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The concept of teacher efficacy

3 dimensions

- Instructional strategies
- Classroom management
- Student engagement
Teacher efficacy

Where is the context?

1. Differences between schools?
2. School characteristics
3. Socioeconomic and gender composition
4. Low-SES boys?
Data and research design

Procrustes 2012-2014 (www.procrustes.be)
58 schools | 6234 students | 1087 teachers

Multilevel analysis
Rstudio (3.5.1) and MLwiN (2.24)

Level 1: teachers
Level 2: schools (~ aggregated student variables)
Conceptual model

• Focus:

the schools’ socioeconomics and gender composition

Socioeconomic composition

Gender composition

Teacher efficacy
Conceptual model

Teacher efficacy

Socioeconomic composition

Gender composition
Conceptual model

- Socioeconomic composition
- Gender composition
- Teacher’s SES
- Teacher efficacy
Conceptual model

Socioeconomic composition

Gender composition

Teacher’s SES

Teacher efficacy
# Results – main model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>TEIS</th>
<th>TECM</th>
<th>TESE</th>
<th>GTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School level</strong></td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic composition</strong></td>
<td>-.010 (.212)</td>
<td>.343 (.190)</td>
<td>-.099 (.137)</td>
<td>.082 (.484)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender composition</strong></td>
<td>.312 (.757)</td>
<td>-1.593* (.675)</td>
<td>-.256 (.493)</td>
<td>-1.740 (1.719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic composition</strong></td>
<td>.567 (.813)</td>
<td>.523 (.728)</td>
<td>-.260 (.529)</td>
<td>.643 (1.848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance level 2</strong></td>
<td>.199 (.172)</td>
<td>.225 (.140)</td>
<td>.056 (.071)</td>
<td>1.108 (.898)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controlling for several teacher characteristics: experience, SES, job satisfaction, workload, stress and sex
## Results – testing Bandura’s theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEIS</th>
<th>TECM</th>
<th>TESE</th>
<th>GTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School level</strong></td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic composition</strong></td>
<td>-.215 (.247)</td>
<td>.259 (.223)</td>
<td>-.141 (.162)</td>
<td>-.414 (.566)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender composition</strong></td>
<td>-.513 (.834)</td>
<td>-2.309** (.757)</td>
<td>-.765 (.548)</td>
<td>-4.252* (1.906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic composition</strong></td>
<td>.367 (.889)</td>
<td>.740 (.810)</td>
<td>.059 (.582)</td>
<td>.745 (2.032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher level</strong></td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachability</strong></td>
<td><strong>.033</strong>** (.012)</td>
<td><strong>.027</strong>** (.010)</td>
<td><strong>.025</strong>** (.008)</td>
<td><strong>.106</strong>*** (.028)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controlling for several teacher characteristics: experience, SES, job satisfaction, workload, stress, sex.
Conclusions

1. Little variance between schools
2. Unexpected effect of gender composition
3. No interaction effects (low-SES boys)
4. Positive outcomes when teaching boys?
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