



ISSN 2278 – 0211 (Online)

Collective Efficacy-enhancing Factors: Public School Teachers' Perspective for Effective School Management

Judith Teebo Zabrina-Anyagre

Lead Inspector, National Inspectorate Board of the Ministry of Education, Ghana

Abstract:

This exploratory survey was conducted in two regions of Ghana: Greater Accra and Upper east regions. Data was gathered from four-hundred and sixty respondents (teachers) with a sixty-forty distribution between the two regions respectively. Instrumentation was mainly by the researcher's designed questionnaire. Data analyses were inferential and descriptive. Major findings were that: 1. Most teachers in the public basic schools are conscious of their efficacy beliefs and would desire an enhancement of their efficacy strengths. 2. Collective efficacy is closely associated with self-efficacy. 3. Environment, Supervisors, Caliber of students and Parental role are highly considered by teachers as factors most likely to boost their general efficacy as a faculty.

1. Introduction

Collective efficacy refers to the perceived “performance capability of a social system as a whole” Bandura (1977[3]), cited in Dimopoulou (2014). It refers to people’s shared beliefs that they can work together to produce effects [4]. Bandura defined self-efficacy as the belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments. Based on the social cognitive theory; Bandura [29], [11], [3] expanded the theory of self-efficacy to the larger social construct of collective efficacy within group settings. Schools are large group settings and do not operate in isolation.

The two constructs are very important in the school system which holds in high esteem the ability of its members to produce outcomes progressively to meet set goals. “The concept of collective efficacy is similar to self-efficacy in that it focuses on the amount of effort and persistence dedicated to a task and the perception of the success of that task” [3]. Personal efficacy has been identified as likely associated with collective efficacy, and the two constructs strongly associated with performance; this is because “personal agency operates within a broad network of socio structural influences”([3]p.6); as such, Bandura’s social cognitive theory which forms the basis of collective efficacy, “extends the analysis of mechanisms of human agency to the exercise of collective agency [3]p.7]; hence, ”beliefs of collective efficacy serve functions similar to those of personal efficacy beliefs and operate through similar processes”[3]. It is therefore noteworthy, as advised by Bandura, that because the collective performance of a social system involves transactional dynamics, perceived collective efficacy should be viewed from the group level perspective and not an individual level; “it is an emergent group-level property, not simply the sum of the efficacy beliefs of individual members” [6].

Pajares (1996) suggests that self-efficacy judgments are most consistent with Bandura’s (1997) theory, and most predictive of behavior, when evaluation of one’s capability is matched to a specific outcome. He claims that several studies of collective teacher efficacy have used individual teacher efficacy variables and aggregated them to the school level, this process; he claims is inconsistent with the theoretical nature of the construct, which concerns the school as a whole. He suggests that, Collective teacher efficacy is not the simple aggregate of individual perceptions of the self; instead, it is individual perceptions of the capabilities of the entire faculty in a school organization. This is why Bandura (1997) noted that the decision to use self or group orientation in collective efficacy measurement should actually consider the level of organizational coupling present; that is, organizations whose functions are highly interdependent (tight coupling), would be more appropriately assessed with a group orientation. Loosely coupled organizations may be more appropriately assessed with an aggregate of individual orientations.

Building on previous findings, Goddard, Hoy and Hoy (2002) suggest that one way for school administrators to improve student achievement is by working to raise the collective efficacy beliefs of their faculties; pointing to the effect of past experiences on the development of teacher sense of efficacy. Hoy, Sweetland and Smith (2002) suggested that school leaders need to lead in ways that promote mastery experiences for teachers.

Just as self –efficacy, collective efficacy is noted to be one element of teacher (group) quality that produces important synergetic dividends. Bandura observes: “The stronger the perceived collective efficacy, the higher the group’s aspirations and motivational investment in their undertakings, the stronger their staying power in the face of impediments and setbacks, the higher their morale and resilience to stressors, and the greater their performance accomplishments” because, “group attainments are the product not only of the

shared intentions, knowledge and skills of its members but also of the interactive, coordinated and synergistic dynamics of their transactions” [6].

