



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SENSE OF EFFICACY AMONG  
FIRST YEAR TEACHERS IN SARAWAK**

**RAHMAH BT. MURSHIDI.**

**FPP 2005 18**



**FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SENSE OF EFFICACY  
AMONG FIRST YEAR TEACHERS IN SARAWAK**

**By**

**RAHMAH BT MURSHIDI**

**Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirement for the  
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia**

**April 2005**



## **DEDICATION**

To  
My beloved husband,  
Saiful Hj Yahya  
and my loving children,  
Khairul, Haziq, Fatin & Yasmin  
For all the love, care, patience, understanding and unfailing support.



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

**FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SENSE OF EFFICACY  
AMONG FIRST YEAR TEACHERS IN SARAWAK**

By

**RAHMAH BT MURSHIDI**

**April 2005**

**Chairman: Associate Professor Dr Mohd Majid bin Konting**

**Faculty: Educational Studies**

This study aimed at examining factors associated with sense of efficacy among first year beginning teachers in Sarawak, Malaysia. Beginning teachers are newly and fully qualified teachers in their first three years of teaching assignment. The aim of this study was pursued by: (a) examining the correlation between two contextual variables (support system and school climate) and first year teachers' sense of efficacy; (b) investigating the differences in sense of efficacy in relation to selected demographic variables; and (c) identifying the predictors of first year teachers' sense of efficacy from the independent variables.

This study employed a combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative method was set to examine the associating factors while as qualitative method was utilised to support and triangulate the association. The quantitative data were gathered by survey method using three instruments: Teacher Sense of Efficacy



Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), Support System Survey (a self-designed instrument) and School Climate Index (Tschannen-Moran & Parish, 2003). Semi-structured interviews were employed to gather qualitative data.

The questionnaires were administered to a sample of 328 first year teachers from 45 secondary schools in Sarawak. The subjects of the study were selected by using stratified random sampling according to eight Educational Administrative Divisions in Sarawak and locality of the schools (urban and rural). The interviews were conducted with two Principals, two Administrative Senior Assistants and six first year teachers from three secondary schools. Two schools with the highest efficacy mean score and one school with the lowest mean score were selected from research sample to be the sites to conduct the interviews.

The quantitative findings indicated that first year teachers demonstrated a moderate level of teachers' sense of efficacy ( $M = 6.57$ ,  $SD = .80$ ; score range from 1 to 9), perceived they were provided with a moderate level of support system ( $M = 3.32$ ,  $SD = .57$ ; score range from 1 to 5) and perceived their schools have a moderate positive school climate ( $M = 3.66$ ,  $SD = .49$ ; score range from 1 to 5). The correlation was significant and moderately positive between support system and first year teachers' sense of efficacy ( $r = .40$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and between school climate and first year teachers' sense of efficacy ( $r = .31$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Qualitative analyses provided related evidence to support and triangulate the correlation between the variables. There were

significant differences in first year teachers' sense of efficacy in relation to types of teacher education ( $t = -2.35, p < .05$ ), oral English proficiency ( $F [2, 325] = 4.30, p < .05$ ) and ethnicity ( $F [3, 324] = 3.88, p < .05$ ). There was no significant difference in first year teachers' sense of efficacy in relation to gender ( $t = 1.42, p > .05$ ), schools location ( $t = -.08, p > .05$ ), having teaching experience ( $t = -1.28, p > .05$ ), age groups ( $F [3, 324] = .85, p > .05$ ), and teaching subject option ( $F [2, 325] = 2.52, p > .05$ ). Two factors from the variable support system (instructional support and institutional support) and one factor from the variable school climate (academic press) were identified as the predictors of teachers' sense of efficacy ( $R^2 = .205, F [3, 324] = 27.766, p < .001$ ). The implication of the study on the theory and practice of teachers' sense of efficacy was discussed. Suggestions were offered as considerations to enhance and foster senses' of efficacy among the first year teachers.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia  
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**FAKTOR-FAKTOR YANG DIKAITKAN DENGAN EFIKASI DI  
KALANGAN GURU TAHUN PERTAMA DI SARAWAK**

