

5-1-2017

An Analysis of Stress and Self-Efficacy Experienced by General and Special Educators

Joanne Lyn Ringer
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Ringer, Joanne Lyn, "An Analysis of Stress and Self-Efficacy Experienced by General and Special Educators" (2017). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 3028.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/10986121>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

AN ANALYSIS OF STRESS AND SELF-EFFICACY EXPERIENCED BY GENERAL AND
SPECIAL EDUCATORS

By

Joanne L. Ringer

Bachelor of Science - Management
Cardinal Stritch University
1994

Master of Education - Special Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2009

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctor of Philosophy - Special Education

Department of Educational and Clinical Studies
College of Education
The Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
May 2017



Dissertation Approval

The Graduate College
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

April 24, 2017

This dissertation prepared by

Joanne L. Ringer

entitled

An Analysis of Stress and Self-Efficacy Experienced by General and Special Educators

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy – Special Education
Department of Educational and Clinical Studies

Jeff Gelfer, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Chair

Kathryn Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D.
Graduate College Interim Dean

Monica R. Brown, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Joseph Morgan, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Richard D. Tandy, Ph.D.
Graduate College Faculty Representative

ABSTRACT

An Analysis of Stress and Self-Efficacy Experience by General and Special Educators

By Joanne L. Ringer

Dr. Jeffrey Gelfer, Committee Chair
Professor of Special Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Public education and teachers are under considerable scrutiny (Gibboney, 2008). With the inception of local, state, and national demands being placed on education, teachers are faced with many challenges (Eppley, 2015). Educational accountability measures have grown out of the political pressures impacting educational policies (Gibboney, 2008). There is much debate regarding whom teachers are accountable to and what they are accountable for (Ornstein, 1986; McDermott, 2011). This scrutiny increases a teacher's level of perceived stress.

Stress and perceptions of stress differ from person to person, making it conditional and highly personal (Fimian, 2001; Jary, 2006). Although stress has been an area of study for many years, academic disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and education define it differently (Saleem & Shah, 2011). Some disciplines view stress as a process while others view it as a result of interactions influenced by culture or customs (Prabhath, 2011). Because stress appears to be pervasive among educators today (Prabhath, 2011), it is important to have an understanding of stress as it relates to education.

The way an educator teaches and how a student learns impacts the perceived self-efficacy of the teacher (Goroshit & Hen, 2014). Current and past educational legislation also has an effect on teacher perceived self-efficacy (Goroshit & Hen, 2014). The efficacy beliefs of a teacher affect how they perform in the classroom, their goals, and what they want to achieve (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy are factors that affect both general and special education teachers. Understanding how perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy affect educators may lead to understanding what positive variables are working with teachers, and how negative situations such as teacher attrition may be avoided.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the relationship between the following perceived stress factors: (a) time management, (b) work-related stressors, (c) professional stress, (d) discipline and motivation, (e) professional investment, (f) emotional manifestations, (g) fatigue manifestations, and perceived teacher self-efficacy with general and special education teachers. This was conducted with students in teacher education programs at a local university in the southwestern United States. There were two surveys that were combined to create the questionnaire that was used. These were the *Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale* (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1979) and the *Teacher Stress Inventory* (Fimian, 1984).

The results of this study showed the correlation between perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy and how they affect a teacher. Many of the studies available at the time of this study contained more variables than perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy. The results of this study also provided a starting point for future research to determine why teacher attrition is occurring.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my late parents who always understood my need to strive for more in this world. I would also like to thank my brothers, Mike and Pat, and their families for their support throughout this process. It was desperately needed! Thank you to my great friends Sibyl, Sky, Evan, Pam, Ellie, Amber, and Patrick for being sounding boards and shoulders to lean on when I had my moments. Thank you to my Silverado High School family. To all of the administration, staff, and students - thank you for such a wonderful environment to grow as a professional and continue to live out my dream. Finally, I would like to thank my dissertation committee Dr. Gelfer, Dr. Tandy, Dr. Brown, and Dr. Morgan. I appreciate your time and assistance working with me to achieve my goal.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my parents, Walter and Ann Ringer. I am who I am because of your love and guidance. You are with me every day. I love and miss you both.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Accountability Measures in Education	3
Stress Defined	5
Self-Efficacy Defined	7
Characteristics of Stress in Education	9
Characteristics of Self-Efficacy in Education	11
Stress in the Field of Education	14
Self-Efficacy in the Field of Education	16
The Relationship of Stress to Self-Efficacy in the Field of Education	18
Statement of the Problem	19
Significance of the Study.....	21
Definitions	21
Limitations	23
Summary.....	24
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	25
Accountability Measures in Education	31
Teacher Stress in the Field of Education	34