Hoy, Sweetland and Smith (2002) found that, collective efficacy was more important in explaining school achievement than socio-economic status, signifying practically that it is easier to change the collective efficacy of a school than it is to influence the socio-economic status of a school. Goddard and Skrla (2006) in their study which looked at school characteristics in correlation with teachers’ level of efficacy reported that less than half the difference in efficacy could be accounted for by factors such as the school’s socio-economic status, student achievement level and faculty experience, based on which they suggested that principals have the opportunity to build collective efficacy through the experiences they provide for teachers.

Hoy (2006) suggests that some of the most influences on the development of teacher efficacy are mastery experiences during student teaching and the induction years. Thus, first years’ teaching could be critical to the long-term development of teachers’ efficacy. Research confirms that, as with the individual teacher’s sense of efficacy, there is a positive relationship between collective efficacy and student achievement.

The environment has been proven by research over the years to have strong associations with school development. School development is mostly talked of in terms of effective teaching and learning, creativity, overall school achievements (human, academic, physical, socio-cultural, etc.) and holistic child growth.

The effect of the physical environment has been found to be profoundly influential to developmental outcomes including academic achievement, cognitive, social and emotional development. Gary Evans’ numerous research studies, as cited in Coon, Carey, Fulker and DeFries (1993), examining the effects of the physical environment on children’s well-being reveal that the effects of the physical environment—noise level, over-crowding, housing and neighborhood quality—are as significant for children’s development as psychosocial characteristics such as relationships with parents and peers. It is common knowledge that, the manner in which a school building is designed, managed and maintained sends a message to its occupants and the community beyond, speaking volumes about the value placed on activities transpiring within its walls—parents would to a large extent, view a school based on the physical evidence.

The Departments of Educational Leadership National Center for Twenty-first Century, San Diego State University reveal in their study that, specific building features and conditions relating to human comfort have been shown to influence student achievement.

“These include building age (Bowers and Burkelt, 1998; Chan, 1979; Earthman and Lemasters, 1996; McGuffey and Brown, 1978; Plumley 1978); O’Neill, 200; Phillips, 1997; Plumley 1978); non-modernized versus modernized and refurbished buildings (Maxwell, 1999; McGuffey and Brown 1978; Plumley 1978); Climate control and indoor air quality (Cash, 1993; Earthman 2004; Hines, 1996; Lanham, 1999); Lighting (Heschong Mahone Group 1999; Kuller and Linsten, 1992; Mayron, Ott, Nations and Mayron, 1974; Wurtman 1975); acoustical control (Evans and Maxwell, 1997; Haines, Stansfield, Job, Berglund and Head, 2001; Hygge, Evan and Bullinger, 2002; Maxwell and Evans 2000); overall impression (Tanner, 2000); and design classifications including flexible class room arrangement, clearly defined pathways, positive outdoor spaces, large group meeting rooms, instructional neighborhoods, and ample egress (Tanner and Lackney, 2006).”

The school environment as already discussed plays an enormous role in enhancing student achievement, not only because students are the ones who do the most learning but equally important for teachers’ performance through the building of the right attitudes and cultures. The nature and quality of the built learning environment has also been proven to affect teachers’ attitudes, behaviors and performance (Buckley, et al.2004; Dawson and Parker, 1998; Lowe 1990; Schneider, 2003).

