearson Correlation	.212	.294	.208	1	-.155	-.149
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.270	.128	.289		.422	.440
	N	29	28	28	29	29	29
Tenure	Pearson Correlation	.031	-.281	.171	-.155	1	-.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.872	.148	.384	.422		.931
	N	29	28	28	29	29	29
Full-Part	Pearson Correlation	-.182	.196	-.001	-.149	-.017	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.344	.317	.997	.440	.931	
	N	29	28	28	29	29	29

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Interview Data

Interviews were held with 10 faculty members from the studied university who agreed to participate in the second phase of the investigation (see Appendix F). These

included faculty members who were identified as having either high or low scores on teaching self-efficacy, enabling organization structure, and collegial trust. Few faculty members declined to be interviewed when they were invited by the investigator for interview. The interviews provided data allowing the researcher to explore the meaning of the survey results and better understand this initial probe into the antecedents of teacher self-efficacy among college faculty.

Interviews were held on campus in facilities provided by the university. The interviews were arranged in such a way that participants had the freedom to talk freely about their views and experiences related to the university. Each interview was preceded by a discussion of the basic interview guidelines. There were introductions and an invitation to sign the consent form for interview (see Appendix G). The consent form detailed the purpose, procedures, risks, benefits, confidentiality, contacts and participant's rights, including the right to participate or not, and the right to refuse to answer questions without negative consequences. The investigator defined each of the main constructs that constitute the focus of the study. Faculty self-efficacy was defined as "the faculty member's belief in his or her ability to affect students' learning and achievement." Trust in colleagues was defined as "a faculty member's willingness to be vulnerable to other faculty members based on the confidence that they are trustworthy (benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open) [adapted from the definitions of Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 1998, p189]. Finally, enabling organizational structure was defined as "the perceptions of individual participants in an organization that the structures of the organization, especially rules and hierarchy, enable rather than hinder their work."

The interview questions centered on the formation of faculty members' perceptions of self-efficacy, faculty trust of colleagues, and enabling organizational structure. Questions surrounding the effects of the mission, institutional type, faculty roles and appointment type on efficacy and trust were also asked (see Appendix H).

During the interview, when a participant hesitated to answer a question or wanted a question clarified, the interviewer obliged and responded with additional prompts. All 10 faculty members (5 women and five 5 exhibited a high level of professionalism and decorum and responded to the questions asked in what appeared to be a candid and thorough manner. Some even volunteered their private phone numbers and invited the investigator to call if additional information or clarifications were needed.

The scores on the principal investigatory variables, and ascribed and achieved characteristics of faculty were tabled and examined to guide selection and invitation of the most promising interview subjects. The investigator reasoned that the views of those with more extreme scores would provide the greatest insight into the roles that bureaucratic structure and collegial trustworthiness might play in the formation of relative teaching efficacy. The three tables below were carefully examined and selections of interviewees were based on specific combinations of high and low scores.

Table 4.4

Faculty Demographics : Faculty Self-efficacy Scores (FacSE).

FacSE	Gen	Tenure	Appt.	Race	Identification Number
36.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG20
44.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG22
45.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG19
47.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG4

52.00	M	NT	PT	W	SG1
52.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG2
53.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG20
56.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG12
56.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG27
56.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG28
58.00	F	NT	FT	O	SG15
58.00	M	T	FT	W	SG29
60.00	M	T	FT	W	SG18
60.50	M	T	FT	W	SG8
61.00	M	T	FT	W	SG4
61.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG23
63.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG5
63.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG11
64.00	F	NT	PT	W	SG9
64.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG13
64.00	F	NT	FT	O	SG26
67.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG16
67.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG24
68.00	F	T	FT	W	SG25
71.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG6
71.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG7
75.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG3
79.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG10

Mean =59.70

Table 4.5

Enabling organizational Structure (ES)

ES	GEN	Tenure	Appt.	Race	Identification Number
24.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG19
38.50	F	T	FT	W	SG12
38.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG20
39.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG2
39.00	M	T	FT	W	SG3
40.00	F	NT	PT	W	SG9
40.00	M	NT	F	W	SG22
41.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG11
42.00	M	NT	PT	W	SG1
42.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG16
43.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG5
43.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG8
43.00	F	T	FT	W	SG25
44.00	F	NT	FT	O	SG15
44.00	M	T	FT	W	SG27
45.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG6
45.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG7
45.00	M	T	FT	W	SG17
46.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG21
48.00	F	T	FT	W	SG23
49.00	M	T	PT	W	SG4
50.00	M	T	FT	W	SG18
50.00	F	NT	FT	O	SG26
50.00	M	T	FT	W	SG29
51.00	F	NT	PT	W	SG10
51.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG14

52.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG13
59.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG24

Mean = 44.32

Table 4.6

Collegial Trust

Col Trust	Gen	TENURE	APPT	RACE	IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
19.00	M	T	FT	W	SG19
21.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG5
26.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG2
28.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG8
28.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG20
30.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG13
30.00	F	T	FT	W	SG12
31.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG28
31.00	M	NT	PT	W	SG9
32.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG10
32.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG18
32.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG22
32.00	M	T	FT	W	SG27
33.00	F	T	FT	W	SG17
33.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG23
33.00	M	T	FT	W	SG25
36.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG16
37.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG6
37.00	M	NT	FT	W	SG7
37.00	F	NT	FT	O	SG15
37.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG21
38.00	M	NT	PT	W	SG14

38.00	M	T	FT	W	SG29
39.00	F	T	FT	W	SG4
39.00	M	NT	PT	W	SG9
39.00	F	NT	FT	O	SG26
41.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG11
41.00	F	NT	FT	W	SG24

Mean =33.41

Interview Participants

To increase the likelihood of learning in greater detail just how and why relative levels of teacher self-efficacy emerged, the investigator selected 10 faculty members, 4 of whom had demonstrated high teaching self-efficacy (71, 71, 67, and 64), high enabling organizational structure (45, 45, 59, and 50), and high collegial trust (41, 39, 37, and 37) through the survey findings. Another four interview subjects were selected because they represented the other end of the spectrum. In other words, they demonstrated through their survey responses that they had relatively low teacher self-efficacy beliefs (52, 56, 58, and 45), and enabling structure (39, 38, 44, and 24). Another individual selected for interview had low teaching self-efficacy (58) and high on enabling organizational structure (50). A final subject was selected because the individual scored high on teaching self-efficacy (68) and low on enabling organizational structure (43). It was anticipated that these combinations of characteristics would produce insight into the relationships among the principal concepts that make up the focus of this study, especially the variety of conditions that produce or fail to produce beliefs of teaching self-efficacy.

Table 4.7

Faculty Interview Participants with High Efficacy and High Enabling Structure

Faculty	Yrs. of Tchg.	FacSE	ES	Gender
		High	High	
SG6	9	71.00	45.00	F
SG7	5	71.00	45.00	M
SG24	44	67.00	59.00	M
SG26	1	64.00	50.00	F
		Low	Low	
SG2		52.00	39.00	M
SG12		56.00	38.00	F
SG15	4	58.00	44.00	F
SG19		45.00	24.00	M
		Low	High	
SG29		58.00	50.00	M
		High	Low	
SG23		61.00	43.00	F

Table 4.8

Participants with High Efficacy and High Trust of Colleagues

Faculty	Yrs. of Tchg.	FacSE	TrustCol	Gender
		High	High	
SG6	9	71.00	37.00	F
SG7	5	71.00	37.00	M
SG24	44	67.00	41.00	M
SG26	1	64.00	39.00	F
		Low	Low	
SG2		52.00	26.00	M

SG12	56.00	30.00	F
SG19	45	19.00	M
	Low	High	
SG29	58.00	38.00	M
	High	Low	
SG23	61.00	33.00	F

Research Question 1

The Perception of Faculty Self-Efficacy and Organizational Structure

The first research question asked if faculty perceptions about organizational structure of the university would be related to faculty self-efficacy, and if there was a relationship, how is it manifested? The quantitative analysis provided earlier revealed a low to moderate relationship between an instructor's perception of the degree to which the university's rules and power structure and his or her beliefs about personal ability to succeed in the classroom, that is, teaching self-efficacy. If the perceptions of the university's structure enabled instructors to do their work, their teaching self-efficacy is expected to likewise increase. However, since there was not strong a relationship between the two variables, the investigator will then explore the reasons for the lack of the predicted relationship. Organizational structures contribute to the perceptions of those who function in them. Organizational structures vary to some degree according to institutional type. In private, church affiliated colleges like St Elsewhere, the organizational structure looks more tightly coupled. The governance model typically is bureaucratic and a limited shared governance.

For faculty at St Elsewhere to perceive the administrative structures to be enabling, some changes have to take place. Shared governance would renew the organizational life of the institution. As Gayle et al, (2003) state,

> The traditional concept of governance itself implies hierarchical decision making…Perhaps more effective university governance requires a redefinition and renewed sense of community. This renewal may begin with the concept of confidence building, over time, based on intensive, communication-rich interaction between permeable companies of coequals. Conflicting views can be discussed more productively within, rather than across, networks of collegiality, where it may be possible to fold multiple points of view together while connecting past realities to an increasingly consensual vision of the future (p.9).

The second part of the research question, namely, how and why perceptions of enabling structure foster beliefs about teacher efficacy, the first approach was to examine the interview responses of those who had both perceived the university structures as enabling and held high self-efficacy beliefs.

Self-Efficacy Results

The self-efficacy questions were asked to find out if a faculty members' responses related to Bandura's (1997) sources of self-efficacy, namely mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasions, and physiological and affective states. When identifying the sources of their teaching self-efficacy, faculty members enumerated examples of mastery experiences, social persuasions, or a combination of both of the sources (Morris and Usher, 2010). Two other sources, vicarious experiences and physiological and affective states were strong for a few although mentioned infrequently.

When asked, "How confident are you in teaching?" one of the high-enabling structure-high efficacy faculty members referred to his experience and passion for teaching and stated, "Oh, I love teaching. I have been teaching since 1998, so it's been 13 years now, this is a passion of mine. I just – I love the interaction in the classroom. I just – It fulfills me. Let's put it this way." (T7- p.2) He goes further to say: "I am still contacted by students who have graduated and gone to graduate schools and medical schools. They still contact me and ask me questions. This suggests they learned something from me" (T7 – p.13).

Another faculty member from the high self- efficacy and high structure group underscored his mastery experiences by referring to the achievements of his past students. When past students who are doing well in the examinations or later personal and professional achievements attribute their success to what this faculty taught them his confidence is reinforced. He states "I am confident and I feel that my confidence is bolstered by students from the past coming back and telling me what I taught helped them" (T24-p.143). Another attributed her sense of confidence or efficacy beliefs to her 25 years of teaching experience and a mixture of physiological and affective states. When she has issues of fatigue, exhaustion, or when issues of unmotivated and disengaged students arise, this faculty member believes her sense of efficacy that has grown over the years of teaching experience and feelings of capability help her to manage and teach classes effectively. With great enthusiasm, she had this to say:

> And I have to say this that if I feel fatigued, if I feel exhausted, if I feel overwhelmed; I am, of course, less effective as a teacher under those circumstances. If I have, unusual circumstances occur, if I have students who

> have lots of problems or who are not really qualified to do college-level work, of course, I feel overwhelmed. But I think that you come across those situations anywhere you teach. And I feel that I've had adequate experience to have strategies for dealing with problems. So I'd have to say I'm very qualified holding the position that I hold. I think I'm very qualified and I think I'm really experienced. (T6 – p.58-60)

A fourth faculty member of this group stated that the mastery of the subject, pedagogical skills and the wealth of experience she possesses show her capability. She was very passionate and stated, "I feel confident. I feel capable. I feel capable because I feel that I've got the background to teach these subjects" (T26 – 93).