Teacher Self-Efficacy in the Field of Education	37
Relationship of Teacher Stress to Teacher Self-Efficacy in the Field of Education	39
Summary	41
 CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	 43
Research Questions	44
Participants	45
Instrumentation	47
Materials	48
Design and Procedures	48
Stress and Self-Efficacy Questionnaire	49
Treatment of the Data	51
Limitations	52
 CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	 54
Results	54
 CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	 59
Stress and Self-Efficacy Indicators for Educators	60
Relationship Between Stress, Self-Efficacy, and Educator	61
Conclusions	62
Recommendations for Future Research	63
Summary	63

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE	65
APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT INVITATION	79
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT	80
APPENDIX D: PERMISSION FROM FIMIAN	82
APPENDIX E: PERMISSION FROM SCHWARZER	84
REFERENCES	86
CURRICULUM VITAE	104

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Teacher Demographic and Background Information	46
Table 2. Independent Samples t-Test	55
Table 3. Group Statistics	56
Table 4. General Education Teachers Pearson's r	57
Table 5. Special Education Teachers Pearson's r	57

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION

Public education and teachers are under considerable scrutiny (Gibboney, 2008). Perceived teacher stress is a growing concern in the field of education (Klassen & Chiu, 2011; Kyriacou, 2001; Platsidou & Agaliotis, 2017). Although there are studies addressing perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy, there is little literature that addresses perceived teacher stress, perceived teacher self-efficacy, and the comparison of the effects of these stress levels between general education and special education teachers.

With the local and state demands placed on education, teachers are faced with many challenges including the methods they use to teach their students (Eppley, 2015). Teaching methods need to be differentiated to address the needs of as many students as possible. According to Sirotnek (2002), these needs include: (a) academic, (b) social, (c) individual, and (d) post high school. Many teachers focused on mandated testing to design their lesson plans. This did not always work because teaching in this manner did not always meet the student needs for learning (Sirotnek, 2002). Teachers needed to revise what they taught, and how they taught it (Eppley, 2015). Teachers are now being held responsible for what schoolchildren learn based upon student assessment scores (Ornstein, 1986). The literature outlined seven beliefs concerning public education: (a) public education is needed and must be supported by local, and state policies, (b) career opportunities must exist for all students, (c) educators must be held accountable, (d) policy makers and the public should be held accountable to the public, (e) a valid accountability system needs to be developed, (f) equal is not necessarily the same, and (g) education must be both accountable and responsible (Sirotnik, 2002).

With No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001), the focus of the policy was on the assumption that all students had the same academic abilities, and had the ability to learn in the same manner (Allen, Altwerger, Edelsky, Larson, Rios-Aguilar, Shannon, & Yatvine, 2007). This entailed state evaluations of educators, the hiring of highly qualified teachers, and holding schools and teachers accountable for children progressing in school (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Gibboney, 2008; Jameson & Huefner, 2006; Zeichner, 2012). In 2004, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was reauthorized to focus on ways to increase access to a general education curriculum for students with disabilities that are in an inclusive educational environment (20 U.S.C. 1400).

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed by President Obama on December 10, 2015 (Dennis, 2016; Franquiz & Ortiz, 2016). This act was developed to ensure that every student had educational opportunities. ESSA included a change of educational authority from the federal government to state and local government (Franquiz & Ortiz, 2016). Although ESSA replaced NCLB, there are some aspects of NCLB that stayed the same (Agoratus, 2016).

ESSA also emphasizes accountability and reporting outcomes (Agoratus, 2016). ESSA has implemented provisions for students with disabilities. According to Agoratus (2016) up to one percent of individuals with significant intellectual challenges can use alternative academic standards. Additionally, these standards must be aligned to the general curriculum. Students with disabilities need to be able to gain access to the general curriculum. Schools need to make sure these students are ready for post-secondary education and/or employment (Agoratus, 2016).

With the implementation of ESSA, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation awarded grants for teacher preparation programs in five different education preparation centers. With these grants they hope to enact effective teaching practices (Franquiz & Ortiz, 2016). The Gates

Foundation also supported the use of strategies for education that resulted in a majority of high school students being ready to transition to careers or college by the year 2025 (Gates Foundation, 2009).

According to Cunningham and Allington (2015) there are eight practices that assist in a child's educational growth. They are: (a) balanced instruction, (b) reading and writing, (c) integration of science and social studies, (d) higher order thinking, (e) reading and writing skills, (f) different instructional formats, (g) variety of materials, and (h) effective classrooms. With the implementation of ESSA, educators are now provided opportunities to meet the needs of students in their learning and development (Dennis, 2016). Teachers are also provided support to continue their development as effective teachers (Dennis, 2016).