Although there is growing literature about the relationship that exists between physical facility quality and student academic achievement, (Earthman, 2004, Earthman and Lemasters, 1996, 1998; Lemasters, 1997; Higgins, Hall, Woolner and McCauley, 2005, Schneider, (2002), the school environment cannot be limited to mere buildings or anything tangible: It means a lot more than grounds. The school environment comprises the physical, psychological, ethical and socio-cultural atmosphere of a school community. Everything important to the development and improvement of the members of a school community forms part of school environment. The Infonomics society defines school environment as the physical academic, socio-economic, and ethnic composition and the way the entire school community perceives the school climate, (The school climate being that picture which reflects the school’s priorities in terms of academic engagements, effective leadership and inter-relationships, well-fare of students and teachers in a goal-driven environment). Broult, Jonasz and Achambault, (2014) identify the important role of the school environment in determining teacher expectations and assert that; school environment plays a statistically significant role in the dissatisfaction of teachers. Moore (2012).

Coon, Carey, Fulker and DeFries (1993) note however the controversy whether these associations reflect true causal relationships between school environment and achievement, suggesting that, often times, associations between academic achievement and characteristics of school environment can result from direct environmental influences of the school, or from placement of children into particular schools based on prior ability. Apart from the parent factor which emanates from parental educational background, parental IQ and parental support which may interfere in a child’s academic achievement as against school factors, the environment can be said to be one big factor which has the propensity to affect student learning and academic achievement. Parental roles are mostly associated with school environment: Parents who send their children to schools with characteristics associated with high achievement may themselves be more supportive or intelligent (Jencks, 1972; Smith, 1972), “Because parents and their children share genes for intelligence, an observed association between school environment and child achievement may occur because the school variable is correlated with parental IQ”. Plomin, Loehlin, and Defries (1985) referred to this type of indirect association as ‘generic mediation’ of the environment”. (Coon et al 1993, p.80).

Regarding academic achievement, a variety of factors including instructional leadership, classroom management and learner response matter a lot. Coon et al (1993) aggregated several variables at the classroom level and suggested that each of these classroom variables in correlation with individual aspects of school environment, have a small effect on learner achievement. "Several of these variables in addition to measures of children's attitudes about school, showed direct environmental associations with reading and math achievement independent of effects of parental IQ" (p. 79). The environment of the school does not only affect the behaviors of students and teachers but the community's on-going engagements with the school as important players in the growth of the school; the community being mostly parents and guardians. Kathleen V. Hoover -Dempsey, Oho C. Bassler and Jan S. Brissie (1987) identified some parental roles such as parental conferences, parental volunteers, parents 'home tutoring programs and teacher perception of parents support as complementary and for increasing productive interconnections between parents and schools. Teachers' teaching experience was fourth in the ranking and proved to have quite a significant relationship with teachers' collective efficacy.

The role of supervision in the professional development of teachers has been identified to be inevitable in school organizations. Zabrina-Anyagre (2016) noted that, school quality couldn't be talked about without identifying the roles supervisors play in the school system. The school supervisor's role is paramount to the growth of school through the effectual functioning of teachers in a collaborated manner. In most schools, supervision is performed mostly by the head of school, supported by departmental heads, subject leaders and specialists, and local officers who in turn draw expertise from higher authorities. It is believed that, supervision enhances knowledge, better organization and performance of tasks, increases motivation, and enhances monitoring for the achievement of expected outcomes.

Supervision involves guidance and support with the aim of aiding the one under supervision (the supervisee), to perform as expected: It is mainly aimed at producing the best out of the supervisee. Supervision has evolved from one stage to another over time. Some contemporary models of supervision as cited by Baffour-Awuah (2011; Zabrina-Anyagre (2016) are the differentiate model and the collegial model. Frasier (2000) and Tsabala (2013) found that, teachers expected their supervisors to be caring, understanding and helpful. The relationship between teachers and their supervisors was also expected by teachers to be collegial rather than authoritarian.

1.1. Hypothesis and Research Questions

1. Teachers are not conscious of their efficacy / How conscious are teachers on their efficacy strengths?
2. Teacher Self-efficacy has minimal or no relationship with collective teacher efficacy
3. What factors are more likely to enhance teachers' collective efficacy?