The faculty members with high scores of self-efficacy and enabling structures were also asked about their vicarious experiences, whether they had role models or some expert to whom they looked in order to be effective and efficacious teachers. Many cited several mentors who influenced them at some point or another as they developed their teaching skills. One said:

> I had good mentors, a therapist who was an award-winning Midwestern teacher of the year. This teacher was also named one of the top teachers in the United States of America. She was the finest teacher.

There was another mentor to whom this same faculty attributed her teaching efficacy. It was an experience she had in her early years as a novice teacher. This one had a stroke and was unable to speak, but she had subtle ways of communicating and managing the class with gestures. Some others said they reach out to their fellow faculty members

when they were in need of help. When problems arose she would reach out to her own wealth of knowledge as a problem solution. She stated:

> First I look internally, introspective, then if I can't find a solution to this problem or challenge, then I reach out to my peers and to other staff members and also other colleagues that I've had in my studies, my graduate and undergraduate studies, friends, family --- (T26- p.86)

Touting vicarious experience, another faculty member stated that he would often bring some experts who teach in some related majors into his class to provide current trends in those areas. He said, "You know, a change in the face of the instructor usually attracts students more" (T7- p.9). He contends that those experts are more knowledgeable in their field than he would be.

Next, the investigator examined the self-efficacy beliefs of the four faculty members with low scores on faculty self-efficacy and structure. They also discussed the importance of their confidence in teaching, again referring to their education, training and experience as signs of their efficacy beliefs. One stated:

> Oh, I am very confident at that… I think my education in life, my training, my experience. You know, I have been teaching for thirty years so I think I'm pretty good at it in my field and read current literature and develop alternate teaching means. (T12, 20-21)

Another stressed on possessing mastery experiences and pedagogical skill and instructional competence and thus asserted, "I feel very confident. I feel I am competent. I am competent in concrete knowledge and confident in delivery of it." (T19, p.34)
He also said:

> And I do think I exhibit enough passion in the classroom that helps pull them in to create an interest in my field, in my area of study, and to understand the interconnections of all the different disciplines, why they need to be able to communicate orally, why they need to be able to communicate in a written format, why they need to be able to do basic math, why they need to be able to do statistics and apply it and understand it. (T19-p.45)

Two faculty members who teach at the college for the working Adults responded that their confidence and persistence were based on their desire for the success of the students and personal relationship with institution. Thus, one of them responded:

> I was an administrative of the College for Working Adults, so my persistence is based on, you know, I saw it from the beginning when it was nothing, when it was just a room and we were advising students to now having over 300 students at this location. So my persistence as a faculty member is more of I want success; I want the will to go out there to teach about whatever the students can take out and do something with when they finish the degree. (T15-p.102)

Another faculty echoes the same view:

> I've got a lot of experience. I've been doing this for almost 13 years now. I was a training and development consultant. I was a full-time faculty at a large state university before I was here. So I've been doing it a long time and you just develop a certain level of confidence in your ability to do the job after a while. (T2-p.124)

A faculty with high score in faculty self-efficacy and low score on enabling structure stated having a high confident level teaching students: "I think I do well at it, so I have a

high confidence level. (T23-p.170). Another faculty with a low faculty self-efficacy score and high enabling structure was cautious and not as exuberant as previous high scoring faculty members in expressing his confidence level. He stated it this way:

> Most days I'm fairly confident. You know, I wonder sometimes if I'm actually reaching anybody out there, but most of the time I'm fairly confident of what I do in the classroom. (T29-p.156)

All the interview participants were asked what makes them capable and persistent in the face of challenges. Some of the high scores group stated that students' evaluations, feedback from past students, strong mentors, and experience are among the reasons for their persistence. One put it this way:

> I guess my passion for teaching. I love the size of our classes. You know, I know my students by name and so our interaction makes for more lively classes. And so the beauty of teaching is no two years are the same because the students are different. So every year brings with it new challenges, and I enjoy these challenges because I learn from them as much as the students learn from me. So this is kind of…renews my energy every semester and every year to come back and teach. (T7-p.3)

Another faculty points to Bandura's (1997) social persuasion experiences as a bolster to his self-efficacy, echoing almost the same thing:

> I think the only thing that I would look at-- Well, there are two things. One, primarily, would be individuals coming back after 20-30 years and I've completely forgotten about them. I don't remember who they are. And they think I was one of the greatest teachers they ever had, you know, that what I taught

them was good. Secondly -- And I don't put much in it – the evaluations the students fill out. I look at them periodically. Most of the time I don't even bother to look at them when they hand them back from the administration. It's very uplifting to see what they write about you, how great you are, you know. (T24-147)

Another faculty with high faculty self-efficacy and enabling structure traced her persistence to being a good reader of the history of teaching, one who looks in the long run, and sets achievable goals incrementally. This faculty asserted:

> Oh, my goodness. I think it's the fact that I'm a good reader, and I've read a lot about the history of teaching. And I know that the challenges that we face right now are not large compared with challenges of the past. I think that if you look in the short run only, you know, the 21st Century or the 20th Century, look at what college teaching has been like, you know, how it's changed, how students have changed in terms of their readiness, how different the situation is, having less money than at a big school. All of those I take into account what the situation is that I have to deal with, but then I say, "What is my role? What am I trying to accomplish?" And I make goals that are workable. I try not to make goals that are out of reach. And I think that for that reason I feel that the way I approach teaching maybe is little different than however other people do it. I look at what students are coming with, what they want to do. In a smaller school, I'm actually able to change to teaching goals a little bit more to where they're in accord with what the students' goals are (T6-p.62-63).

The same question was asked, "What makes you persistent in the midst of challenges and name conditions you attribute to your sense of teaching efficacy?" Some of the faculty members in the low scores of self-efficacy and enabling structure, said feedback from motivated and engaged students and colleagues, the desire for students' success, experience in dealing with students over the years, and the ability to adapt to students' instructional changes contributed to their efficacy beliefs and persistence in the face of challenges. One faculty member stated:

> The response I get from good students. When I say "good students", motivated, engaged students. Not necessarily, the most talented but the motivated and engaged students, the response I get back from them would be my first and foremost. (T19-p.46)

Another faculty from the same group also responded, "I don't let things get down. It is what it is. I just keep going and giggling and you know, try a different route and change plans. You know, I'm adaptable. But, yea, I have great persistence" (T12- p.22).

All the participants were asked, "What are the challenges and concerns you have in teaching students?" Ninety percent of all faculty interviewees had a negative opinion of most students. All the high scorers on faculty self-efficacy and enabling structure pointed to students' lack of enthusiasm, lack of motivation, unpreparedness for classes, and lack of appropriating great opportunities faculty members provide for help and guidance. One put it this way: "I think I faced this ever since I started teaching -- was the lack of enthusiasm, I suppose by students, them wanting to get by with the least work that they can get by with." (T24). Another faculty stated how she was perplexed at students' lack of motivation, and how those with various needs would not take advantage

of visiting and seeking help from their teachers during the office hours. A faculty member recounts with a sense of utter bewilderment:

> Sometimes it is difficult to reach some students. I'm not sure about some of the levels of some of the incoming students… I try to give them every opportunity to learn. I make myself available. I let them know that I'm available. Sometimes I've extended my hours, my office hours so that they can come in to visit with me or receive help. But there are times I've received no response from some students even when I've become concerned with them and I know that they need some type of help. (T26-p.89)

The low scorers in the faculty self-efficacy and enabling structure had the same concerns voiced by the high scoring faculty. In their view, most students are not motivated, not engaged, and lack commitment to academic rigor. Here is how one of them stated it:

> We have an incredibly unmotivated student body here. Half, two – thirds of our student body is unmotivated, much more so here than the schools I have been at. Until they get their motivation right, there's not a lot I can do… They're here because – that significant number is here -- because they don't want to be anywhere else. They don't want to be challenged. (T19- p.43)

Another faculty from this group echoes the same sentiment:

> We've seen trends with students nowadays that they don't want to work. They don't want to step up to level of expectations of the university, and they feel like they are a customer that should be able to dictate how things are ran for them. Especially in this type of environment, they feel like they're a customer. And if we don't give them what they want, then they'll just quit and go down the road to

> the next fast-food chain. And that's been a bit of a challenge for all of here, and it seems to be getting worse each year. (T2-p.132)

This faculty also stated:

> Shortchanging themselves and going the easy route just to get a piece of paper isn't necessarily -- I had a student actually look me in the face and say, "I don't really care if I learn anything. I'm just here to get a piece of paper." And I said, "Well, this probably isn't the place for you, then." There are other schools in town that will take your money and give you a piece of paper, but that's not us," and he and his wife left the program. (T2-p.133)

One participant who scored high in efficacy and low in enabling structure noted too that some students are unreachable and lack connectedness by stating:

> I think at this time a huge challenge is reaching the students. I don't know if they're busier. I don't know if there are distractions. But there's not deep a sense of connectedness with the students. Fewer students come by my office to ask for assistance. There seems to be a little widening of the gap there, but I'm not sure why… So sometimes, it just doesn't happen no matter how much you try (T23 – p.177-178)

The Enabling Structure Responses

Organizational structures vary to some degree

Faculty members were asked questions regarding their perceptions of the administrative structure of the university. Participants were asked, "How supportive is the administration to your teaching in this university?" Most of them stated that they feel they were more supported now by the present administration (which includes the provost,

deans and presidents) than in the past administrations. Some still take issues with some decisions made by some members of the administrations in the past.

One of the high scores' group responded never felt unsupported while another maintains that the administration is as supportive as it can be, especially providing partial funding and reimbursements for attending conferences and presentations. Sometimes not a whole lot because the budget is tight. But then says that the administration is shifting towards collaboration and shared governance with the faculty. There is effort towards academic freedom and joint decision making. This interviewee stated it this way:

> And the university has been shifting more and more towards an environment of collaboration, if you will, between administration and faculty and staff. You see more and more trades of shared governance on campus. And so from that perspective, the perspective the administration is, you know, welcoming the input of faculty. And so if I see it from that angle, yes, there's support from the administration. (T7- p. 4-5)

The faculty is more and more becoming vocal, being present at board meetings and decision making processes and having a voice and allowing the freedom of speech as much as possible in a religious institution such as St. Elsewhere. This faculty member stated his concerns with university administration. The 2009 financial meltdown and the interim nature of the leadership are issues that need to be addressed. The issue of interim leadership was put this in way:

> And so our president is ad interim; our provost is ad interim; our executive vice-president for health reasons had to leave. And so, you know, the top leaders of the university haven't been around and aren't going to be around for a long time. And

so I think for an institution to be stable and following a strategic plan, it needs leadership that's going to be stable and willing to follow and stay a while for the strategic plan to be realized. (T7-p.18).