Accountability in Education

Educational accountability measures have grown out of the political pressures impacting educational policies (Gibboney, 2008). The concept of accountability, when applied in education, means that an individual is responsible for student achievement according to specific criteria (Ornstein, 1986; Heilig & Darling-Hammond, 2013). The change in educational accountability policies has impacted many of the organizational structures that have been in place for years in education (McDonnell, 2012). While public opinion supported local, state, and federal governments for being involved in education, the support differed based on the level of government (Jacobsen & Saultz, 2012). However, in recent years, this has evolved to include the community, state, and federal government (McDonnell, 2012). With changes in federal policies and directives, educators attempted various methods to increase student learning (IDEA, 2004). The role of the educator changed with these accountability factors (Allen et al., 2007). With the accountability measures, teachers based instruction on a core curriculum and students were given

a state assessment to measure material learned (Dennis, 2016). It was thought that students would learn more with these changes (Heilig & Darling-Hammond, 2013). However, many of these practices differed from what teachers perceived as best practices (Valli & Buese, 2007).

ESSA implemented new accountability measures that included teacher development, academic factors, and school quality, or student success indicators (Klein, 2016). Teachers were able to improve their knowledge and skills to meet the needs of their students (Dennis, 2017). The academic factors included test scores, number of students who have graduated, and aptitude of English-language learners (Klein, 2016). School quality or student success factors included school environment, access to higher classes, or student attendance (Klein, 2016).

Standards-Based Instruction

State and federal governments set budgets and learning standards for education (Jacobsen & Saultz, 2012). A direct result of this under NCLB was the development of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), adopted to define the information students should be taught to ensure readiness for postsecondary education or the workplace (Test, Cease-Cook, Fowler, & Bartholomew, 2011). NCLB had an agenda with implementing CCSS that was focused more on accountability rather than learning (Dennis, 2016).

The implementation of ESSA required states, not the federal government, to implement educational standards (Dennis, 2016). One option available to states is the use of CCSS. However, the federal government cannot determine which standards a state should use (Dennis, 2016).

High Stakes Testing

Under NCLB, the United States Department of Education approved approximately \$330 million to develop assessments for the CCSS (Hess & McShane, 2013). The Partnership for

Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC) and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) were the consortia that worked to develop these assessments. These tests were developed to guide instruction for student needs and assess student learning on a consistent national level (Duncan, 2010). The effects of high-stakes testing were seen as both positive and negative (Heilig & Darling-Hammond, 2008). Some studies indicated that when tests were used for decision making, there was a gain in context. However, other studies showed no gains or even negative results (Heilig & Darling-Hammond, 2008). There were studies that measured proficiency in a subject, but did not measure student achievement during the year (Gewertz, 2013). Each state was allowed to develop a test. As a result, there was a lack of consistency in what was needed for a student to be considered proficient (Gewertz, 2013).

Some of the testing guidelines for ESSA remained the same as they were under NCLB (Klein, 2016). Schools still need to have a 95 percent student participation rate in tests. Additionally, states could use a national test such as the SAT or ACT at the high school level (Dennis, 2016).

Stress Defined

Stress and perceptions of stress differ from person to person, making it conditional and highly personal (Fimian, 2001; Jary, 2006). Although stress has been an area of study for many years, academic disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and education define it differently (Saleem & Shah, 2011). These differences are addressed in further paragraphs. Some disciplines view stress as a process while others view it as a result of interactions influenced by culture or customs (Prabhath, 2011). Because stress appears to be pervasive among educators and other individuals (Prabhath, 2011), it is important to have an understanding of stress as it relates to education.

The Field of Psychology

In the field of psychology, stress refers to a response the body undergoes when conditions change and an individual needs to adapt (Cohen, Janicki-Deverts, & Miller, 2007). This response may be from an internal (e.g., anxiety, depression) or external stressor (e.g., ecological, life occurrence) and may manifest itself physically or mentally (Holahan, Moos, Holahan, Brennan, & Schutte, 2005). Some of the effects of stress may be: (a) eating disorders, (b) hair loss, (c) muscle aches and pain, (d) heart palpitations, (e) indigestion, (f) diarrhea, and/or (g) headaches (Joseph, 2000).

The Field of Sociology

In the field of sociology, stress is related to an individual's interactions with others or the environment (Pearlin, 1989). Stress is viewed as a situational trait that can be hazardous to the individual (Sutton, 1984). According to Jary (2006), this often results in anxiety and strain. While under stress, an individual has difficulties handling various situations or events called stressors. Perceived stress may happen as a result of different stressors experienced by the educator. These are: (a) working conditions, (b) lack of materials, (c) environment, (d) job security, (e) salary, (f) internal conflicts, curriculum vs. time, (g) teacher role, (h) heavy workload, (i) responsibilities to administration, students, parents, and (j) physical and mental abuse by students (Swich & Hanley, 1980).

The Field of Education

In education, Kipps-Vaughan (2013) defined perceived teacher stress as emotions resulting in negative sentiments regarding work (e.g., tension, anger, depression). This stress is grounded by the individual's sense that work is threatening their confidence or happiness (Kyriacou, 2001). Beginning special educators have more difficulties with job satisfaction than

beginning general education teachers or experienced special education teachers (Stempien & Loeb, 2002). High stress levels for teachers contribute to health problems and leaving the teaching profession (Kyriacou, 2001).