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

The study was descriptive and exploratory in nature. This involves collecting data in order to test hypothesis or answer research questions concerning the current status of the subject of study (Gay, 1992, Amedahe 2000). Descriptive methods were adopted because research shows that this design can be conducted among others to demonstrate association or relationships between things. It is most advised for cross-sectional studies, as it involves a one-time interaction with the groups and individuals in the sample. The purpose of this design is to observe, describe and document aspects of a situation as it appears naturally. Exploratory methods were adopted to support the research study given that it is a kind of research generally applied when there is a minimal study in the area of investigation in order to pave way for further studies. It is believed to be flexible and addresses all manner of research questions such as (what, why, how?).

2.2. Population

The population of this study comprised all trained teachers in Public Basic Schools (PBS) in two regions of Ghana, (Greater Accra and Upper east). The two regions were selected to reflect the main geographical divide of the country (The north and south), considering several factors (socio-economic, geographical etc.) in the dichotomy. Studies reveal that the northern parts of the country are still recording higher incidents of deprivation and inequalities in many areas such as literacy, health, education and other social and economic standards, than the southern sector. It is worth noting that within the two regions are urban and rural settlements as well as endowed and less-endowed schools. Though in class management, many factors come into play to make a lesson successful, for instance the availability of teaching/learning materials, physical/social/ethical environment, the role of the teacher as facilitator cannot be over emphasized; they mediate between the learners and their parents as well as between school and community.

2.3. Sample and Sampling Procedure

The sample for this research comprised four-hundred and sixty (460) teachers from the two regions (Greater Accra and Upper east). The sample size was selected based on Professor Emeritus, John Curry's ; "rule of Thumb" model Yount (2006), and that of R.M Jacobs, cited at Researchgate.com : If a population size is around 1500, 20% should be sampled, and beyond a certain point, for example, five-thousand plus, (5000 +), the population size is almost irrelevant and a sample size of 400 (8%) may be adequate. The population sample of four-hundred and sixty (460) trained teachers therefore fell within the two models above- less than 10% of the total teacher population in the two regions.

Stratified random sampling was used in the selection of teachers for the study. P.A Twumasi (2001) explains that, if a group is a heterogeneous one in terms of its social characteristics, there is the need to include more individuals and to stratify the group in order

to lower variance. The entire population was therefore divided into meaningful strata – Hence, the researcher in collaboration with Ghana’s Ministry of Education, using the Education Management Information System (EMIS) classified schools in the regions by location and endowment.

2.4. Instrumentation

A questionnaire designed by the researcher was the main tool used in collecting data for this research study. The questionnaire which contained two parts, (one and two) was designed to elicit responses ranging from optional choice answers and Likert-scale to open-ended questions, (Part one and part two) respectively. A pretesting of the instrument was first conducted to ascertain validity and reliability.

2.5. Data Analyses

Responses to the statements in the questionnaire were coded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Service Solutions (SPSS) computer software. Further analysis was done using descriptive and inferential statistical tools. Some of the tools were percentages, means and standard deviations, average and estimations. The non-parametric chi-square test, independent samples t-test, and Kruskal Wallis Test, a non-parametric equivalent of the one-way between-subject ANOVA were also used to analyze the data.

3. Results

- *Research Question 1: How conscious are teachers of their efficacy and professional functioning?*

Categories	I don't Agree	Partially Agree	I strongly Agree	Total	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)			
Awareness	56	138	260	454	139.260 ^a	2	0.000
Consciousness	92	221	139	452	56.580 ^b		

Table 1: Non-parametric chi-square test on teachers’ awareness or consciousness of their own efficacy

A non-parametric chi-square test was conducted on responses from the Likert scale test to assess whether a relationship exist in teachers’ awareness and consciousness of their own efficacy. The results of the non-parametric chi-square test were found to be statistically significant, $X^2(df=2, n = 454) = 139.260, p < 0.05$ for awareness level and $X^2(df=2, n = 454) = 56.580, p < 0.05$ for consciousness level. Thus, there was a significant difference between the respondents who **do not agree** on their awareness (n=56) and their consciousness (n=92) of their own efficacy. Also, a significant difference exists between respondents who **partially agree** on their awareness (n=138) and their consciousness (n=221) of their own efficacy. Finally, a significant difference exists between respondents who **strongly agree** on their awareness (n=260) and their consciousness (n=139) of their own efficacy. The results suggest that there is a significant relationship between teachers’ awareness and consciousness of their own efficacy.