Another faculty made a final thought at the end of the interview about administration:

> They're very, you know, I think we have a very good academic dean. He doesn't want to be academic dean. I agree with him. I wouldn't either. The provost, she's very, very active and very gung-ho, you know. The president is good. I like the president, definitely. (T24 – p.155)

However, in an obvious departure from the very high perception of most members of this group, one faculty on the high self-efficacy and enabling structure responded that the administration supports them only slightly: there is little interrelationship. You were supported only if you take the position of the leaders, seldom recognized and appreciated. This is how the participant summarized this feeling:

> You know, it's just simply looking at it very carefully, trying to see it from their point of view… So I don't feel that I'm getting very much support, much support, per se. I think that we're liked and I think that people know us, and they support us as best they can. There's not a lot of money to spread around. But I do feel that we have a clear path if we try to take their point of view. So it's a "yes" and "no" question. (T6 - p.65)

This participant offered another reason for not feeling a whole lot supported which was the fact that in their department, the departmental chair was imposed upon them, meaning "that their filter is through this department chair." However, their department enjoys the support of the faculty and staff, and not the administration. When asked, "How does that

affect how you work?' the response was pointing at a cartoon in higher education magazine, which was narrated this way:

> It was kind of like an ogre. You know, smiling with his teeth showing. And the caption was "I like you. I'm going to eat you later." And, basically, the article was about the role of research in universities and just how challenging and competitive it is. And I got to thinking about it and I said, "Actually, I do kind of relate that even myself." I mean, if they don't know you at all. If they don't know your challenges at all, you can expect to be fire. You know, you can expect to be moved on. You know, you can expect that someone who has less experience, is less knowledgeable has no idea how to do this, is going to be working in your position in a year or two. (T6-p.66-67)

The faculty on the low scores of self-efficacy and structure responded that the administration is getting better in its support of the faculty. One of these faculty members echoes some of the concerned delineated by the high efficacy and enabling structure scorers which included little verbal support and respect for the faculty. Some of the immediate past members of the administration were weak, but nice and lack knowledge and competence. Some of them maintained a structure that was weak in academics, set low academic standards while most of the staff disrespected the academic faculty. However, there is a general feeling things, are getting better with the present administration. The present provost is regarded highly by all the ten participants to this interview. An example of this positive reputation regard for the provost can be traced to this statement by one of the participants: "But our provost, she is the first legitimate

academic administrator that the studied university has probably had since they became a four-year university." (T19- p.38)

> The real concern expressed again was the uncertainty, which surrounds the longevity of these administrators' stay with the university. One of our problems now is we have a couple of good administrators, but they're ad interim. They are not going to be here. You know, they were brought on an interim basis. That is somewhat fearful. That is a change. Will the people that will take their place be as? Or even close to as good? (T19-36)

One participant who scores high on efficacy and low in organization structure expressed an optimism that things are gradually changing as far as the administration is concerned. Faculty is currently involved in changes taking place. There is more discussion and freedom of expression. Some respect is being accorded the faculty, for example:

> Just little things like there aren't any parking places that say, "faculty." And you are like, well, you know, as faculty, don't we need to have an easier place to park so we can get to classes? And so there's not always a differentiation between the different roles that people play… It's getting better. There's even discussion now of having a faculty lounge as opposed to just the staff lounge…where faculty would have a chance to just get together and talk with each other. (T23-174)

The results of this interview question revealed there is a relationship between faculty self-efficacy and enabling structure for the faculty members who made high scores in self-efficacy and enabling structure, whereas for the low scorers, even though they asserted having high personal teaching efficacy, the issues of student's lack of

motivation, engagement and limited resources and administrative uncertainties weigh heavily on their general efficacy and administrative perceptions.

Research Question 2

The second research question was "Will faculty trust of colleagues be related to faculty teaching self-efficay? If there is a relationship found, how does it emerge?" Faculty participants were asked their if they trusted their colleagues. Interestingly, the same faculty that had scored high efficacy and enabling structure were among the group of high scorers in the faculty trust of colleagues. To the specific question, "What are the behaviors do you find among the faculty that make you feel that the faculty here are trustworthy?" Some of them said that they could talk to the faculty in honesty and know that what ever they discussed would be confidential. Another talks about the cordiality and sense of comraderie that exist among the faculty member and said,

> I have being in other institutions before coming here, and I 've seen the kind of attitude, antagonistic attitude that you know, faculty members have against each other. We don't experience it as muchhere, and that's what makes the relationship more positive and more trustworthy. (T2-p.3)

Another person in the high scores said the faculty deserve ninety percent trust because they are quite open, welcoming, and approachable. As a new faculty member, this participant says; "I feel that… I still have quite a few questions about processes, procedures, and so feel that I can go to these… my peers and ask the questions that I need." (T26- p. 86) Finally, another person of the high structure score said that the university faculty offer interrelationship among members of diverse social sciences and amazingly how they find common ground, and a place where there is a lot of concord.

Even when there is a bad time with anyone, it's usually pretty short-lived. The following obsevation was thus made about the faculty:

> I feel that at (this university) unlike many schools you have many opportunities to get to know your faculty members, people who are not in your area. And I think for that reason, I find this to be a far more attractive situation for teaching. (T6 – p.60)

A faculty with high trust of colleagues and low faculty efficacy score said that the university faculty members trust each other. There was this sense that inter faculty politics was not as strong as in other places.

Another faculty with low trust and high faculty self-efficacy has trust for most faculty and distrust for just a few others. For this participant, when you expect that people will give you honest opinion, and feel that something you tell them would stay with them, you trust them. However, there is blame for faculty mistrust on the administration and faculty members because of the absence of information and communication. The catalyst for curbing mistrust is for everyone to work on communication, to understand just how important that is between the administration, the faculty, the faculty/staff, the administration/student/faculty/staff, the whole circle. (T23-.p181)

Responding to this question of faculty trust of colleagues, some of the participants with low scores said that they trust the faculty for the most part for being amazing and able to keep confidential discussions. In fact, one puts it this way:

> I think that they have -- particularly in my area. And they're very good at keeping information confidential whether it has to do with me or a student or whatever. I

have rarely ever had a disappointment about that. So I think keeping information confidential. I think some of the behaviors are also that they feel free to express their own opinions and views even if they were from me. (T12 – p. 20)

A faculty with low score in trust of colleagues stated that he has a very limited trust of colleagues, alleging that too many of the faculty members are anything but competent and accountable. Most of them show resistance for change and give easy grades to unqualified students. When asked to explain the rationale for such a pungent critique of his colleagues, he said:

> Too many of the teachers are allowed to persist based on emotional support system not on a competency support system. In other words, well, they're a good person. She's a nice lady, Yadda, yadda, yadda. But they really aren't extremely competent nor are they held accountable for that competency. They're held accountable more on their personality or emotional factors than they are of the other. (T19- 35)

He contends that the faculty members are undermining academic standard and rigor expected of college students. This participant believes that the university is too heterogeneous; a mixture of high and many low ACTs. He thinks that many of the students were ineligible for the baccalaureate. They "can't read or "write" and are not engaged. And a situation where these are norm, there is no hope for them at the university. His mistrust for most faculty members and deans are based on what he called "cultivating a culture of retaining marginal kids," and hence opined:

> I do not buy into the validity of a lot of research that says we can do a lot with marginal kids. I don't believe it. I've taught too many marginal kids. Send them

to the bulkhead and let them go be a welder. They don't have to have -- Not everybody has to have a bachelor's degree. I mean, there are good legitimate career jobs. And it doesn't mean it's a moral issue because the world, society needs good welders. Society needs good honest auto mechanics. But that doesn't mean everybody can read Shakespeare and interpret Shakespeare. (T19-p44-45)

The result of these interviews showed that those faculty members who had high faculty self-efficacy and high trust of colleagues show a relationship between faculty self-efficacy and collegial trust. The self-efficacy of faculty is positively impacted when they are open, honest, reliable, benevolent and trusting the competence of each other; whereas self-efficacy is minimized when faculty members have limited trust of each other.

Research Question 3

The third research question was "What effects do institutional type; mission and organization; and appointment type have on faculty self- efficacy and trust in this educational setting? Some parts of this question like faculty roles were exclusively investigated through statistical research analysis. However, the effects of institutional type, mission and organization and appointment type were investigated through the prism of qualitative research.

Institutional Type

St. Elsewhere University is a private, Catholic, liberal arts university in the surburban, Midwestern United States. Participants were asked, "What does it mean to teach in a small catholic university like St. Elsewhere's?" A faculty with high score of the self-efficacy and enabling structure saw a spiritual connection with working at the university, " I became fascinated with it. It became a place of prayer for my family" (T6-

p.78) She trusts that this institution doesnot harbor corruption and the level of politics found in public institutions. It rather teaches one accountability. This was how she summarized it:

> I've seen some terrible corruption. -- In other schools. I saw it at the last school I taught. I've seen it at big schools. So even though this is not all easy, even though there's lots of politics here too, I haven't seen the same level of politics that I've seen other places. I haven't seen the same corruption. I haven't seen the same cynicism that I've seen other places. I think that our poverty has kept us honest. It's weird. And I treasure it because I think the alternative to that cynicism is to be doing something for no good reason at all. I'm happier. Every time I drive up that driveway, I'm filled with joy. It has never happened to me at any other job I've ever taught in. (T6-p. 79)

Another said, "I love it. I love it." (T7-15). The interaction with the faculty within a small university like (this one) is just fantastic. There is sense of community you get from a small liberal arts university such as this is not available at large institutions -- where one was like a "social security number." (T7-16) Others stated that it makes for more intercommunication between the faculty and the students, where there is one-to-one relationship as opposed to a larger university where one-to-one contact is lost. Another participant equally reiterated importance of having close contact with students by observing, "I have experience with larger universities, and I felt more of a belonging at a smaller university like (this one)." (T26- p96)

The low efficacy, enabling structure and faculty trust of colleagues equally opined that teaching at a small private university like (this one) meant a lot them. For example, one said:

> It means a lot. It means I'm able -- I'm making a difference to people's lives. I mean look at the mission of this university, you know, we're here to educate the whole person, not just, you know, give you the theory and you're gone. And I'm a product of that. I feel because I went to school here, at this University traditional campus. And, yes, I got the textbook knowledge. I got everything, but I also got skills that have helped me as a human being. And I hope that's something that I am bringing to those students as well and doing the same thing for them. (T-p.15)

Another felt it was "fabulous—we can talk about faith… pray, talk about the spiritual, connected to Benedictine spirituality that values liberal arts education." (T12-p.27). Teaching at this university affords each student and faculty to speak about God without inhibitions. This same sentiment was reiterated by one of the low scorers when he said, "I like small schools for personal connections with students, though we have to have rigor and standards." (T19-p.51) Most of the faculty members interviewed felt that small size classes afford them the opportunity to get to know students and fellow faculty members very well. He states, "But you really do get to know the students. And the more you get to know them, the better job you can do as an instructor individualizing for them. And that part is very important to me. I would hate to have to teach classes of 100, 250."(T19 – p.51) A participant with low efficacy and high trust of colleagues and enabling structure had always set his goal to teach in a catholic school where values and issues of spiritual development are allowed. As he put it, "I won't like anywhere else in

America since no values are attached to education." (T29- p168) Finally, one person thought it was more preferable to teach in an application focused business program at one of the studied university campuses, the College for Working Adults where there is no requirement for "those publish or perish environments. We teach here. We are not expected to publish on regular basis to keep our jobs." (T2- p.137) Another point he made was that he took the teaching at (this university) because it was available.

Mission

The next interview question was, "Does the mission of the university affect how you do your teaching job?" The mission of this university is a Roman Catholic University, offering through the master's degree level a liberal arts education that has been cherished and handed down in the educational institutions of the founder's Order. This university promotes education of the whole person in the context of a Christian community in which students are encouraged to develop a love of learning and to live lives of balance, generosity and integrity. As the state's only catholic university, it reaches out to Catholics and to members of other faiths who value the distinctive benefits that it offers.