For the purpose of this dissertation, perceived stress is defined as the undesirable feelings experienced by an individual stemming from some feature of their work. This may include the amount of tension and anxieties experienced and the reactions to various situations in the environment (Kyriacou, 2001).

Self-Efficacy Defined

Perceived self-efficacy has been defined by Bandura (1977) as the belief that an individual can be successful at performing the actions needed to generate the results. In the area of social cognitive theory, Bandura (1977) discussed perceived self-efficacy. The discussion revolved around self-perception of needs, wants, actions, and measures to accomplish goals. Erdem and Demirel (2007) identified success factors as a combination of personal beliefs, abilities, and methods to reach objectives. One of the most important aspects of self-efficacy is a person's view of himself/herself as an entity (Bandura, 1982; Gecas, 1989). This involves the setting of goals, achieving goals, and feeling a sense of accomplishment (Erdem & Demirel, 2007). This, in turn, impacts perceptions of personal expertise and success (Gecas, 1989). Lee, Dedrick, and Smith (1991) believed that an individual's perception of how successful they will be when performing a job defines efficacy and satisfaction describes how the teacher feels about the completion of the job. Different disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, education) view the definition of self-efficacy in various ways.

The Field of Psychology

In psychology, perceived self-efficacy has its roots in Bandura's social cognitive theory. This theory maintains that perceived self-efficacy signifies the confidence an individual has in their capability to administer and effectively achieve actions needed to meet their goals in different situations (Bandura, 1977). These beliefs ultimately influence how a person approaches different challenges in life (Bandura, 1977). This confidence is linked to the conviction a person has in their abilities (Elias, Barney, & Bishop, 2013).

There are differing views in the field of psychology concerning perceived self-efficacy. According to Elias, Barney, and Bishop (2013), some psychologists believe efficacy should be an area of specific study. An example of this would be perceived work self-efficacy in which an individual believes that they have the necessary skills to complete a specific job correctly. Other psychologists believe that efficacy is more generalized, as in the sense of the individual that they do things correctly regardless of the specific job (Elias, Barney, & Bishop, 2013). Overall, perceived self-efficacy deals with opinions of expertise rather than actual levels of expertise (Hoy & Spero, 2005). There are times that actual levels of expertise are miscalculated and individuals may plan a course of action that is not appropriate for what actually occurred (Hoy & Spero, 2005).

The Field of Sociology

The field of sociology discusses perceived self-efficacy as an essential factor in social psychological investigation (Gecas, 1989) and is linked with areas of an individual's physical and mental health. According to Cupertino, Berg, Gajewski, Hui, Richter, and Cutley (2012) self-efficacy refers to the ability of an individual to manage a project to completion.

According to Lee, Dedrick, and Smith, (1991), efficacy deals with an individual's perception of success in completing a job and is not related to a specific job. The individual accomplishes a goal by defining how to accomplish it and calculating the effect (Lee, Dedrick, & Smith, 1991). This process reflects thoughts concerning the strategies involved with the job and is influenced by the capability and background of an individual (Lee, Dedrick, & Smith, 1991).

The Field of Education

In education, the research concerning teacher efficacy is related to the achievement and motivation of students, as well as job satisfaction and commitment of the educator (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) defined a universal gauge of an educator's perceived self-efficacy as teachers being able to explain their impression of their strengths in teaching and their beliefs while performing specific jobs. According to Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2007), a teacher's perceived self-efficacy affects their teaching and how they motivate students. Often, this is imparted by the engagement or enthusiasm from students and is viewed as positive feedback by the teacher (Mulholland & Wallace, 2001).

Teachers who experience lower perceived self-efficacy tend to struggle with teaching (Betoret, 2006). Perceived self-efficacy is one of the best measures of occupational enjoyment (Judge, & Bono, 2001). The definition of perceived self-efficacy used in this dissertation is the confidence of an individual in their capability to administer and effectively achieve actions needed to meet their goals (Bandura, 1977).

Characteristics of Stress in Education

According to Farber (2000), individuals respond in different ways to stressful situations. Some people flourish, some are apathetic, and others may develop psychological or physical illness over a period of time (Farber, 2000; Holahan, et al., 2005). Classroom features, teacher

experience, and school atmosphere play important roles in perceived measures of stress in education (O'Donnell, Lambert, & McCarthy, 2008). There are various sources of stress that can be constructive or destructive, wanted or unwanted, and positive or negative (Fimian, 2001; Kipps-Vaughan, 2013). Stress may result from internal or external influences and have a positive or negative effect on an individual (Dohrenwend, 1961; Fimian, 1982).

Some types of stress include: (a) life change, (b) trauma, and (c) on-going stress (Holahan, et al., 2005). Life changing events may include death of a family member or friend, change of life style such as divorce or marriage, or a change in financial status like a job loss (Clark, Michel, Early, & Baltes, 2014; Holahan et al., 2005). Traumatic stressors are events over which the individual has no control (e.g., war, natural disaster) and continual stressors include events or roles that are ongoing (e.g., family, work) (Holahan et al., 2005). Two variables involved that cause stress are stressors and the individual perceptions of what is happening (Fimian, 1982; Jary, 2006).