Oleh

**RAHMAH BT MURSHIDI**

**April 2005**

**Pengerusi: Profesor Madya Dr Mohd Majid bin Konting**

**Fakulti: Pengajian Pendidikan**

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk meneliti faktor-faktor yang dikaitkan dengan efikasi di kalangan guru baru yang mengajar dalam tahun pertama di Sarawak, Malaysia. Guru baru adalah guru yang bertauliah dan baru bertugas dalam tiga tahun pertama pengajaran mereka. Tujuan kajian ini dilaksanakan dengan: (a) meninjau korelasi di antara dua pembolehubah kontekstual ( sistem sokongan dan iklim sekolah) dengan efikasi guru tahun pertama (b) meninjau perbezaan efikasi guru tahun pertama dengan pembolehubah demografik yang terpilih; dan (c) mengenalpasti peramal efikasi guru tahun pertama dari pembolehubah tidak bersandar.

Kajian ini menggabungkan kaedah kuantitatif dan kualitatif. Kaedah kuantitatif adalah untuk meneliti faktor-faktor yang mempunyai korelasi sementara kaedah kualitatif adalah untuk menyokong dan membuat triangulasi tentang korelasi ini. Data kuantitatif diperolehi dengan kaedah survei menggunakan tiga instrumen:

Skala Efikasi Guru (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), Survei Sistem Sokongan (instrumen yang dibina sendiri) dan Indeks Iklim Sekolah (Tschannen-Moran & Parish, 2003). Temubual digunakan untuk mengumpul data kualitatif.

Soal-selidik ditadbirkan kepada sampel yang terdiri daripada 328 guru tahun pertama dari 45 buah sekolah menengah di Sarawak. Subjek kajian dipilih menggunakan persampelan rawak strata mengikut lapan Bahagian Pentadbiran Pendidikan di Sarawak dan lokasi sekolah ( bandar dan luar bandar). Temubual dijalankan dengan dua orang Pengetua, dua orang Penolong Kanan Pentadbiran dan enam orang guru tahun pertama dari tiga buah sekolah menengah. Dua buah sekolah dengan skor min efikasi tertinggi dan sebuah sekolah dengan skor min terendah dipilih daripada sampel kajian sebagai tempat untuk menjalankan temubual.

Dapatan kuantitatif menunjukkan guru tahun pertama mempamerkan tahap efikasi yang sederhana ( $M = 6.57$ ,  $SP = .80$ ; julat skor dari 1 hingga 9), mempunyai tahap sistem sokongan yang sederhana ( $M = 3.32$ ,  $SP = .57$  julat skor dari 1 hingga 5) dan mempunyai persepsi iklim sekolah mereka adalah sederhana positif ( $M = 3.66$ ,  $SP = .49$  julat skor dari 1 hingga 5). Hubungan yang signifikan dan sederhana positif wujud di antara sistem sokongan dan efikasi guru tahun pertama ( $r = .40$ ,  $p < .01$ ) dan di antara iklim sekolah dan efikasi guru tahun pertama ( $r = .31$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Analisis kualitatif menyokong dan memberi triangulasi tentang korelasi antara pembolehubah ini. Perbezaan-perbezaan yang signifikan wujud dalam efikasi guru tahun pertama di