Interview participants responded that they understood the mission of St Elsewhere's and incorporate it in their various disciplines. Both the high and low scores said they know and embrace the mission of the university. One participant said,

> Of course, everything you do on campus has to be tied to the mission of the institution regardless of what the major is; for example, in chemistry everything we do is green chemistry. We don't make any waste. We don't create any toxic

> byproducts and that's part of, you know the Benedictine tradition of the university and the Catholic teaching. Like not doing harm and, you know, hospitality, I guess to a certain extent. (T7-p.16)

One faculty member sees a connection between the missions of this university and her personal mission by saying,

> Well, the fact that our mission is the same. I believe I'm here to help people to learn, to be able to have value and help the world around them. And that's the role of the university. It makes it much easier. (T23-p.179)

Another faculty responded that as long as he had worked at this university he had always found a way to bring the mission of the university into his teaching. He said, "I know when I walk into the classroom I have a sense that I'm there to promote the mission of the institution. (T29- p.165) Two faculty members said that they know and agree with the mission, but even before the written mission, they have and will always fulfill the mission of total commitment to the education of the whole human being. For instance, when asked if the mission affected how they did their job, one said, "Well, yes, the mission does, you know. But if I think even if we didn't have the mission written down, I would still teach the same way." (T24-152) The other said,

> The Mission doesn't affect how I do my job. How I do my job effects the mission because what I believe in and the way I do my job is described in the mission. I mean it is -- It was just put into words what always happened. As long as I've been teaching no matter where I've been teaching, I have always done what is stated in the mission. So I want to say that the mission effects what I do. What I did is reflected in the mission. It is the other way around. (T12-p.29)

Pressed to explain more on this, this participant said, "the mission is my personality, it is how I live my life; it is how I teach my class…. The mission reflects what I have always done" (T12-29)

A faculty on the very low scores of the variables said that mission affects their job; it is the academic mission first and foremost. "And that comes back to an academic standard, creating a good academic standard which is implied right there in the mission, a strong implication for that." (T19-52).

Tenure

The participants were asked if tenure affected the way they performed their job of teaching. Fifty percent thought it was not necessary, while the other 50 stated that it was necessary for job security. Among those who said it was not, necessary said they would always be diligent with their teaching role whether tenured or not. However, one of them said, "Tenure is not necessary. It was a bunch of c-r-a-p, except if it would help to get rid of unqualified teachers." Another said,

> Absolutely not. I am a member of the monastery; I have no concern for job security because I belong to the community. I am a permanent member of the community, and there will always be something for me to do at this university, and so I won't worry about tenure, or I don't worry about those kinds of things. (T29- p.161)

When probed further to explain whether this feeling of job security made him not to care about how he did his teaching job, his response was:

I am not that kind of person… I'm always – Well, I'm a bit of a perfectionist, so I'm always--- whatever it is that I do, whatever job I have, I'm always trying to do it well and figure out ways to do it better. (T29-162)

Those who thought tenure was necessary argued that it would lead to their job security, professional development and a sign of recognition for good job performance. One faculty said:

> So let's say that a person who's tenured is listened to by mainly the staff a little bit more. A person who is tenured on a committee would-be listened to more than a person who's not tenured. So I feel that it does affect my relationships. (T6-80)

Another supporter of the tenure system, however, cautioned that tenure track may not be entered just for its sake. But as long as the university uses it to develop its faculty, that they are staying current and bringing unique experience for their students and for their professional growth, and not being lazy and unproductive, it is worthwhile.

Summary

In this chapter, a mixed-method data analyses was presented in order to answer the research questions:

> 1) Will organizational structure be related to faculty self-efficacy? And if there is a relationship found between faculty organizational structure and faculty self-efficacy, how does it emerge?
>
> 2) Will trust in colleagues be related to faculty self-efficacy? If there is a relationship found between trust in colleagues and faculty self-efficacy, how does it emerge?

3) What effects do institutional type; mission and organization; and faculty roles and appointment type have on efficacy and trust in this educational setting?

The instrument used to collect the quantitative data for faculty self-efficacy was Gibson and Dembo's (1984) scale that comprised of modified 15 items relating to the construct of self-efficacy. The statistical technique employed was Pearson Moment correlations. It was found that differences exist among the faculty self-efficacy, which was determined by a range a mean scores for teachers' self-efficacy of the university.

The faculty organization structure perceptions of the faculty were measured by a 12 items was used to gather the quantitative data information. The range of mean was determined. The correlation was a low to moderate relationship between an instructor's perception of the degree to which college's rules and power structure enabling teaching and his/her beliefs about personal ability to succeed in the classroom

The collegial trust was measured by a modified version of Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (199, 2003), the 8-item scale measure for faculty collegial trust was applied. There was a moderate correlation approaching statistical significance, which suggests that there, a moderate importance of collegial trust as an antecedent to instructor's beliefs about his/her ability to succeed in the classroom.

Finally, qualitative data were gathered through interviews. Faculty responses provided answers to other variables of interest in question 3. The interviews were transcribed and coded so as to identify patterns and similarities throughout the investigation.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter provides the discussion based on the findings of this study. The purpose of this mixed-method study was to explore the antecedents of faculty self-efficacy at a Catholic university in the Midwestern U. S. There were three major variables of interest in this study: teaching self-efficacy, enabling organizational structure and faculty trust of colleagues. The summary of the findings relating the problems, conclusions, implications, limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are discussed.

Overview of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of self-efficacy of college/university faculty, a subject not much examined in the higher education literature, but much studied with K-12 teacher populations. Chapter I addressed the research problem as manifested specifically in higher education. Many students entering college are said to have multiple issues militating against their academic success. Some of these are a lack of experience with academically rigorous instruction, low motivation, and a history of academic disengagement. These conditions seem consistent with rampant plagiarism, other forms of academic dishonesty, and low levels of college retention. There is a significant body of research focused on improving the quality of education and boosting the academic success of the students in both K – 12 and college students. Of concern in this report is the fact that research also suggests a link between teaching self-

efficacy and its antecedents like enabling organizational structure and collegial trust of faculty at the elementary and high school level (Adams, 2003, Adams and Forsyth, 2004: and McGuigan, 2005). However, much less attention has been paid to this relationship at the higher education level (Looney and Fives, 2009).

Chapter two of this study established the conceptual framework and the literature review for each of the constructs of teaching self-efficacy, enabling organizational structure and collegial trust. Following the exploration of the conceptual framework was the establishment of the research questions guiding the inquiry.

Chapter III explains the research methods used in this study. They were a mixture of quantitative and qualitative techniques used to determine the antecedents of faculty self-efficacy. The study was conducted in two phases. In the first phase, the construct of teaching self-efficacy was measured with the efficacy scale developed by Gibson and Dembo (1984). A trust scale used for this study was part of the Omnibus T- Scale of Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2000), which was modified to assess collegial trust.

In addition to quantitative survey methods, a second qualitative method, the interview, was also used. An interview protocol was constructed to enable the researcher to gain a better understanding of the emergence of efficacy views of faculty in an environment of administrative rules, procedures, policies and varying perceptions of inter-faculty trust.

Chapter IV reports the findings obtained from the study in two phases: quantitative (survey) and qualitative (interview). The analyses of participant responses were also analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative.

Summary of the Findings

The first research question was "Will organizational structure be related to faculty self-efficacy? And if a relationship is found, how does it emerge? This investigator was interested in exploring the nature of teaching self-efficacy of college instructors, a subject not much studied in higher education but much studied in the K-12 teacher populations. Research shows K-12 teachers as being greatly influenced by their perceptions of how organization (school) affects their work. By extrapolation, it was expected that the teaching self-efficacy of college teachers would too be affected by their views of the college's rules and authority structure. This research was designed as a first effort to bridge the gap in understanding of college faculty's efficacy formation. These findings add to the organizational literature on effective schools and colleges by providing additional insight to the consequences of faculty perceptions about organizational structure and their trust of colleagues.

In general, the survey research revealed that, contrary to what might have been expected, neither faculty perceptions of bureaucratic structure of the university, nor the levels of collegial trust among faculty, were powerful antecedents of teaching self-efficacy. The interview data, collected to better understand what the survey data might suggest, seem to reveal strong relationships between faculty perceptions of organizational structure and collegial trust and teaching self-efficacy.

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Organizational Structure

When Faculty self-efficacy scores were calculated and ranked, the figures revealed that the perceptions of the faculty members varied quite significantly. The investigator was able to identify outlying high to low scores. This goes to validate

Bandura's (1986) theory that "People who regard themselves as highly efficacious act, think, and feel differently from those who perceive themselves as inefficacious" (1986; p.395).

Equally, the research computations and ranking of scores showed that enabling organizational structure scores vary among the interview respondents. The ranking helped to identify the top and low scorers. Those with the highest scores on both enabling structure and faculty self-efficacy represent the classic group relationship found in the K-12 research. Namely, that teachers thrive in healthy environments considered to be free from hierarchical overbearing and coerciveness (Hoy and Sweetland, 2000, 2001; McGuigan, 2005). This group sees the bureaucracy of the institution as enabling rather than hindering the work they do. The rules, regulations and the control structures foster collegiality, collaboration, nurture a fertile ground for strong efficacy beliefs and ultimately become highly effective teachers.

Although the general relationship between perceptions of organizational structure and teaching self-efficacy is not reflected in a high correlation of these variables across the board, clearly there are a significant number of faculties in this population who both see the structure as enabling and also believe themselves to be efficacious teachers. Data justifies the classification of the high and low efficacy faculty members. Examination of the interview data would shed more light revealing that, in this college environment, the bureaucracy does not play as significant a role in the formation of faculty self-efficacy as it does in K-12 school environments. College faculties have often been regarded as practicing a great deal of academic freedom. This may, in part, explain the lesser

importance of bureaucracy in this relationship at the college level as compared to K-12 educational institutions.

Teaching Self-Efficacy and Collegial Trust

The collegial trust of the faculty was calculated and ranked in the same manner, as were the other variables. From the mean and range of the scores, it was possible to determine the variation of degrees of the perception of faculty member trust of colleagues and to identify extreme scorers. Previous research has delineated the relationship between collegial trust of faculty and their interdependence on each other. For example, in K-12, 5th grade teachers are dependent on 4th grade teachers for building the conceptual and skill base of students so they can move forward and learn the content prescribed for the 5th grade. So trusting colleagues, that is, seeing them as especially reliable, competent, honest, open, and benevolent, but especially reliable and competent, clearly is related to a teacher's beliefs that he or she can succeed in teaching students (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2000). Many studies have shown statistically significant relationships between teacher efficacy and trust (Adams, 2003; Adams and Forsyth 2004; Geist & Hoy, 2003; Hoffman et al., 1994; McGuigan, 2005; Hoy, Smith et al., 2002b; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, 2003; Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Here again, as above, the strong relationship found in K-12 educational organizations between collegial trust and teaching self-efficacy reveals itself to be similar, but much less intense. Conditions appear to make the instructional competence and success of other instructors less important for the formation of individual teaching self-efficacy.

The non-predictive effects of collective trust on teaching self-efficacy at collegiate level may be a result of loose coupling and the lack of connectedness among many college courses. Loose coupling refers to "a system in which the components have weak or indirect linkages, but the components remain responsive to each other" (Bess and Dee, 2007, p.223). Weick (1976) popularized the notion of organizations as loosely systems. His work was a reaction to the rationalism, regulation and hierarchical ideology of his time. Weick (1976) posited "that coupled events are responsive, that each event also preserves its own identity and some evidence of its physical or logical separateness" (p.3). All though all levels of education can be considered as loosely coupled one way or another, educational theorist agree that loose coupling is more prevalent at the higher educational realm (Bess & Dee, 2007; Ingersoll, 1991). It is probable that loose coupling did make faculty trust perceptions a less important predictor of teaching self-efficacy.