Educators

Kipps-Vaughan (2013) maintained that perceived teacher stress is something that is seen in all cultures in which teachers attempt to inspire students to learn. However, when teachers are stressed, the atmosphere in the classroom may be impacted, affecting student learning (Kipps-Vaughan, 2013). Zhang (2002) defined characteristics of stress as general education teachers exhibiting: (a) impatience with students, (b) a lack of empathy for students, (c) a lack of interest in school activities, (d) poor relationships with other teachers or students, (e) a low morale, and (f) poor teaching. Over time, the effects of stress on educators may affect student learning (Kipps-Vaughan, 2013). Stress is also shown in the amount of teacher absenteeism, teacher

retirement, and teacher attrition (Kipps-Vaughan, 2013). Teachers who are not content with their job show less commitment and are more likely to leave the teaching profession (Ingersoll, 2001).

Brownell and Smith (1993) maintained that specific characteristics of students with disabilities may cause perceived teacher stress. Students with diverse learning needs or students in self-contained classrooms may affect a teacher's ability to help students succeed (Thornton, Peltier, & Medina, 2010). With the demands being placed on special education teachers to have students perform at proficient levels on state academic assessments, teachers experience more stress (Thornton, Peltier, & Medina, 2010). Billingsley, Carlson, and Klein (2004) found that there are a variety of circumstances in special education that result in the teacher experiencing more stress. These include curricula, instructional methods, caseload, salary issues, and job manageability (e.g., time, organizational issues). In addition, general educators and administrators do not understand what is involved in special education, contributing to the stress experienced by teachers (Billingsley, 2002).

Characteristics of Self-Efficacy in Education

Characteristics of perceived self-efficacy include actions such as self-motivation, thought patterns and responses, behaviors, and productivity (McCormick & Ayres, 2009). Bandura (1977) suggested four sources that affect an individual's perceived self-efficacy. They are performance accomplishments, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal.

Performance Accomplishments

The first factor affecting perceived self-efficacy is performance accomplishments (Bandura, 1977). According to McCormick and Ayres (2009), this is the strongest factor because of the strength of the teaching that is involved. According to Gavriel (2016) one of the best ways

to impact performance is to set suitable goals and directions to help guide an individual towards success.

A teacher who has effectively taught a subject for a long period of time, most likely, has a high level of perceived self-efficacy (Hoy & Spero, 2005). If the teacher believes they are unsuccessful in their teaching, perceived self-efficacy tends to be lower (Hoy & Spero, 2005). Beginning teachers often indicate that the strength of teaching is a strong indicator of perceived self-efficacy (Mulholland & Wallace, 2001). This means that beginning teachers view experienced teachers as having high perceived self-efficacy.

Vicarious Experience

Vicarious experience refers to learning by observation or modeling and is a factor that affects an individual's perceived self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). The more a teacher relates to what is being modeled, the stronger the influence or efficacy (Hoy & Spero, 2005). According to Gavriel (2016) modeling and peer learning can be very influential on the new educator. More exposure to practicing teachers gives the new educator a stronger sense of their ability to do the job (Gavriel, 2016). Many times success or failure of others will lead educators to question their own ability to perform the duties of the teacher (Tatar & Buldur, 2013).

Verbal Persuasion

Verbal persuasion (e.g., encouragement, discouragement) has its roots in the comments of others within the school environment (Bandura, 1977). If the teacher is unsure of what to do and listens to others say negative things about the task, the teacher may begin to believe that the task is too difficult (McCormick & Ayres, 2009). However, if the educator perceives the person giving praise or encouragement as someone they emulate, the opinion of the person giving praise will be well received (Gavriel, 2016)

Emotional Arousal

The final factor that affects an individual's perceived self-efficacy is emotional arousal. This is exhibited as physical signs of distress (Bandura, 1977). According to McCormick, and Ayres (2009), individuals who have difficulties when teaching may exhibit physical signs (e.g., sweaty palms, increased heart rate) and believe they have low perceived self-efficacy. According to Gavriel (2016), an individual's physical response to stress can impact performance. Individuals may not attempt the job because of fear of failure.

Educators

Most general education teachers report satisfaction with their jobs (Stempien & Loeb, 2002). Educators at the secondary level experience higher levels of perceived stress and lower perceived self-efficacy than elementary school teachers (Geving, 2007; Wolters & Daugherty, 2007). According to research, many general education teachers have stated that they do not receive the needed instruction to teach students with disabilities (Zhang, Wang, Losinski, & Katsiyannis, 2014) They also believe they are unsuccessful, they need encouragement, and the actions of their students leads to a high stress level (Westling, 2010). This lack of mentoring for general education teachers may impact the implementation of best practices in the classroom (Billingsley, Griffin, Smith, Kamman, & Israel, 2009). There are some teachers who would like to have new special education teachers and general education teachers mentored together to establish a stronger working environment (Hirsch et al., 2009; Whitaker, 2000). Despite the type of induction program, many new general education teachers will leave the teaching profession because of the stress involved in teaching students with disabilities (Claycomb, 2000). The new teachers question their abilities regarding the time and work involved in teaching. This results in lower perceived self-efficacy.