- *Research Question 2: What relationship exists between teachers’ self-efficacy and their collective efficacy?*

To examine the research question, a non-parametric chi-square test was again conducted to assess the relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their collective efficacy (see Table 2).

Categories	I don't Agree	Partially Agree	I strongly Agree	Total	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)			
Self-Efficacy	74	180	200	453	120.444 ^a	2	0.000
Collective Efficacy	39	126	292	457	864.375 ^b		

Table 2: Non-parametric chi-square test on the relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their collective efficacy

Again, a non-parametric chi-square test was conducted to ascertain the relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their collective efficacy. Respondents were required to choose from a Likert scale composed of options such as “I strongly agree”, “I agree”, “I don’t agree”, “I am not sure”. The results of the non-parametric chi-square test were found to be statistically significant, $X^2(df=2, n = 453) = 120.444, p < 0.05$ for their Self-Efficacy and $X^2(df=2, n = 457) = 864.375, p < 0.05$ for their Collective Efficacy. Thus, there was a significant difference between the respondents who do not agree based on their self-efficacy (n=74) and respondents (n=39) based on their collective efficacy perception. A significant difference also exists between respondents who partially agree based on their self-efficacy (n=180) and respondents (n=126) based on their collective efficacy perception. Finally, a significant difference exists between respondents who strongly agree, based on their self-efficacy (n=200) and respondents (n=292) based on their collective efficacy. The results suggest that the null hypothesis that there is no statistical relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their collective efficacy was rejected at $p < 0.05$. The results showed a statistically strong relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their collective efficacy.

- *Research Question 3: What factors do teachers perceive as most influential to their sense of collective efficacy?*

To analyze the research question, descriptive statistics (frequency and percentages) was used to present the perceived factors that influence or boost teachers’ professional confidence. The factors presented in this section were ‘what colleagues tell us (peers)’, ‘the

environment within which the school is located (environment)', 'how often/ long we work together' (collaboration), 'the caliber of students we teach (caliber of students)', 'what head or supervisor does (supervisor's role)', 'Experience', 'parental support', 'frequency of practice', and 'motivation and remuneration' (see Table 3).

Factors	Frequency (N=460)	Percentages (%)
Peers	147	32.0
Environment	348	75.7
Collaboration	28	6.1
Caliber of Students	335	72.8
Supervisor	347	75.4
Parents	311	67.6
Experience	230	50.0
Frequency of Practice	22	4.8
Motivation and Remuneration	22	4.8

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of factors that boost teachers' collective efficacy beliefs

From Table 3, 147 (32.0%) out of the 460 respondents were of the view that their professional confidence is boosted depending on what colleagues tell them (peers), 348 (75.7%) were also of the view that their professional confidence is boosted depending on the environment within which the school is located (environment), 28 (6.1%) of respondents were boosted by how often/ long they work together (collaboration), 335 (72.8%) were boosted by the caliber of students they have got to handle, 347 (75.4%) were boosted by what the head teacher or supervisor does (supervisor), 311 (67.6%) were boosted by parental support, also 230 (50.0%) were boosted by 'experience' and same number of respondents, 22 (4.8%) were boosted by 'frequency of practice' and 'motivation and remuneration'.