The third research question asked, "What effects do institutional type, mission and organization, and faculty roles and appointment type have on efficacy and trust in this educational setting?" Four quantitative variables that were explored related to this question and data collected by survey: (1) Ethnic/racial identity, (2) Gender, (3) Tenure and (4) Status of employment, whether full- or part-time. The ethnic/racial identity could not be analyzed quantitatively because only two respondents indicated their identity as non-White. The other three variables were explored through correlation analyses, and they were both weak and not statistically significant correlations among gender, tenure, employment status and any of the three principal variables of the study: collegial trust, enabling structure and faculty self-efficacy. The two highest correlations were as follows: female instructors were higher in teaching self-efficacy than were men ($r = .29$)

and, somewhat ironically, non-tenured instructors were higher in teaching self-efficacy than were tenured instructors (r = -.28).

What could be the explanation for female faculty scoring higher than male faculty in teaching self-efficacy? Several studies have, in fact, found that female teachers experience less job satisfaction than males because they experience more stress than do male teachers (Antoniou, Polychroni, & Vlachkis, 2006; Chaplain, 2008; Liu & Ramsey, 2008). Klassen et al. (2009) found similar relationships between self-efficacy and job satisfaction for teachers from five North American and Asian countries. "The results from their studies suggest that teachers' nationality and associated cultural beliefs can influence the relationships among job stress, job satisfaction, and teachers' efficacy" (Klassen & Chiu, 2009). However, other researchers seem to contradict this view (Landino &Owen, 1988; and Schoen and Winocur, 1988). Their results show that efficacy beliefs are related to gender differences, and that women had higher efficacy beliefs. They reasoned that female higher efficacy beliefs are rooted in the nurturing nature of females.

Bandura (1997) proposed that self-efficacy remains relatively stable once established, and although this stability may be true within a specific career stage, the results of this study suggest that non-tenured were higher in efficacy beliefs than the tenured faculty. This pattern is consistent with the work of Huberman, (1989). Klassen summarized Huberman as follows:

> Teachers undergo a process of survival and discovery in early career years, during which the gulf between professional ideals and daily classroom life is exposed and self-doubts and initial enthusiasm are entwined. About 4-6 years into their

> careers, teachers enter a period of stabilization, marked by a definitive commitment to the profession (or the choice to leave the profession." (Klassen et al. (2009, p.5)

Following this stage are the mid-career years (7-18) marked by periods of experimentation and activism or reassessment. Years 19-30, are a period of serenity, during which a "gradual loss in energy and enthusiasm is compensated for by a greater sense of confidence and self-acceptance" (Klassen, 2009, p.6). Then, finally the late career stage (years 31-40) is the age of disengagement, marked either by serenity or disappointment and bitterness. Of course, these stages are general trends and cannot be presumed to be true in an individual case.

Since a few studies have found a significant relationship between faculty efficacy beliefs and trust, one can draw an inference that when trust is diminished among faculty members, their efficacy perceptions dwindle also (Hoy & Tshannen-Moran, 1999). Smith and Shoho (2007) found a similar trend in their conceptual and empirical analysis of higher education trust, rank and race. According to their results, there was an inverse relationship between trust and rank; that is, the level of trust tends to diminish with ascending academic rank. They stated

> Certainly, in any employer-employee relationship, early subordinate trust is predicted on the initial rapport developed with the person who hires them. Obviously, there are a number of possibilities why trust appears to erode as faculty members ascend the academic ladder. (Smith & Shoho, 2007, p.133)

Another possible explanation hinges on the possible naiveté of the untenured faculty, who may discover later in their careers that their expectations and enthusiasm are

mere flukes and unrealistic expectations. Other studies mirror the foundation led by Huberman's work. Day and Gu (2007) found that most teachers in the middle years (i.e., years 8-23) increase in motivation and commitment, whereas increased proportions of teachers in the later stage of their career stage (24+ years of experience) report declining motivation (Klassen, 2009).

The investigator also examined the relationship between enabling structure and faculty trust of colleagues, the presumed, dual antecedents of teaching self-efficacy. There was a strong and statistically significant correlation between the two. Some researchers have found a positive significant relationship between teaching self-efficacy, enabling structure and collegial trust at elementary and high school levels. (Adams & Forsyth, 2004; McGuigan, 2006). However, in this study, neither enabling structure nor collegial trust was related to teaching self-efficacy. Some limited explanation for these non-convergent findings may be found in the interview data. The interview responses suggest that it is the teaching task itself (the unpreparedness and lack of motivation of students) that appears negatively to affect teacher self-efficacy more than anything else.

Conclusion

The quantitative data and analyses suggest that the contextual elements, even though they are so important to the formation of teacher self-efficacy in K-12 education organizations, are not as critical in the university environment. However, these elements could become more critical if faculty collegial trust and enabling structures are strengthened. It is quite possible that stronger levels of these variables could increase the faculty self-efficacy generally.

Faculty Interviews

The purpose of this study was to explore the antecedents of self-efficacy perceptions of higher education faculty members of St Elsewhere. The ranking of the survey scores enabled this investigator to determine the high and low outliers of the three principal variables. These participants were identified and interviewed regarding their perceptions of their faculty self-efficacy, enabling structure, and collegial trust. Other variables of interest were probed, such as institutional type, mission, appointment type, and tenure. The use of Yin's (2009) explanation building technique was to derive possible explanation that the survey data could not provide. Shaughnessy, (2004) and (Hoy, 2004) both reasoned that qualitative methods are appropriate for an exploration of factors that mediate efficacy developments and cultural influences in the construction of efficacy beliefs.

Self-efficacy perceptions from the interviews. All participants were asked about their confidence and persistence during challenging moments. The responses were very fascinating. There was little or no differentiation between the responses of the high and low efficacy faculty members. Participants reported that successful instructional experiences and positive evaluative feedback from students are the most powerful sources of their confidence and strong teaching self-efficacy feelings. Bandura (1986, 1993, &1997) said that mastery experiences are the most potent of all efficacy sources. Pajares (2006) delineates the importance of boosting efficacy through helping faculty members to acquire mastery experiences. Some of the participants stated that early coaching and training experiences had helped provided them with mastery experiences. This concurs with Bandura's (1986) proposition that the feelings of high expectations,

confidence and persistence, even in challenging situations, are indicative of highly efficacious people (Usher and Morris, 2010). Allinder (1995) observed that teachers with a high sense of efficacy confidently apply innovative teaching strategies and believe that differentiated classroom practices will help students succeed. This study used Gibson and Dembo's (1984) efficacy scale. They predicted that teachers with high efficacy traits have high expectations for their students, promote sustained learning skills and persistently reach out to struggling students through rigorous effort and support.

The majority of participants in this investigation stated that their confidence levels got bolstered when they were either mentored by proficient teaching models, or observed other highly efficacious and effective teachers. Some even recalled exemplary teachers they encountered while venturing into the profession. These were examples of vicarious experiences according to Bandura, (1986, 1993, and 1997). Only one faculty member mentioned that he never had a mentor. He thought everything he did came out of his own personal development in the teaching profession.

Many faculty members mentioned past social persuasion and confidence-building experiences resulting in the acquisition of pedagogical skill resulting from appraisals they received from classmates while in college. One said,

> I feel that I am capable of teaching because of my background in my education. Then throughout my life time…I was always approached by my classmates who asked me to help specifically in math and sciences and some other classes as well (T26-p 93).

Some faculty members talked about their physiological and affective states (Bandura's terms) experiences. Two faculty members said their weaknesses often make

them slough and leave classes early or even cut the amount of course work done in classes.

This investigation found that all participants, high and low self-efficacy faculty, were concerned about students' lack of motivation and academic rigor, disengagement, and unpreparedness for college work. There were some signs of surprise and resignation that students do not take opportunities such as office visits and mentoring and coaching opportunities offered to them. Some faculty thought students who appear unmotivated should not be in college. These comments suggest that both high and low efficacy scorers feel confident and sufficiently experienced to teach; however, at issue was the faculty's analysis of the teaching task. Analysis of teaching task was a dimension of Tschannen-Moran, et al's (1998) teaching efficacy. The efficacy beliefs of faculty could be attenuated if faculties believe that students who come to college are not ready to learn or are not motivated to learn.

Organizational structure from the interviews. When the participants were asked whether they were supported by the administration, the majority of the high and low enabling structure individuals expressed the view that they felt supported by the administration. This finding is consistent with the concept of enabling and hindering nature of educational organizations (Hoy and Sweetland, 2000, 2001). Enabling institutional structures use bureaucratic elements of formalization and control structures of the institution to engender collaborating commitment and problem-solving among stakeholders. Faculty members are inclined to trust other teachers when structures are perceived to be enabling.

Faculty members were asked about any administrative characteristics with which they had concerns; all expressed the lack of administrative stability. The university has, within a few years, replaced the dean, president and provost multiple times. There is always this fear of the unknown. Faculty expressed their feeling that the lack of administrative stability affects their job performance because they are constantly adjusting to the vision and priorities of the new leadership.

Collegial trust from the interviews. Faculty members were asked about faculty trust of colleagues. Nine out of the 10 interviewees stated that they trust their colleagues. The culture of openness, commitment, collaboration and reliability is necessary for establishing and maintaining a healthy and productive educational organizational environment. One faculty member did not trust colleagues. This faculty member thinks that most of the faculties do not maintain high academic standards. This individual accused other faculty members of playing to the emotions of administrators and students. This individual also expressed the belief that faculty are afraid of change and give out easy grades to win students' positive evaluations.

Tenure from the interviews. A tenure track policy has just started at this institution. Some of the interviewees are on tenure track lines. Two of the participants were tenured. For the whole institution, only nine out of thirty-three faculty were tenured. Seven tenured faculty participated in the interview. About 50 percent of the 10 faculty interviewed expressed a desire for tenure. The other half stated that tenure did not matter much to them.

Institutional mission from the interviews. The mission of the studied University, a Catholic university, states that it is concerned with the total development of

students, both body and soul. It has an explicit spiritual dimension to its mission. Some of the participants indicated that they were not of the Catholic faith, but voiced their support for the institution's mission. All interviewees stated that they agreed with the mission of the university. One faculty member vouched for his support of the institution mission "as long as the academic standards of the institution were not jeopardized."

Institutional role from the interviews. Faculty members were asked whether their appointment type affected their efficacy beliefs. All responded that their appointment did not affect their teaching efficacy beliefs.

Overview of Interview Data

After the faculty members identified as high and low on teaching self-efficacy, enabling structure, and collegial trust and all the other variables of interest were interviewed, it was clear that only few categories emerged. Surprisingly, all responses were shared between the high and low groups. For this reason, the results of this interview were inconclusive in some areas.