antara jenis pendidikan guru ( $t = -2.35, p < .05$ ), kecekapan lisan Bahasa Inggeris ( $F [2, 325] = 4.30, p < .05$ ) dan bangsa ( $F [3, 324] = 3.88, p < .05$ ). Tidak terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan dalam efikasi guru tahun pertama di antara jantina ( $t = 1.42, p > .05$ ), lokasi sekolah ( $t = -.08, p > .05$ ), pengalaman mengajar ( $t = -1.28, p > .05$ ), umur ( $F [3, 324] = .85, p > .05$ ) dan opsyen mata pelajaran ( $F [2, 325] = 2.52, p > .05$ ). Dua faktor dari pembolehubah sistem sokongan (sokongan pengajaran dan sokongan institusi) dan satu faktor dari pembolehubah iklim sekolah (penekanan terhadap akademik) dikenalpasti sebagai peramal efikasi guru tahun pertama ( $R^2 = .205, F [3, 324] = 27.766, p < .001$ ). Implikasi kajian terhadap teori dan praktik efikasi guru tahun pertama telah dibincangkan. Cadangan-cadangan telah dikemukakan untuk meningkatkan tahap efikasi guru tahun pertama.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to praise and thank God Almighty for gracing me with the strength, patience and ability to complete this dissertation within the scheduled time. Without the much needed strength it would be difficult for me to survive throughout the turbulent years.

To all my supervisors, Associate Professor Dr Mohd Majid bin Konting, Professor Dr Habibah bt Elias and Dr Foo Say Fooi, I wish to extend my very sincere and deepest appreciation for their patience, guidance, support and encouragement throughout the completion of my thesis. Without their unfailing support and guidance I could never have completed it.

I would also like to extend my special word of thanks to Professor Dr Rahim Md. Sail and Dr Arshad Abd Samad from UPM, Dr Lim Chong Hin from UPSI and Dr Chow Fook Meng from MP Perlis for giving me the precious input and direction in my work. I would also like to thank a group of lecturers: Encik Abdullah Borda, Encik Clarence Jerry and Encik Christopher Tan (Jabatan Bahasa), Pn Hjh Rokaiyah bt Hj Jaya (Ketua Jabatan Pengajian Melayu) from Maktab Perguruan Tun Abdul Razak, Kota Samarahan and Dr Nooreen bt Noordin from UPM for proof reading my thesis.



My deepest gratitude also goes to Assistant Professor Dr Megan Tschannen-Moran from College of William and Mary, USA for her encouragement and generous contributions in giving me the permission to use two of her instruments: Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and School Climate Index (SCI), providing me with a lot of input, ideas and directions in my research, and scrutinising and refining my journal article.

My heartiest and sincere gratitude also goes to my parents; Hj Morshidi and Hj Shahara, my in-laws; Hj Yahya and Hj Maimon, my husband Saiful Hj Yahya, my children Khairul, Haziq, Fatin and Yasmin, my siblings; Zainah, Dr Zalia, Ustazah Saodah, Abdul Karim, Abdul Razak and their respective spouses for giving me inspiration and providing me with their unfailing support throughout the duration of my study in UPM.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Tunku Abdul Rahman Sarawak Foundation Scholarship for funding my doctoral studies, Ministry of Education for granting my study leave, EPRD and Faculty of Educational Studies, UPM. Last but not least, many thanks to State Educational Office, all Divisional and District Education Officers, all School Principals, Senior Assistants and beginning teachers of the participating schools in Sarawak. I wish to express my appreciation for their cooperation and assistance at the time when I conducted my study.



## TABLES OF CONTENTS

|                            | <b>Page</b> |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| DEDICATION.....            | ii          |
| ABSTRACT.....              | iii         |
| ABSTRAK.....               | vi          |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....       | ix          |
| APPROVAL SHEETS.....       | xi          |
| DECLARATION FORM .....     | xiii        |
| TABLES OF CONTENTS.....    | xiv         |
| LIST OF TABLES.....        | xix         |
| LIST OF FIGURES.....       | xxii        |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS..... | xxiii       |