4. Discussion of Results

The results of the non-parametric chi-square test revealed that, most teachers were pretty aware and conscious of their self-efficacy as one important factor highly likely to affect their instructional and professional competencies, with a statistical significance of $X^2 (df=2, n = 454) = 139.260, p < 0.05$ for awareness level and $X^2 (df=2, n = 454) = 56.580, p < 0.05$ for consciousness level. By this, the null-hypothesis that teachers may not be aware and conscious of their own efficacy was rejected. It is however striking to note that although they appeared to be aware of the likely effects of their efficacy levels, the consciousness to make to make their beliefs work was quite on the low side, 56.580 as compared to their awareness level which was about three-times higher, 139.260. The implication is that, most teachers have positive beliefs about their capability to get students learn and make great achievements. It also means that most teachers have strong personal characteristics including self-esteem and confidence in them, which might be a push factor for them to consciously consider the influence they could exert on student learning, as facilitators. A teacher who has positive beliefs in himself is likely to have positive beliefs in his students to be able to improve on their various capabilities. It also suggests that since there is a relationship between awareness and consciousness, teacher training must include personal and professional attitudinal training to enable teachers develop the right professional attitudes. Positive attitude of teachers goes a long way in building self-esteem in the students they teach which will eventually nurture them to be the great students that they are desired to be. A teacher who does not see any value in himself cannot help others to value themselves. Teachers' beliefs, practices and attitudes are important for understanding and improving educational processes....". They are closely linked to teachers' strategies for coping with challenges in their daily professional life and their general well-being, and they shape student learning environments and influence student motivation and achievement", OECD 2009.

It was also found that a significant relationship exists between teachers' individual efficacy (self-efficacy) and collective efficacy. Apparently, teachers who had strong efficacy beliefs as individuals tend to have strong beliefs in the collective ability of a faculty. This revelation points to the fact that, only individuals with strong professional beliefs and perceptions can make a difference in their field of work against all possible odds, and are likely to impact existing systems in the faculty; they are in a better position to influence their colleagues positively to consider ways of improving existing situations and developing-school cultures. This is in consonance with earlier findings by Bandura (1977), Goddard, Hoy and Hoy (2002) Hoy (2006), Goddard and Skrla (2006).

The study also sought to find out what factors teachers would consider as most influential to the enhancement of their collective efficacy. The following: Environment, experience, peer influence, caliber of students, the role of the supervisor, parental support, motivation and remuneration, long service, and frequency of practice (experience) were presented as predictors among which school environment ranked first as the influential factor to the building or boosting of the Teachers' Collective Efficacy (TCE). The role of the supervisors ranked the second most influential factor, followed by the caliber of students, ranking third most important factor, and the role of parents as fourth most important factor. The result appeared to be in consonance with earlier findings by Moore (2012) that the environment plays a significant role in the dissatisfaction of teachers. School environment in this sense refers to the physical, (location and infrastructure), academic, socio-economic, and ethnic composition, and the way the entire school community perceives the 'school climate'-that picture which reflects school priorities in terms of academic work, effective education, academic achievement and the general welfare of students and teachers in a goal-driven school community. Christine Brout of the University of Montreal in their study (ScienceDaily 2014) found that the school environment in which teachers' work is related to their expectations of students. Brout, Jonosz and Archambault (2014) also intimated that notwithstanding the fact that schools are located

in communities with diverse features including physical, social, economic and cultural considerations, most teachers think that, the school environment plays an important role in determining the expectations of teachers.