Implications

This study was designed to examine relationship between college faculty self-efficacy and potential antecedents, enabling organizational structure and collegial trust in an institution of higher education. Research has shown that K-12 teachers are influenced by the social relationships and context that surrounds them. There is ample evidence that the teaching efficacy of K-12 faculty is strengthened by collegial trust and enabling structure (Adams & Forsyth, 2004; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001; Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 1999; McGuigan, 2005; Petersen, 2008; Watts, 2009). While organizational structure and collegial trust predict teaching self-efficacy in K-12 education, no research

has attempted to explore these relationships at the college level. This study was therefore designed to begin the exploration of their salience at the college level. The correlational analysis did show low to moderate relationships among these variables. Interestingly, the interview data seemed to show that issues surrounding the teaching task as discussed by Tschannen-Moran (1998) such as frequent administrative changes, student lack of motivation, and student disengagement affect their perceptions and profoundly affect teaching self-efficacy among these university instructors.

The researcher makes the following recommendations for future research based on the preliminary findings presented and the experience of conducting this study:

1. Research has demonstrated that faculty teaching self-efficacy perceptions are affected by environmental contexts where administrative structures are enabling and collegial trust of colleagues are flourishing. Hence, universities should work to foster faculty cultures characterized by high teaching self-efficacy by consciously creating an enabling structure and promoting social interaction among faculty that results in the formation of collegial trust

2. University leaders and faculty should set high expectations for students and provide reasonable support for faculty who are struggling.

3. University leaders should work with faculty to identify struggling, disengaged and unmotivated students and find solutions to these negative conditions.

4. University leaders and faculty interested in educational success should understand the importance of trust as an essential ingredient for maintaining healthy and productive work in organizations.

5. University leaders and faculty should examine their collegial trust and self-efficacy profile periodically so that when problems of distrust and low self-efficacy beliefs arise, they can be addressed in a timely way.

6. Establishing problem-solving teams of university leaders and faculty to identify problems, develop action plans, and implement, and assess its usefulness (Smith and Shoho, 2007) might be useful.

7. University leaders might need to make available programs for professional development of the faculty who are unprepared to serve the students in their classes. Providing junior faculty with the kind of supports that would lead to the development of strong resilient efficacy beliefs could help to address these conditions (Tschannen-Moran, 2007).

Further Research

This study broadens the existing body of research on the contextual antecedents of teaching self-efficacy. Understanding the relationship between faculty teaching self-efficacy beliefs and its antecedents may be gaining traction at the higher education level. The researcher makes the following recommendations for future inquiry.

1. There may be unexamined intervening factors in the relationship between teaching self-efficacy and enabling organizational structure and collegial trust. These need to be explored.

2. This case study lacks generalizability because of the small and unique population studied. A larger sample of multiple institutions of various types should be done to verify the tentative findings revealed in this mixed-method study on a single, small college faculty.

3. As always, longitudinal exploration of these relationships would provide more credible evidence as to the possible causality of collegial trust, and enabling bureaucracy for teaching self-efficacy.

Conclusion

This study set out to examine the nature of the relationships between teaching self –efficacy, organizational structure, and collegial trust of college teachers, a set or relationships nearly unexplored in higher education. The results of the correlational analyses produced evidence of a weaker relationship among these variables in the higher education setting. However, the interview data seemed to suggest that organizational structure and collegial trust were of some importance for the teaching self-efficacy perceptions. Taken together, the survey and interview data provide some support for prior finding on teaching self-efficacy, collegial trust, and organizational structure at the K-12 levels, although clearly a weaker relationship.

REFERENCES

Adams, C.M., & Forsyth, P.B. (2006). Proximate sources of collective teacher efficacy *Journal of Education Administration, 44(6),* 625-642.

Adams, C.M., & Forsyth, P.B. (2007). Promoting a culture of parent collaboration and trust: An empirical study. *Journal of School Public Relations, v28,* 32-56.

Adler, P.S. (1999). Building better bureaucracies. *The Academy of Management Executive, 13,* 36-49.

Adler, P. S. (2003). Towards Collaborative Interdependence: A Century of Change in the Organization of Work. In Kaufman, B., Beaumont, R., Helfgott, R. (Ed.), *Balancing the Interests: The Evolution from Industrial Relations to Human Resources and Beyond* Armonk, NY: Sharp (pp. 353-399):

Adler, P.S. & Borys, (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 61-89.

Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *17*, 86-95.

Anderson, R., Greene, M., & Loewen, P. (1988). Relationships among teachers and students' thinking skills, sense of efficacy, and student achievement. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 34(2)*, 148-165.

Antoniou, A. -S., Polychroni, F., & Vlachakis, A. -N. (2006). Gender and age differences

in occupational stress and professional burnout between primary and high-school teachers in Greece. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *21*, 682–690.

Armor, D., Conroy-Oseguera, P., is Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A., Pauly, E., Zellman, G, (1976). *Analysis of the school preferred reading programs in selected Los Angeles minority schools*. (REPORT NO. R-2007-LAUSD). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.130 243).

Arches, J. (1991). Social structure, burnout, and job satisfaction. *Social Work, 36(3),* 202-206.

Ashton, P. (1984) Teacher efficacy: A motivational paradigm for effective teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 35(5)*, 28-32.

Ashton, P., & Webb, R.B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement.* New York, NY: Longman.

Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.

Baier, A. (1994). *Moral Prejudices.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

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*. New York, NY: W.H.Freeman and Company.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 611-623.

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

Barfield, V., & Burlingame, M. (1974). The pupil control ideology of teachers in selected schools. *Journal of Experimental Education 42,* 6-11.

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectatio*n. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bennis, W. G. (1966). *Changing Organizations.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Berman, P., McLaughlin, M. G., Pauly, E. & Zellman, G. (1977). Federal programs supporting education change: Vol.7. Factors affecting implementation and continuation. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation (ERIC Documents Reproduction Service. No 140 432).

Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2008).*Understanding College and University Organization: Theories for Effective Policy and Practice: Volume I &II Dynamics of the System.* Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Blake, T. R., & Rust, O. (2002). Self-esteem and self-efficacy of college students with disabilities. *College Student Journal.* Retrieved at: FindArticles.com. 08 Jul, 2011. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCR/is_2_36/ai_89809972

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and methods*, Boston, MA: Pearson Education Group.

Bonjean, C., & Grimes, M. (1970). Bureaucracy and alienation: A dimensional approach. *Social Forces, 48,* 365-373.

Bradach, J. L. & Eccles, R. G. (1989). Price, authority and trust: From ideal types to plural forms. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *15*, 97-118.

Bromily, P., & Cummings, L. L. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brousseau, B. A., Book, C., & Byers, J.L. (1988). Teacher beliefs and the cultures of Teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36(6),* 33-39.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). *Trust in school: A core resource for improvement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Butler, J. K., & Cantrell, R. S. (1984). A behavioral decision theory approach to modeling dyadic trust in superiors and subordinates, *Psychological Reports, 55,* 19-28.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80, 468-278.*

Chacon, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela, *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21,* 257–272.

Chaplain, R. P. (2008). Stress and psychological distress among trainee secondary teachers in England. *Educational Psychology*, *28*, 195–209.

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

Coleman, J. (1990). *Foundations of social theory.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Cook, J. & Porras, J. I. (2002). Built up to last: Successful habits of visionary companies:

New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53,* 39-52.

Covey, S.R.(1990). *The seven habits of highly effective people: Restoring the character ethic.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cummings, L. L. & Bromily, P. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI): Development and validation, in Kramer, R. and Tyler, T. (Eds.), Trust in Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cusumano, M. A. (1991). *Japan's Factories*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2007). Variations in the conditions for teachers' professional learning and development: Sustaining commitment and effectiveness over a career. *Oxford Review of Education*, *33*, 423–443.

Deming, W. (1986). *Out of the crisis.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study.

Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *Journal of conflict resolution, 2,* 265-279.

Dirks, K. T. (1999). The effects of interpersonal trust on work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84(3),* 445-455.

Fives, H. & Looney, L. (2009). Collective instructors' sense of teaching and

collective efficacy. International *journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher education, 20(2),* 182-191.

Forsyth, P. B., Barnes, L. L., & Adams, C. M. (2006). Trust-effectiveness patterns in schools. *Journal of Educational Administrations. 44,* 122-141.

Friedman, T. (2005). *The world is flat: a brief history of the twenty-first century.* New York, NY: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). Trust: The social virtues & the creation of prosperity. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Gambarro, J. J. (1978). The development of trust, influence, and expectations. In A. G. Athos & J. J. Gambarro (Eds.), *Interpersonal Behavior: Communication and Understanding in Relationships* (pp. 299-303). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust? In D. Gambetta (Eds.), *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, (pp. 213-238*)*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Geist, J. R. & Hoy, W. K. (2003). Cultivating a culture of trust: Enabling school structure, teacher professionalism, and academic press. Unpublished manuscript, The Ohio State University.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2000). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference 9.0 update*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gibson, S. & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76(4), 569*-582.

Goddard, R. D. (1998). *Effects of collective efficacy on student achievement in urban public elementary schools*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Ohio State

University, Columbus, OH.

Goddard, R.D. (2002). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the measurement of collective efficacy: The development of a short form. *Educational And Psychological Measurement*

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W.K., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Education Research Journal, 37(2),* 479-507.

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions *Educational Researcher*, 33(3), 3-13.

Goddard, R. D.,Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W.K. (2001). Teacher trust in students and parents: A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of trust in urban elementary schools. *Elementary School Journal, 102(1),* 3- 17.

Goddard, R.D., LoGerfo, L. & Hoy, W.K. (2004). High school accountability: The role of perceived collective efficacy. *Educational Policy, 10,* 403-425.

Gordon, L. M. (2001). High teacher efficacy as a marker of teacher effectiveness in the domain of classroom management. A paper presented at the California Council on Teacher Education, San Diego, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 465 731).

Gouldner, A. (1954). *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy.* Free Press: New York, NY.

Guskey, T. R. (1987). Context variables that affect measures of teacher efficacy. *Journal of Educational Research*, *81(1)*, 41-47.

Guskey, T. (1982). The effects of change in instructional effectiveness of the relationship

of expectations and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, *75*, 345-349.

Guskey, T. R. (1981). Measurement of responsibility teachers assume for academic successes and failures in the classroom. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *32*, 44-51.

Gusky, T.R., & Passaro, P. (1993). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions. *American Educational Research Journal, 31(3),* 627-643.

Haines, V.J., Diekhoff, G.M., LaBeff, E.E., & Clark, R.E. (1986). College cheating, immaturity, lack of commitment, and the neutralizing attitude. *Research in High Education, 25,* 342-354.

Hall, R. H. (1999). *Organizations: Structures, processes, and outcomes.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Henderson, J. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1983). Leader authenticity: The development and test of an operational measure. *Educational and Psychological Research*, 2, 123-130.

Heppner, M. J. (1992). An empirical investigation of the effects of a teaching practicum on prospective faculty. *Journal of Counseling of Development, 72,* 500-508.

Hirschhorn, L. (1997). *Reworking authority: Leading and following in a post-modern organization.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Bassler, O. B., & Brissie, J. (1987). Parent involvement: contributions of teacher efficacy, school socioeconomic status, and other school characteristics. *American Educational Research Journal*, *24*, 417-435.

Hoy, W. K. (2003). *Academic optimism and flow*. [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from www.coe.ohiostate.edu/whoy/Acad%20Opt.ppt

Hoy, W., Blazovsky, R., & Newland, W. (1983). Bureaucracy and alienation: A

comparative analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration, 21*, 109-121.

Hoy, W. K., Gage, C. Q., & Tarter, C. J. (2006). School mindfulness and faculty trust: necessary conditions for each other? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(2), 236-255.

Hoy, W.K., Kuppersmith, W. (1985). The meaning and measure of faculty trust. *The Educational and Psychological Research, 5,*1-5.