Perceived teacher self-efficacy appears to have more impact during the early years of an educator's career and becomes higher with experience (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Some of the areas in which special education teachers experience dissatisfaction are: (a) teacher induction, (b) mentoring, (c) professional development, (d) working conditions, and (e) lack of administrative support (Billingsley, Carlson, & Klein, 2004; Thornton, Peltier, & Medina, 2010; White & Mason, 2003).

Special education teachers are more likely to leave the profession when compared to general education teachers and, generally, will leave within the first five years of teaching (Claycomb, 2000). If educators participate in induction programs, there are times when they will be committed and satisfied with their employment and will stay in teaching (Whitaker, 2000), even though most induction programs do not focus on the needs of special education (Boyer & Gillespie, 2000; Stodden, Galloway, & Stodden, 2003).

Stress in the Field of Education

Teaching often is referred to as a challenging and possibly aggravating profession (O'Donnell, Lambert, & McCarthy, 2008; Pettegrew & Wolf, 1982). These challenges and aggravations may result in high levels of stress (Kyriacou, 2001). According to Johnson, Cooper, Cartwright, Donald, Taylor, and Millet (2005), teaching ranks among the six most stressful careers, with educators reporting the lowest contentment in the area of job satisfaction. There are many causes of stress for teachers including: (a) teaching students who have little motivation, (b) keeping discipline in the classroom, (c) completing large amounts of work in short time frames, (d) working with constant change, (e) being evaluated by administration, (f) working with other teachers, (g) experiencing self-worth issues, (h) working with administration, (i) declining condition of the workplace, and (j) changing roles/responsibilities (Kyriacou, 2001).

Educators

Teachers work with children/youth from different cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds, along with students who have disabilities in their classrooms (Zeichner, 2012). Many times teachers question their ability to teach students with disabilities, and believe the students should be learning at the same rate as the general education students in the classroom (King-Sears, 2008). The teachers also may question the evidence-based methods that are used to teach both general education students and students with disabilities (King-Sears, 2008). The rate that the curriculum is taught, and assessments are given, may be questioned by the general education teacher (King-Sears, 2008). Other stressors in the work place include the safety factor in school, unhappy coworkers, and students who are not motivated or prepared (Mahan, Mahan, Park, Shelton, Brown, & Weaver, 2010).

There have been multiple changes in special education over the years, including changes to federal legislation, growth in the population of students with disabilities, increased documentation, and changes in standards (Zabel & Zabel, 2001). Teachers use a variety of techniques when working with students who have disabilities, a variety of learning needs, and a lower level of preparedness (Brownell & Smith, 1993). Teachers who work with students who have disabilities are exposed to many stress factors including: (a) student capability and performance, (b) student behavior, (c) apathetic students, (d) student guidance and assistance, (e) number of students in class and on caseloads, and (f) lack of support from parents and administrators (Nichols & Sosnowsky, 2002).

Stress can manifest itself in several different ways and can affect a teacher's feelings, behavior, or physical needs (Fimian, 1982). According to Kipps-Vaughan (2013), stress also affects classroom atmosphere and impacts student learning. This occurs when stressed teachers

become irritable, impatient with students, and frustrated in the classroom. As a result, students do not receive the emotional or physical support they need to thrive (Kipps-Vaughan, 2013). Excessive worry also is a symptom of stress, resulting in less teaching of students (Fimian, 1982). This may result in teacher absenteeism, teacher attrition, and teachers taking early retirement (Kipps-Vaughan, 2013).

Self-Efficacy in the Field of Education

In education, perceived self-efficacy is discussed as being the beliefs held by teachers concerning their actions and the impact of these actions on student outcomes (Zhang, Wang, Losinski, & Katsiyannis, 2013). These are illustrative of their beliefs concerning their abilities as an educator (Wheatley, 2002). The importance of improving teacher efficacy is seen as a positive goal to improve education (Ross, 1998). According to Pajares (1996), perceived self-efficacy impacts the individual's considerations of situations and their responses. High perceived self-efficacy can provide teachers with the incentive and drive needed to remain in teaching (Yeo, Ang, Chong, Huan, & Quek, 2008). Low perceived self-efficacy indicates a sense that a situation is difficult, while high perceived self-efficacy may facilitate a willingness to approach situations viewed as difficult (Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, & Morrison, 2012).