The role of the supervisor who might be the head of school, circuit supervisor or team leader, was rated second most important factor teachers consider as influencing their collective ability. The supervisor plays major roles in enhancing and enforcing the vision and the mission of the school towards making a good school; his or her roles include leading the team in building a strong culture. The study of Hipp (1996) on principals' leadership behavior identified certain behaviors significantly related to efficacy. In a research conducted by Anit, Somech and Anat Drach-Zahavy (2000), Collective efficacy was found to be positively related to extra-role behavior towards the team (teachers). Ebmeire Howard (2003) in his research established that supervisors had a profound impact on teachers' commitment and efficacy levels. Coladarci (2010) also found that, greater commitment tends to be expressed by teachers with high personal and general efficacy believes and worked under principals regarded positively in the areas of instructional leadership, school advocacy, decision making and relating with students and staff. Teachers' believe they can perform better under supervisors who work with differentiated and collegial models of modern supervision rather than authoritative supervision Boaffour –Awuah Fresie (2002) and Tsabalal (2013). Teachers and head teachers tended to have positive perceptions about their individual and collective abilities, drawing strength from one another and their supervisors: Teachers generally believed that effective supervision had and would always have greater impacts on their professional abilities, while head teachers tended to believe in the ability of teachers to improve school management, playing various collaborative roles Zabrina-Anyagre (2016).

Most teachers opined that the caliber of students they thought had a lot to do with what they can be optimistic of and what they cannot. Hence, caliber of students was amazingly ranked third most important collective efficacy-enhancing factor among teachers.

Parental role was ranked fourth most important influential factor to the enhancement of teachers' collective efficacy. The result was quite obvious, given that parents form part of the school community and the school's social environment at large: Their relationship to teachers' attitude couldn't be far -fetched. Kathleen V. Hoover -Dempsey, Oho C. Bassler and Jan S. Brissie (1987) identified some parental roles such as parental conferences, parental volunteers, parents' home tutoring programs and teacher perception of parent's support as complementary and for increasing productive interconnections between parents and schools. Teachers' teaching experience was fourth in the ranking and proved to have quite a significant relationship with teachers' collective efficacy.

Ranking 'caliber of students' and 'parental roles' as third and fourth most important collective efficacy-enhancing factors among public school teachers could only go to confirm earlier submissions that since teachers perceive the environment of the school in such high regard, then the products and inhabitants of that same environment are equally important factors worth considering. The consistency therefore is exonerating. It can then be said that the various roles students and parents play as members of the school community are deemed highly important and crucial to the expectations and professional functioning of teachers.

It is worth noting that this research study rather ranked 'Experience', 'peer influence/teacher collaboration', and 'motivation/remuneration' very low. This proved contrary to the general belief that long serving teachers have greater experience than younger ones and so can perform better than their younger colleagues. Teachers in this study generally believed that, how long they teach doesn't really count in their collective efficacy. They also intriguingly perceived that, their own peers or collaborative activities do not actually help much in boosting their general efficacy beliefs. It was interesting finding that teachers do not consider fiscal motivation or remuneration as an important factor in the enhancement of their efficacy beliefs. Remuneration ranked lowest among eight predictors of teacher efficacy enhancing factors.

5. Conclusion

This research study of teachers in Ghanaian public schools is a special piece of work with some intriguing revelations that could go a long way to guide and influence education policy and practice with regard to Teacher Pre-service training, In-service training and general school development and management.

6. Recommendations

From the findings above, Policy makers and school managers would need to pay attention to what really influences teachers' attitudes and expectations, and the conditions that may be required to make the school environment and climate conducive and radiant enough to produce desired outcomes in all important domains. Therefore, because this study cannot be said to be absolute in its findings, more is left to be desired in really getting to understand teachers and their expectations, and the rudiments of the teaching profession. There is therefore the need for further research around the construct: Teacher efficacy (individual and collective) and teacher attitudes and expectations. It would be interesting to find out the extent to which other equally important teacher and school factors as well as external factors may influence teachers' attitude and efficacy strengths

7. References

- i. Association for Educational Communication Technology (AECT, 2001) The Handbook of Research for Educational Communication and Technology <https://www.aect.org/edtech/ed1/34/34-05.html>
- ii. Broutl, M. C., Jonasz, M., Archanbault, S. Effects of school composition and school climate on teaching expectations of students: A multi-level analysis. *Teaching and teacher education*, 2014; 44; 148 DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2014.08.008
- iii. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/2158244012438888>
- iv. Coon, H., Carey, G., Fulker, D.W. and DeFries, J.C (1993). Influences of school Environment on the Academic Achievement Scores of Adopted and Non-Adopted Children