Hoy, W. K., Sabo, D., & Barnes, K. (1996). Organizational health and faculty trust: A review from the middle level. *Research in Middle Level Quarterly, Spring,* 21- 39.

Hoy, W.K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2000). "School bureaucracies that work: Enabling, not coercive." *Journal of school Leadership, 10,* 525-541.

Hoy, W.K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). "Designing better schools: The Meaning and Measure of Enabling School Structures." *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37(3,)* 296-321.

Hoy, W.K., Tarter, C.J., & Wiskowskie, L. (1992). Faculty trust in colleagues: Linking the principal with school effectiveness. *Journal of Research and Development in Education. 26*(1), 38-45.

Hoy, W, K., & Tschannen-Moran (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of school Leadership, 9,184-208.*

Hoy, W. K. & Woolfolk, A. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *The Elementary School Journal, 93(4),* 355-372.

Huberman, M. (1989). The professional life cycle of teachers. *Teachers College*

Record, *91*, 31–57.

Ingersoll, R. (1991). *Loosely Coupled Organizations Revisited*. Portions of paper * presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (83rd, August 1988) and the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association: Chicago, IL, 53.

Jackson, S. W., & Schuler, R. S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 36,* 66-78.

Jelinek, M., & Schoonhoven, C. B. (1993). *The innovation marathon*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, S. M., & Landman, J. (2000). Sometimes bureaucracy has its charms: The working conditions of teachers in deregulated schools. Teachers College Record, 102(1), 85-125.

Johnson, R.B., & Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Research. 33(7),* 14-26.

Johnson-George, C. E. & Swap, W. C. (1982). Measurement of specific interpersonal trust: construction and validation of a scale to assess trust in a specific other. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43,* 1306-1317.

Kakabase, A. (1986). Organizational alienation and job climate. *Small Group behavior, 17,* 458-47.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity.* Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing.

Kee, H. W., Knox, R. E. (1970). Conceptual and methodological considerations in study

of trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 14,* 357-365.

Klassen, R. M., Bong, M., Usher, E.L., & Chong, W.H., Huan, V.S., & Wong et al, (2009). Exploring the validity of a teacher's self-efficacy scale in five countries, *Contemporary Educational Psychology 34,* 67-76.

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu., M. M. (2009). Effects of teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102(3),* 741-756.

Knoblauch, D., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2008). Maybe I can teach those kids: The influence of contextual factors on student teachers' efficacy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24,* 166-179.

Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Reviews: Psychology*, *50*, 569-598.

Kramer, R. M., Brewer, M. B., & Hanna, B. A. (1996). Collective trust and collective action: The decision to trust as a social decision. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), Trust in Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kramer, R. M. & Cook, K. S. (Eds.). (2004). *Trust and distrust in organizations: Dilemmas and approaches*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Landino, R. A ., & Owens, S. V. (1988). Self-efficacy in university faculty. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35,* 1-14.

Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. Kramer, & Tyler (Eds), Trust in Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Liu, X. S., & Ramsey, J. (2008). Teachers' job satisfaction: Analyses of the teacher

follow-up survey in the United States for 2000–2001. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*, 1173–1184.

Loup, K. J., Clarke, J., Ellett, C.D., & Rugutt, J. (1997). Exploring dimensions of personal and organizational efficacy motivation: A study of teachers, social workers and university faculty. (ERIC DOCUMENT, ED 411 205).

Marsden, P., Cook, C. R., & Knoke, D. (1994). Measuring organizational structures and environments. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *37*, 891-910.

Maslach, C., & Pines, A. (1978). The burn-out syndrome in the day-care. *Child Care Quarterly*, *6*, 100-113.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. *The Academy of Management Review* Vol. 20, No. 3 (Jul., 1995), pp. 709-734.

McAllister, E. A. (1996). Learning together: Collaboration for active learning in elementary language arts. ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication and EDINFO Press (Bloomington, Ind.)

McGuigan, L. (2005). *The role of Enabling Bureaucracy and Academic Optimism In Academic Achievement Growth*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Meijer, D., & Foster, S. (1988). The effect of teacher self-efficacy on referral chance. *Journal of Special Education, 22(3),* 378-385.

Michaels, R. E., William, L.C., Alan, J. D., & Erich, A.J. (1988). Influence of formalization on the organizational commitment and work alienation of sales people and industrial buyers. *Journal of Marketing Research, 25*, 376-383.

Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self and task-related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to junior high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81(2),* 247-258.

Mintzburg, H. (1979).*The structure of organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mishra, A. K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Moore, W., & Esselman, M. (1992). Teacher efficacy, empowerment, and a focused instructional climate: Does student achievement benefit? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Morris, D. B., & Usher, E. L. (2011). Developing teaching self-efficacy in research institutions: A study of award-winning professors. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36, 232-245.

National Center for Education Statistics (2006). The condition of education: 2006 in brief. Jessup, MD: ED Pubs.

Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62,* 307-332

Pajares, F. (1994). Role of self-efficacy and self-concept beliefs in mathematical problem solving: A path analysis. *Journal of Educational psychology, 86,* 193-203.

Pajares, F. (1997). Current directions in self- efficacy research. In M. L. Maehr & P.R. Pintrich (Eds), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (pp. 1-49). Greenwich,

CT: JAI Press.

Pajares, F. (2002a). Gender and perceived self-efficacy in self-regulated learning. *Theory into Practice*, *41(2),* 116-125.

Pajares, F. (2006). Self-efficacy during childhood and adolescence: Implications for teachers and parents. In: F. Pajares and T. Urdan, Editors, *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*, Information Age Publishing, Greenwich, CT (2006), pp. 117–137.

Palmer, D. (2006). Durability of changes in self-efficacy of preservice primary teachers, *International Journal of Science Education* 28 (2006), pp. 655–671.

Patton, M. (1990) *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Petersen, K. S. (2009). *Collective efficacy and faculty trust: A study of social process in School.* (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Texas at San Antonio, (UMI: 3303911).

Pino, H.W. & Smith, W.C. (2003). College Students and academic dishonesty. *College Student Journal.*

Poulou, M. (2007). Personal teaching efficacy and its sources: Structure teachers' perceptions, *Educational Psychology, 27*, 191-218.

Prieto, L. R. & Altmaier, E. M. (1994). The relationship of prior training and previous teaching experience to self-efficacy among graduate teaching. *Research in Higher Education, 35*, 481-497.

Prieto, L. (2006). Teaching Self- Efficacy Scale (CTSES). Retrieved from http://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/CTSES-Prieto2006.pdf

Prieto, L.R., & Meyers, S.A. (1999). Effects of Training and Supervision on the Self-

Efficacy of Psychology Graduate Teaching Assistants. *Teaching of Psychology. 26(4).*

Raudenbush, S. W., Rowan, B., & Cheong, Y. F. (1992). Contextual effects on the self-perceived efficacy of high school teachers. *Sociology of Education*, *65*, 150-167.

Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M. D. (1985). Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*, 95-112.

Riggs, I., & Enoch's, L. (1990). Toward the development of an elementary teacher's science teaching efficacy belief instrument. *Science Education*, *74*, 625-638.

Ripley, A. (2010). A call for action for public schools, *Time, 17,(12),* 32-42.

Rose, J. S. & Medway, F. J. (1981a). Measurement of teachers' beliefs in their control over student outcome. *Journal of Educational Research, 74*, 185-189.

Rose, J. S. & Medway, F. J. (1981b). Teacher locus of control, teacher behavior, and student behavior as determinants of student achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *74,* 375-381.

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

Ross, J. A. (1994). Beliefs that make a difference: The origins and impacts of teacher efficacy. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies.

Ross, J. A. (2004). Effects of running records assessment on early literacy achievement. *The Journal of Education Research, 97 (4),* 186-194.

Ross, J. A., Hogaboam-Gray, A., & Hannay, L. (2001). Effects of teacher efficacy on computer skills and computer cognitions of K-3 students. *Elementary School Journal, 102*(2), 141-156.

Ross, J. A., & Cousins, J. B. (1993). Enhancing secondary school students' acquisition of correlational reasoning skills. *Research in Science & Technological Education, 11(3)*, 191-206.

Ross, J. A. (1998). The antecedents and consequences of teacher efficacy. In J. Brophy (Ed.) *Advances in Research on Teaching. Vol. 7* (pp. 49-74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Rousseau, D. (1978). Characteristics of departments, positions and individuals: contexts for attitudes and behavior, *Administrative Science Quarterly 23,* 531-540.

Rotter, J. B. (1954). Social learning and clinical psychology. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.

Rotter, J. B. (1967). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs, 80,* 1-28.

Rotter, J. B. (1975). Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *43*, 56-67.

Rushton, S. P. (2003). Tow Preservice teachers' growth in self-efficacy while teaching in an inner-city school. Urban Reviews, 35(3), 167-189.

Schoen, L. G., & Winocur, S. (1988). An investigation of the self-efficacy of male and female academics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32,* 307-320.

Schonberger, R. I. (1986). *World Class Manufacturing*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Savange, W. C., & Robinson, R. S. (2001). Qualitative Research Issues and methods: An introduction for educational technologists. *Handbook of Research Educational Communications and Technology*, *40*, 1171-1195.

Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, (1996). Organizational trust: Philosophical perspectives and conceptual definition*., Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 24-59.

Shaughnessy, M. (2004). An interview with Anita Woolfolk: The educational psychology of teacher efficacy. *Educational Psychology Review, 16*(2), 153-176.

Short, P. (1994a). Defining teacher empowerment. *Education, 114*(4), 488-493.

Sinden, J. E., Hoy, W.K., & Sweetland, S.R. (2004). An analysis of enabling school structure: theoretical, empirical, and research considerations. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42(4),* 462-478.

Siwatu, K. O. (2011). Preservice teachers' sense of preparedness and self-efficacy to teach in America's urban and suburban schools: Does context matter? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 257-365.

Shoho, A. R., & Smith, P. A. (2004). An exploratory analysis of faculty trust in higher education. In W.K. Hoy, & C. G. Miskel (Series Eds.), Educational*, policy, and reform: Research and measurement* (pp. 279-303). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *99*, 611–625.

Smith, P. A., & Birney, L. L. (2005). The organizational trust of elementary schools and dimensions of student bullying. *International Journal of Educational Management, 19,* 469 -485.

Smith, P. A., Hoy, W.K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Organizational health of high schools and dimensions of faculty trust. *Journal of Leadership, 12,* 135-150.

Smith, P. A., & Shoho, A. R. (2007). Higher education trust, rank and race: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Innovative Higher Education*, *32(3),* 125-138.

Solomon, R. C., & Flores, F. (2001). *Building trust in business, politics, relationships, and life.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Soodak, L. & Podell, D. (1996). Efficacy and experience: Perceptions of efficacy and among preservice and practicing teachers. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 30,* 214-221.

Stevens, F., Diedricks, J., & Philipsen, H. (1992). Physician satisfaction, professional characteristics, and behavior formalization in hospitals. *Social Science and Medicine, 35(3)*, 295-303).

Tarter, C. J. (1989). School characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 25(3),* 294-308.

Tarter, C. J., Bliss, J. R., & Hoy, W.K. (1989). School Characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 25,* 294-308.

Tarter, C. J., Sabo, D., & Hoy, W. K. (1995). Middle school climate, faculty trust, And effectiveness: a path analysis. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 29(1),* 41-49.

The Center for Educational Reform (1998). Education manifesto: A nation still at

risk. Retrieved from http://www.edreform.com/index.cfm?fuseActions=document&documentID

Thompson, V. A. (1965). Bureaucracy and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *10*, 1-20.