| <b>CHAPTER</b> |   | <b>Page</b> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| <b>1</b>       | <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>  | <b>1</b>    |
|                | 1.1 Background of the Study.....                                  | 1           |
|                | 1.2 The Problem Statement.....                                    | 8           |
|                | 1.3 Objectives of the Study .....                                 | 10          |
|                | 1.4 Research Questions.....                                       | 11          |
|                | 1.5 Significance of the Study.....                                | 13          |
|                | 1.6 Limitation of the Study.....                                  | 15          |
|                | 1.7 Definitions of the Terms.....                                 | 17          |
| <b>2</b>       | <b>REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....</b>                                  | <b>26</b>   |
|                | 2.1 Introduction.....   | 26          |
|                | 2.2 Self-Efficacy and Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....            | 27          |
|                | 2.2.1 Defining Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....                   | 32          |
|                | 2.2.2 A Model of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....                 | 34          |
|                | 2.2.3 Dimensions of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....              | 46          |
|                | 2.2.4 Measuring Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....                  | 49          |
|                | 2.3 Beginning Teachers.....                                       | 60          |
|                | 2.3.1 Beginning Teachers' Training<br>Programmes in Malaysia..... | 61          |
|                | 2.3.2 Beginning Teachers' First Year of<br>Teaching.....          | 62          |
|                | 2.3.3 Beginning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....                  | 69          |



|          |   |            |
|----------|---|------------|
| 2.3.4    | Demographic Differences in Beginning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....   | 74         |
| 2.4      | Factors Associated with Beginning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....  | 87         |
| 2.5      | Support System for the Beginning Teachers.....  | 89         |
| 2.5.1    | Types of Support System for the Beginning Teachers.....   | 97         |
| 2.5.2    | Relationship between Support System and Beginning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....                              | 106        |
| 2.5.3    | Theoretical Framework on the Relationship between Support System and Beginning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy..... | 111        |
| 2.6      | School Climate.....   | 113        |
| 2.6.1    | Climate or Culture: A Comparison.....   | 113        |
| 2.6.2    | Defining School Climate.....  | 115        |
| 2.6.3    | The Concept of School Climate.....  | 117        |
| 2.6.4    | Types of School Climate.....  | 119        |
| 2.6.5    | Measuring School Climate.....   | 124        |
| 2.6.6    | Studies on School Climate.....  | 131        |
| 2.6.7    | Leadership Behaviour and Its Implication on School Climate.....   | 133        |
| 2.6.8    | Relationship between School Climate and Beginning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....                              | 136        |
| 2.6.9    | Theoretical Framework on the Relationship between School Climate and Beginning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy..... | 142        |
| 2.7      | Formulation of Research Framework.....  | 144        |
| 2.8      | Summary of the Chapter.....   | 146        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>METHODOLOGY.....</b>   | <b>147</b> |
| 3.1      | Introduction.....   | 147        |
| 3.2      | Research Design.....  | 147        |
| 3.3      | Rationale and Justification for Using the Survey Method.....  | 149        |
| 3.4      | Population, Sample and Sampling Method.....   | 150        |
| 3.5      | Description of the Population.....  | 151        |
| 3.6      | Determining Sample Size.....  | 155        |
| 3.7      | Sampling Procedures.....  | 157        |