Perceived teacher self-efficacy has been linked with teacher job satisfaction (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Teachers are more content with their performance when they believe they are accomplishing their responsibilities and goals (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). Ross (1998) indicated that teachers with higher levels of perceived self-efficacy are more likely to: (a) improve their teaching, (b) use new approaches to learning, (c) find measures to improve student independence, (d) support students with disabilities, (e) increase student views about their abilities, and (f) have realistic goals for students. Wheatley (2002) has recognized areas that

educators should view as positive goals, however, perceptions often convey negative thoughts. Examples of this are: (a) contemplation of work performance, (b) incentive to learn, (c) receptiveness to diversity, and (d) teamwork. Often some individuals may respond in a negative manner thereby avoiding any action that may improve their performance (Wheatley, 2002).

Educators

The efficacy beliefs of a teacher affect how they perform in the classroom, their goals, and what they want to achieve (Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001). Perceived self-efficacy beliefs are higher when a teacher believes they are successful in the classroom (Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001).

A higher perceived self-efficacy allows teachers to be open to new ideas and more willing to use new methods to teach their students (Soodak, Podell, & Lehman, 1998). Being more open also results in the teachers being less critical of their students when they experience difficulty with the work (Soodak, Podell, & Lehman, 1998). Higher perceived self-efficacy is linked to more positive classroom policies (Soodak, Podell, & Lehman, 1998).

The special education teacher works with a diverse number of students with various learning needs. This can have a positive or negative affect on the commitment and satisfaction of the teacher and their perception of teaching (Miller, Brownell, & Smith, 1999). There are special educators with low levels of perceived self-efficacy who have difficulties managing student behaviors and have negative reactions to the behaviors (Lee, Patterson, & Vega, 2011). One of the major problems of low perceived self-efficacy is the strong possibility of teacher attrition (Lee, Patterson, & Vega, 2011). Teachers who have higher levels of perceived self-efficacy believe that they can help their students obtain good results in their studies and at times the

teachers believe they can counteract any negative influences that their students may have (Coladarci & Breton, 1997).

The Relationship of Stress to Self-Efficacy in the Field of Education

A high sense of perceived self-efficacy supports an individual's motivation while decreasing the amount of perceived stress a person experiences (Erdem & Demirel, 2007). Teachers with higher perceived self-efficacy tend to not experience as many struggles in school-based situations as teachers with lower perceived self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). Those with lower perceived self-efficacy reflect higher perceived stress levels on the job, producing a negative impact on their teaching (Betoret, 2006). If a teacher's perceived self-efficacy and self-esteem are increased, their perceived stress level often is lower (Vaezi & Fallah, 2001). Klassen and Anderson (2009) found that a high stress level promotes lower contentment with employment. Self-efficacy that is determined to be low and high stress can contribute to the reasons special education teachers leave the field (Zhang, Wang, Losinski, & Katsiyannis, 2013).

According to Bandura (1977), if teaching students is effective (e.g., they learn something) the teacher's efficacy will be higher. As a result, the teacher will expect their students to produce effective work on a consistent basis. If teaching has not been effective, then it is possible that teacher efficacy will be lower. In this instance, the teacher will experience thoughts that their work is not effective. The lack of perceived teacher self-efficacy can be a likely source of stress (Schwarzer & Schmitz, 2004). Teachers with high perceived self-efficacy are motivated to work with students while teachers with low perceived self-efficacy are not (Schwarzer & Schmitz, 2004). Job dissatisfaction and stress are primary reasons individuals decide to leave the teaching profession (Stempien & Loeb, 2002). According to Emery and Vandenberg (2010), the primary

reason for teachers leaving the profession is their belief that self-efficacy is low and stress is high.

Statement of the Problem

Research indicates that perceived teacher self-efficacy is a primary factor for supporting improvements in education (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). According to Goroshit and Hen (2014), a teacher's perceived self-efficacy relates to how that teacher teaches and how a student learns. A teacher's perceived self-efficacy is an indicator of how successful a teacher will be with students in the classroom (Guo, Piasta, Justice, & Kaderavek, 2010). Individuals will gravitate towards tasks in which the perceived result will be success, thereby the individual's perceived self-efficacy will be high (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). In addition to the focus on perceived teacher self-efficacy, perceived teacher stress is a growing concern in the field of education (Bembenutty, 2007). Kyriacou (2001) defined perceived teacher stress as the negative emotions stemming from some feature of the teacher's work and/or the anxiety and pressures on the teacher and how these issues are handled. Organizational stress is another form of perceived teacher stress (Pithers & Soden, 1998). According to Fimian (1982; 2001), perceived teacher stress is a theoretical concept showing a relationship between a person reacting to situational demands and the actual situation. Kyriacou (2001) defined perceived teacher stress as the feelings of undesirable emotions stemming from some feature of their work that includes tension and anxieties. Ultimately, perceived teacher stress can lead to teacher attrition (Zabel & Zabel, 2001).

Teacher attrition is a rising concern in education (Zabel & Zabel, 2001). The 2015 report from the U. S. Department of Education regarding public school teacher attrition indicated an increase in beginning teachers leaving the teaching field over a five-year period. From the year

2007 to 2012, 54 percent of new teachers left the teaching profession (NCES, 2015). Teacher attrition in public schools is high, with special education showing a higher percentage than general education (Boe, Bobbitt, & Cook, 1997). Teacher attrition has a tremendous impact on the area of special education. As the number of students increases, the number of qualified teachers does not keep pace (Miller, Brownell, & Smith, 1999).