Tracs, S. & Gibson, S. (1986). Effects of efficacy on academic achievement. Paper presented at the California Research Association annual meeting, Marina del Rey, CA.

Trentham, L., Silvern, S., & Brogdon, R. (1985). Teacher efficacy and teacher competency ratings. *Psychology in Schools*, *22,* 343-352.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration, 39(4*), 308-331.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration, 36*, 334-352.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A. & Hoy, W.K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 36,* 334-352.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *17*, 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). Fostering organizational citizenship: Transformational leadership and trust. In W.K. Hoy & C.G. Miskel, *Studies in Leading and Organizing Schools* (pp. 157-179). Information Age Publishing: Greenwich: CT.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism: The role of Professional orientation and trust, *Educational Administrational Quarterly, 45,* 217-247.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23(6),* 944-956.

Tucker, C. M., Porter, T., Reinke, W. M., Herman, K. C., Ivery, P. D., Mack, C. E. et al. (2005). Promoting teacher efficacy for working with culturally diverse students. *Preventing School Failure*, *50(1),* 29-34.

Ward, K.A. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. ASHE- * ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29. No. 5. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Warren, M. (1999). *Democracy and trust*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Watts, D. M. (2009). *Enabling school structure, mindfulness, and teacher empowerment: Test of a theory*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL.

Weaver, S. (2008*). Sources of efficacy for first-year teachers*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: 3289293).

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Williamson, O. E. (1993). Calculativeness, trust and economic organization. *Journal of Law and Economics*, *30*, 131-145

Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2004). Self- efficacy in college teaching: Essays on teacher excellence. *Toward the Best in Academy, 15(7),* 8-11.

Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2008). What motivates teachers? Important work on a complex question. *Learning and Instruction, 18*, 492-498.

Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Burke Spero, R. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 343–356.

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

Yin, R. K., (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Young, K. J. & Kline, T. J. B. (1996). Perceived self-efficacy, outcome-efficacy and feedback: Their effects on professors' teaching development motivation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 28*, 43-51.

Zielenziger, D. (2003). US Companies Moving More Jobs Overseas. Retrieved from http://www.commondreams.org/cgi-bin/print.cgi?file=/headlines03/1224-07. htm.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date:	Wednesday, January 12, 2011
IRB Application No	ED10152
Proposal Title:	The Effects of Organizational Structure and Collegial Trust on College Faculty Teaching Efficacy in a Catholic University
Reviewed and Processed as:	Expedited

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 1/11/2012

Principal Investigator(s):

Desmond Okpogba
1017 E. Redwood Ave.
Sallisaw, OK 74955

Edward Harris
308 Willard
Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

☒ The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 219 Cordell North (phone: 405-744-5700, beth.mcternan@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,

Shelia H. Kennison

Shelia Kennison, Chair
Institutional Review Board

Appendix B

Demographic Information

1. What is your gender?	( ) Male	( ) Female
2. What is your racial identity?	( ) African-American	( ) White, ( ) Other Non-Hispanic
3. Tenure ( )	Non-Tenured ( )	
4. Full-Time Faculty ( )	Part-Time Faculty ( )	

Appendix C

College Faculty Self-Efficacy Inventory

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	
1. When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exert a little extra effort.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their outside environment.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The amount a student can learn is primarily related to family background.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I have enough training to deal with almost any learning problem	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. When a student gets a better grade than he/she usually gets, it is because I found better ways of teaching the student.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. When I try, I can get through to most difficult students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Faculty are not a very powerful influence on student achievement when all factors are considered.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. When the grades of my students improve, it is usually because I found more effective teaching or coaching approaches.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. If a student masters a new concept quickly, this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching that concept.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. The influence of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Even faculty members with good teaching abilities may not reach many students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. When it comes right down to it, a faculty really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his/her outside environment.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. My experience has given me the necessary skills to be an effective faculty member.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix D

Collegial Trust Scale

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Faculty in this university trust each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Faculty in this university typically look out for each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Faculty in this university are suspicious of each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Even in difficult situations, faculty in this university can depend on each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Faculty in this university have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Faculty in this university are open with each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. When faculty in this university tell you something, you can believe it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Faculty in this university do their jobs well.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix E

Organizational Structure

	Never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Always
1. Administrative rules in this university enable authentic communication between faculty and administrators.	1	2	3	4	5
2. In this university, red tape is a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The administrative hierarchy of this university enables faculty to do their jobs.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The administrative hierarchy obstructs student achievement.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Administrative rules help rather than hinder faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The administrative hierarchy of this university facilitates the mission of this university.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The administrative rules in this university are used to punish faculty	1	2	3	4	5
8. The administrative hierarchy of this university obstructs innovation.	i	2	3	4	5
9. Administrative rules in this university are substitutes for professional judgment.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Administrative rules in this university are guides to solutions rather than rigid.	1	2	3	4	5
11. In this university the authority of the president is used to undermine faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The administrators in this university use their authority to enable faculty to do their jobs.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F

Letter/Email to be sent to faculty requesting interview:

Dear Faculty Member,

Thank you for your earlier participation in my research study, "The Effects of Organizational Structure and Collegial Trust on College Faculty Teaching Efficacy in a Catholic University". I am contacting you now to invite you participate in a follow-up interview to further explore the structural and trust related antecedents of college faculty efficacy at (your university).

If you agree to participate, you will be interviewed in a one on one setting for up to a 60-minute period. This interview will tap into your experiences as a faculty member and your perceptions teaching efficacy and university environments. You will be asked questions regarding your classroom experiences how you have adapted to teaching in university setting. I will moderate the session, and the interview will be audio recorded. After the study is complete, the audio will be deleted. Your institution has approved my research project and will receive only the results of aggregated data analysis.

If you are interested in participating in the interviews please contact me at desmondchid@aol.com to arrange a convenient time for the interview.

Thank you in advance for your time and willingness to share your experiences at (your university) as a faculty member. Your help is invaluable for this study.

Sincerely,

Reverend Desmond Okpogba
desmondchid@aol.com
Graduate, school of Educational Leadership
Oklahoma State University

Appendix G

CONSENT FORM FOR INTERVIEW

Project Title: The Effects of Organizational Structure and Collegial Trust on College Faculty Teaching Efficacy in a Catholic University

Investigators: Rev Desmond Okpogba, B. Phil, BD, MS
Oklahoma State University

Purpose:
You have been invited to participate in the second phase of the research study titled "The Effects of Organizational Structure and Collegial Trust on College Faculty Teaching Efficacy in a Catholic university. This research is being conducted as part of my dissertation to explore the structural and trust related antecedents of college faculty efficacy at (the university studied).

Procedures:
If you agree to participate in this portion of the research study, you will be interviewed in a one on one setting for up to a 60-minute period. This interview will tap into your experiences as a faculty member and your perceptions of teaching efficacy and university environments. You will be asked questions regarding your classroom experiences how you have adapted to teaching in university setting. I will moderate the session, and the interview will be audio recorded. After the study is complete, the audio will be deleted. Your institution has approved my research project and will receive only the results of aggregated data analysis.

Risks of Participation:
There are no known risks associated with this project which are greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.

Benefits:
The results of this research will contribute to college structure literature, trust literature and enhance the knowledge base of teacher efficacy and the antecedents to its formation.

Confidentiality:
All information collected from this study will be confidential and will be used solely for research purposes. The data obtained from the interviews will be published; however, Neither your name nor identifying factors will be included. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers and individuals responsible for research oversight will have access to the records. It is possible that the consent process and data collection will be observed by research oversight staff responsible for safeguarding the rights and wellbeing of people who participate in research.

Contacts:
If you have any questions about this study, please contact the PI at 918.521.4727 or

desmondchid@aol.com or my advisor, Dr. Ed Harris at 405.744.7932 or ed.harris@okstate.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research volunteer, you may contact Dr. Shelia Kennison, IRB Chair, 219 Cordell North, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405.744.3377 or irb@okstate.edu .

Participant Rights:
Your participation is entirely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will in no way jeopardize your future relations with your current institution, (the studied) University. You also have the right to refuse to answer any question that you might not wish to answer without negative consequences.

Signatures:
I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy of this form has been given to me.

_____ _____
Signature of Participant Date

I certify that I have personally explained this document before requesting that the participant sign it.

_____ _____
Signature of Researcher Date

Appendix H

Interview Questions

1) When did you begin teaching at this university?

2) What are the behavior/s you find in the faculty that make/s you feel that the faculty here are trustworthy?

3) What makes you feel capable and persistent in the face of challenges?

4) What makes you feel supported or not supported?

5) In what ways are the university's administrators supportive of your work?

6) How do you attempt to accommodate learners of varying degrees?

7) Does tenure or job security play a role in your feelings about life in the university?

8) To what events, experiences, and conditions do you attribute your sense of teaching self-efficacy?

9) What are the biggest challenges in the classroom as a faculty member?

10) What does it mean to you teaching in a small Catholic university like St. Elsewhere?

11) Does the mission of St. Elsewhere affect how you do your job?

12) Does the tenure system affect how you do your job?

VITA

Desmond Okpogba

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Dissertation: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, COLLEGIAL TRUST, AND COLLEGE FACULTY TEACHING EFFICACY: A CASE STUDY

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education in Higher Education at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA in July, 2011.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Curriculum and Instruction at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA in 2001.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Theology at Bigard Memorial Seminary, Enugu, Enugu State, Nigeria, in 1989.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy at Bigard Memorial Seminary, Ikot Ekpene, Cross River State, Nigeria, in 1985.

Experience: Taught one year at St Peter Claver Seminary, Okpala, Imo State, Nigeria in 1981. Chaplain to Anambra College of Technology, Uli, Anambra, Nigeria in 1995 – 1997.
Chaplain at Bishop Kelley High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, USA, in 1998.

Name: Desmond Okpogba Date of Degree: July, 2011

Institution: Oklahoma State University Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, COLLEGIAL TRUST, AND COLLEGE FACULTY TEACHING EFFICACY: A CASE STUDY
Pages in Study: 165 Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Education
Major Field: Higher Education

Scope and Method of Study: The purpose of this mixed-method study was to explore the relationship between faculty self-efficacy, organizational structure, and collegial trust. The concepts of teacher self-efficacy, organizational structure, and collegial trust were used to investigate any possible empirical relationships existing between these variables in a private, Catholic university in a Midwestern state.

The construct of faculty self-efficacy were measured with a modified version of the 15-item teacher self-efficacy scale of Gibson and Dembo (1984). The organizational structure was measured with Hoy and Sweetland's (2000, 2001) 12-item enabling structure scale adapted for higher education. Collegial trust of faculty was measured by an 8-item collegial trust scale based on Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's (1998) Omnibus T-scale and adapted for higher education respondents in a manner similar to the approach used in the High Educational Faculty Trust Inventory (HEFTI) of Smith and Shoho (2007). After analyzing faculty data on these variables, individuals with high and low scores were identified and interviewed to explore responses of the participants.
Findings and Conclusions: Organizational structure and faculty self-efficacy were moderately correlated ($r = .34$) and faculty collegial trust and faculty self-efficacy were also moderately correlated ($r = .35$). However, the qualitative interview analysis seemed to verify the importance of organizational structure and collegial trust for faculty self-efficacy perceptions. These findings support prior research on teacher self-efficacy and collegial trust and organizational structure at the K- 12 levels. These constructs would be useful, as educators try to find means of enhancing academic success among college students.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: Dr. Patrick B. Forsyth