|          |   |            |
|----------|---|------------|
| 3.8      | Instrumentation.....  | 162        |
| 3.8.1    | Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale .....   | 163        |
| 3.8.2    | Support System Survey.....  | 166        |
| 3.8.3    | School Climate Index.....   | 172        |
| 3.9      | Validity and Reliability of the Instruments.....  | 175        |
| 3.10     | The Final Instruments.....  | 177        |
| 3.11     | Data Collection Procedures.....   | 177        |
| 3.11.1   | Quantitative Data Collection Procedure.....   | 178        |
| 3.11.2   | Qualitative Data Collection Procedure.....  | 180        |
| 3.12     | Data Analysis Procedures.....   | 185        |
| 3.12.1   | Quantitative Data Analysis Procedure.....   | 185        |
| 3.12.2   | Qualitative Data Analysis Procedure.....  | 202        |
| 3.13     | Summary of the Chapter.....   | 204        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>RESULTS.....</b>   | <b>205</b> |
| 4.1      | Introduction.....   | 205        |
| 4.2      | Demographic Data of the Respondents.....  | 206        |
| 4.2.1    | Distribution of First Year Teachers<br>according to Gender.....   | 206        |
| 4.2.2    | Distribution of First Year Teachers<br>according to School Locality.....  | 206        |
| 4.2.3    | Distribution of First Year Teachers<br>according to Teaching Experience.....                                      | 207        |
| 4.2.4    | Distribution of First Year Teachers<br>according to Types of Teacher<br>Education .....                           | 208        |
| 4.2.5    | Distribution of First Year Teachers<br>according to Age Groups.....   | 208        |
| 4.2.6    | Distribution of First Year Teachers<br>according to Ethnicity.....  | 209        |
| 4.2.7    | Distribution of First Year Teachers<br>according to Oral English Proficiency<br>Level.....                        | 210        |
| 4.2.8    | Distribution of First Year Teachers<br>according to Teaching Subject Option.....                                  | 211        |
| 4.3      | Results.....  | 212        |
| 4.3.1    | Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Levels .....  | 212        |
| 4.3.2    | Levels of Support System.....   | 215        |
| 4.3.3    | Types of School Climate.....  | 218        |
| 4.3.4    | The Difference in First Year Teachers'<br>Sense of Efficacy in Relation to<br>Selected Demographic Variables..... | 221        |

|          |  |            |
|----------|--|------------|
| 4.3.5    | Support System and First Year<br>Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....  | 235        |
| 4.3.6    | School Climate and First Year<br>Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....  | 247        |
| 4.3.7    | The Predictive Factors of First Year<br>Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....   | 257        |
| 4.4      | Summary of the Chapter.....  | 265        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....</b>  | <b>266</b> |
| 5.1      | Introduction.....  | 266        |
| 5.2      | Discussion of Results.....   | 266        |
| 5.2.1    | Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Levels.....  | 266        |
| 5.2.2    | Levels of Support System.....  | 273        |
| 5.2.3    | Types of School Climate.....   | 278        |
| 5.2.4    | The Difference in First Year Teachers<br>Sense of Efficacy in Relation to<br>Selected Demographic Variables..... | 282        |
| 5.2.5    | Support System and First Year<br>Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....  | 294        |
| 5.2.6    | School Climate and First Year<br>Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....  | 301        |
| 5.2.7    | The Predictive Factors of First Year<br>Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....   | 308        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND<br/>RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>  | <b>318</b> |
| 6.1      | Introduction.....  | 318        |
| 6.2      | Summary of the Study.....  | 318        |
| 6.3      | Implications of the Study.....   | 324        |
| 6.3.1    | Levels of First Year Teachers'<br>Sense of Efficacy.....   | 324        |
| 6.3.2    | Levels of Support System<br>for the First Year Teachers.....   | 328        |
| 6.3.3    | Types of School Climate as Being<br>Perceived by First Year Teachers.....  | 331        |
| 6.3.4    | Demographic Differences in First Year<br>Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....  | 334        |
| 6.3.5    | Relationship between Support<br>System and First Year Teachers'<br>Sense of Efficacy.....                        | 338        |



|                                   |   |            |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------|
| 6.3.6                             | Relationship between School<br>Climate and First Year Teachers'<br>Sense of Efficacy.....     | 340        |
| 6.3.7                             | The Predictive Factors of First Year<br>Teachers' Sense of Efficacy .....                     | 342        |
| 6.4                               | Recommendations .....   | 343        |
| 6.4.1                             | Recommendations for Policy Makers<br>and Practitioners.....                                   | 344        |
| 6.4.2                             | Recommendations for Future Research.....  | 348        |
| <b>REFERENCES.....</b>            |   | <b>351</b> |
| <b>APPENDICES.....</b>            |   | <b>375</b> |
| A1                                | Research Questionnaires.....  | 376        |
| A2                                | Interview Protocols.....  | 387        |
| B                                 | Permission to Use Research Instrument.....  | 390        |
| C1                                | Permission to Conduct Research (MOEM).....  | 395        |
| C2                                | Permission to Conduct Research (JPN Sarawak).....   | 396        |
| D1                                | Research Translation Panel.....   | 397        |
| D2                                | Credentials of Research Translation Panel.....  | 399        |
| E1                                | Results of Exploratory Data Analysis on<br>Assumptions of Normality and Homogeneity.....      | 401        |
| E2                                | Results of Exploratory Data Analysis on<br>Assumptions of Linearity and Homoscedasticity..... | 408        |
| E3                                | Regression Model Summary for Whole Sample.....  | 414        |
| <b>BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR.....</b> |   | <b>422</b> |





## LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Title   | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 3.1   | Number of rural and urban secondary schools with first year teachers according to Educational Administrative Divisions in Sarawak.....                                      | 153  |
| 3.2   | The distribution of first year teachers according to the date of placement, Educational Administrative Divisions and locality (population of the study) .....               | 154  |
| 3.3   | Number of rural and urban secondary schools and number of respondents initially involved in the study according to the Educational Administrative Divisions in Sarawak..... | 159  |
| 3.4   | The initial distribution of first year teachers according to the date of placement, Educational Administrative Divisions and school locality.....                           | 160  |
| 3.5   | Number of rural and urban secondary schools and number of respondents finally involved in the study according to the Educational Administrative Divisions in Sarawak.....   | 161  |
| 3.6   | The final distribution of first year teachers according to the date of placement, Educational Administrative Divisions and school locality.....                             | 162  |
| 3.7   | The three factors of Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale.....   | 166  |
| 3.8   | Factor loading for all items in Support System Survey.....  | 169  |
| 3.9   | Inter-correlation of Support System Survey and the three factors  | 171  |
| 3.10  | The three dimensions of Support System Survey.....  | 172  |
| 3.11  | The four dimensions of School Climate Index.....  | 174  |
| 3.12  | Reliability indices of the final three instruments.....   | 176  |
| 3.13  | The pseudonym names of the schools and the data of the informants.....  | 182  |
| 3.14  | The data collection approaches.....   | 184  |



|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| 3.15 | The criteria to interpret the strength of the relationship between two variables.....                                     | 191 |
| 3.16 | The result of multicollinearity test in terms of tolerance values and VIF on the independent variables.....               | 196 |
| 3.17 | The result of multicollinearity test in term of condition index on the independent variables.....                         | 197 |
| 3.18 | Summary on the types of analyses and tests.....   | 201 |
| 4.1  | Distribution of first year teachers according to gender.....  | 206 |
| 4.2  | Distribution of first year teachers according to school locality...   | 207 |
| 4.3  | Distribution of first year teachers according to teaching experience..  | 207 |
| 4.4  | Distribution of first year teachers according to types of teacher education.....  | 208 |
| 4.5  | Distribution of first year teachers according to age groups.....  | 209 |
| 4.6  | Distribution of first year teachers according to ethnicity.....   | 210 |
| 4.7  | Distribution of first year teachers according to oral English proficiency level.....                                      | 210 |
| 4.8  | Distribution of first year teachers according to teaching subject option.....   | 211 |
| 4.9  | The mean scores and percentages of first year teachers for three levels of efficacy and the respective factors.....       | 212 |
| 4.10 | The mean scores and percentages of first year teachers for three levels of support system and the respective factors..... | 215 |
| 4.11 | The mean scores and percentages of first year teachers for three types of school climate and the respective factors.....  | 218 |
| 4.12 | The results of <i>t</i> -test for differences in relation to gender.....  | 222 |
| 4.13 | The results of <i>t</i> -test for difference in relation to school locality...  | 223 |