- v. University of Utah and University of Colorado, Boulder.
- vi. Coladarci, T. Teacher Sense of Efficacy and Commitment to Teaching
- vii. The Journal of Experimental Education. Vol. 60, No 4 (summer, 1992), PP. 323-337
- viii. Heldref Publications. Accesses: 11/03/2010. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20152340>
- ix. Dimpoulou, E. Self-efficacy and collective efficacy on beliefs in relation to position, quality of teaching and years of experience. Brunnes university London, UK, copyright (2014).
- x. Donohoo, J. (2016) Fostering Collective Teacher Efficacy: Three Enabling Conditions.
- xi. <http://corwin-connect.com/2016/07/fostering-collective-teacher-efficacy-three-enabling-conditions/>. Retrieved, July 13, 2016.
- xii. Donohoo, J. (2017) Collective efficacy: The Effect Size Research and Six Enabling Conditions
- xiii. <http://thelearningexchange.ca/collective-teacher-efficacy>. Retrieved, January 9, 2017.
- xiv. Evans, G.W. (2006) Child development and the physical environment. Annual Review of psychology, 57,423-451. University of Utah and university of Colorado, Boulder.
- xv. First published, February 24, 2012
- xvi. Goddard R.D, Hoy W.K and Hoy A.W. (2002). Collective teacher efficacy; its meaning measure and impact on student achievement American Educational Research Journal, 37(2), 479-507.
- xvii. Goddard, R.D and Skrla L (2006). The influence of school social composition outreaches, collective efficacy beliefs. Educational Administration Quarterly, 42(2) 216-235.
- xviii. Goddard, R.D., Goddard, Y.L., "A multi- level analysis of relationship between teacher and collective efficacy in urban schools" teachers and teacher education, 2001, 17, PP, 807-819
- xix. Goe, L (2007). The link between teacher quality and student outcomes; A research synthesis. Washington, DC; National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved, February 27, 2008, from <http://www.ncctq.org/uploadedpdf/410958-NBPT Otcomes.pdf>
- xx. Goe, and L and Stickler, L. M. Teacher quality and student achievement: Making the Most of Recent Research. March 2008. National Comprehensive Centre for Teacher Quality, Washington, Dc 2003 6-4632.
- xxi. Hipp, K.A (1996) teacher efficacy; influence of principal leadership behavior. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- xxii. Howard, Ebmeier –How Supervision Influences Teacher Efficacy and Commitment: An investigation of a Path Model
- xxiii. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, V, 1822 p110-141 Win 2003
- xxiv. Hoover-Dempsey, K.V., Bassler, O.C, and Brassie, J.S. Parent involvement: Contributions of Teacher Efficacy, School characteristics
- xxv. American Educational Research Journal, first published, September 1, 1987
- xxvi. Kini, T. and Podolsky, A., Learning Policy Institute, (2016). Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness? A Review of the Research
- xxvii. Palo Alto, CA 94304 P: 650.332.9797
- xxviii. Moore, C. M. (2012) The Role of School Environment in Dissatisfaction Among US public school Teachers. First Published February 24, 2012.
- xxix. Somech, A. and Drach-Zahavy, A. Understanding extra-role behavior towards in school: the relationships between job satisfaction, sense of efficacy, and teacher extra-role behavior
- xxx. Teaching and Education, Vol 16, Issue 5-6, July 200, pages 649-659
- xxxi. Zabrina-Anyagre (2016) Examining the Views of Teachers and Head teachers on Supervision and collective school management in Contemporary Ghana
- xxxii. International Journal of Innovative Research and Development, Vol 5, Issue 10, September 2016 www.ijird.com
- xxxiii. Zuzovsky R. Center for Science Technology Education, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.
- xxxiv. Teacher Qualification and Their Impact on Student Achievements; Findings from TIMSS 2003