|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.14 | The results of <i>t</i> -test for difference in relation to teaching experience..   | 225 |
| 4.15 | The results of <i>t</i> -test for difference in relation to types of teacher education.....                                   | 226 |
| 4.16 | Mean and standard deviation according to age groups.....  | 228 |
| 4.17 | The results of One-Way ANOVA test for difference in relation to age groups.....   | 228 |
| 4.18 | Mean and standard deviation according to ethnicity.....   | 229 |
| 4.19 | The results of One-Way ANOVA test for difference in relation to ethnicity.....  | 230 |
| 4.20 | Mean and standard deviation according to oral English proficiency level.....  | 232 |
| 4.21 | The results of One-Way ANOVA test for difference in relation to oral English proficiency level.....                           | 232 |
| 4.22 | Mean and standard deviation in relation to teaching subject option.....   | 234 |
| 4.23 | The results of One-Way ANOVA test for difference in relation to teaching subject option.....                                  | 234 |
| 4.24 | The results of correlation test between support system and the three factors with first year teachers' sense of efficacy..... | 236 |
| 4.25 | The results of correlation test between school climate and the four factors with first year teachers' sense of efficacy.....  | 248 |
| 4.26 | The results of stepwise regression between teachers' sense of efficacy and the independent variables.....                     | 259 |
| 4.27 | The results of stepwise regression between instructional strategies efficacy and independent variables .....                  | 261 |
| 4.28 | The results of stepwise regression between classroom management efficacy and independent variables.....                       | 262 |
| 4.29 | The results of stepwise regression between student engagement efficacy and independent variables.....                         | 264 |



## LIST OF FIGURES

| <b>Figure</b> | <b>Title</b>  | <b>Page</b> |
|---------------|---|-------------|
| 2.1           | The Conceptual Framework of Efficacy.....   | 28          |
| 2.2           | A Model of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy .....  | 34          |
| 2.3           | Theoretical Framework of the Relationship between<br>Support System, First Year Teachers' Sense of Efficacy<br>and Students Efficacy.....   | 112         |
| 2.4           | Theoretical Framework of the Relationship between<br>School Climate, Teacher Efficacy and<br>Students Achievement.....  | 143         |
| 2.5           | The Research Framework.....   | 145         |
| 3.1           | The Flowchart that described the procedure in collecting<br>Qualitative data.....   | 181         |
| 5.1           | Illustrated summary on the integration of qualitative<br>and quantitative results in the relationship between support<br>system, school climate and teachers' sense of efficacy ..... | 307         |
| 5.2           | A Modified Model of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy.....  | 315         |
| 5.3           | The New Research Model Developed from the Study.....  | 316         |



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| EPRD  | Educational Planning and Research Division        |
| KDPM  | Kursus Diploma Perguruan Malaysia                 |
| KPLI  | Kursus Perguruan Lepas Ijazah                     |
| MOEM  | Ministry of Education Malaysia                    |
| NQT   | Newly Qualified Teachers                          |
| PTA   | Parent Teacher Association                        |
| OCDQ  | Organisational Climate Description Questionnaires |
| OHI   | Organisational Health Inventory                   |
| OSTES | Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale                 |
| SCI   | School Climate Index                              |
| SPM   | Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia                          |
| SSS   | Support System Survey                             |
| TES   | Teacher Efficacy Scale                            |
| TSES  | Teacher Sense of Efficacy                         |



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background of the Study

The quality of education in our nation has been a continual concern of the public. This concern has been translated into numerous programmes to improve teaching and teacher quality especially among the beginning teachers. Beginning teachers are newly qualified teachers in their first three years of teaching appointment after undergoing and completing their teacher preparation programme. Being new in the profession, these beginning teachers need to be groomed as professionally effective and quality teachers (Weiss & Weiss, 1999). Having quality teachers to teach in schools will greatly influence students performance and achievement (Killion & Hirsh, 2001), which will consequently improve the quality of education.

Both teacher training institutions and universities may endeavour their best to prepare their trainees to deal successfully in situations teachers regularly face. The trainees are given comprehensive pedagogical input as well as real teaching experience. However, the task of preparing teachers cannot be accomplished solely through pre-service programmes. Teacher preparation programmes merely provide the foundation for continual professional growth. It can only be conceived as a substantial beginning of a lifelong programme of professional education. Therefore other critical steps in continual development of teachers should be carried out during