The effects of perceived teacher stress as stated by Fimian (1984, 1985, 1988) in the areas of: (a) time management, (b) work-related stressors, (c) professional stress, (d) discipline and motivation, (e) professional investment, (f) emotional manifestations, and (g) fatigue manifestations, and its connection to perceived teacher self-efficacy in general education teachers and special education teachers are not known. Additionally, the comparison in stress levels of both general education teachers and special education teachers in these areas is not known. Understanding how perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy affect educators may lead to a beginning point of understanding what positive variables are working for teachers, and how negative situations such as teacher attrition may be avoided.

This study will address the following questions:

Research Question 1: Is there a difference in the levels of stress indicators between general education teachers and special education teachers?

Research Question 2: Is there a difference in the levels of perceived self-efficacy stated on the General Self-Efficacy Scale between general education teachers and special education teachers?

Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between the levels of stress indicators and the levels of perceived self-efficacy of general education teachers?

Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between the levels of stress indicators and the levels of perceived self-efficacy of special education teachers?

Significance of the Study

Perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy are factors that affect both general and special education teachers in all levels of education. Perceived teacher stress is a growing concern in the field of education (Kyriacou, 2001). Although there are studies addressing perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy, there is little literature that addresses only perceived teacher stress, perceived teacher self-efficacy, and if there is a relationship with general and special education teachers. This is a factor that needs to be determined when looking at attrition in general and special education teachers. This study evaluated the relationship between the perceived stress factors and perceived teacher self-efficacy in both general and special education teachers. Additionally, the stress levels of the educators were compared to see whether there was a difference. The results of this study may be used to understand the effects of these perceived stress factors in combination with perceived teacher self-efficacy in both general education teachers and special education teachers. The results of this study can be used as a starting point to researching teacher attrition.

Definitions

The definitions below were used in this study. They contribute to the understanding of the purpose of the study.

Discipline and Motivation. Utilized in the Teacher Stress Inventory. A high score in the discipline area generally means teachers are aware of problems in the classroom. They record student behavior, deal with poor discipline policies in schools, and believe that no one sees them as having any authority in the school. A high score in the motivation area generally means some

educators are stressed when working with students who are not motivated and would probably do better if they tried (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990),

Emotional Manifestations. The different ways educators react emotionally to stressful work situations. A high score in this area means they have strong feelings of insecurity, vulnerability, no coping skills, depression, and anxiety (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990).

Fatigue Manifestations. This includes a variety of stress-related fatigue problems. A high score in this area means the individual may have a tendency to sleep often, procrastinate, often be tired, be physically exhausted, and feel physical weakness (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990).

General education. Instruction designed for students with and without disabilities. Instruction is based on a core curriculum (NCLB, 2001).

Perceived self-efficacy. The confidence of an individual in their capability to administer and effectively achieve actions needed to meet their goals (Bandura, 1977).

Perceived teacher stress. The feelings exhibited by a teacher of undesirable emotions stemming from some feature of their work as a teacher. This may include the amount of tension and anxiety the teacher has and how they react to various situations (Kyriacou, 2001).

Professional investment. This is the time, job satisfaction, achievement, recognition, work, advancement, and growth that an individual contributes to employment. Individuals who receive high scores on this feel they have minimal investment in their careers (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990).

Professional stress. This type of stress contains stressors typical for the type of work done (Pithers & Soden, 1998). As used in the Teacher Stress Inventory this category includes all the stress factors (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990).

Special education. Specially designed instruction for students with disabilities. This can be provided in either special education classrooms or general education classrooms. Special education classrooms include self-contained classrooms or resource classrooms (IDEA, 2004).

Stressor. A situation or event that causes a stress response that is seen as negative (Anisman & Merali, 1999).

Teacher Attrition. Teachers leave the field of teaching (Ingersoll, 2001).

Time management. A person exercising control over time spent doing various aspects of their job (Ritz, Burris, Brashears, & Frazee, 2013). In the Teacher Stress Inventory, this category represents the individuals who are stressed by time problems (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990).

Work-related stressors. In the Teacher Stress Inventory, this category represents specific areas of concern for an individual that causes them stress. This includes too much work, too much paperwork, classes are too big, no personal time, all due to aspects of the job (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990).

Limitations

The limitations of this study included the following:

1. Data was collected at one time, but individual perceptions may have changed.
2. The design of the questionnaire and statements may have contributed to a low response rate.
3. Statements in the questionnaire may have been misunderstood.
4. The majority of responses came from educators who have been teaching less than three years.
5. The majority of educators taught students under grade five.
6. The majority of educators were under the age of 35.

7. The majority of educators were female.

Summary

It is important to understand how perceived stress and perceived self-efficacy affect a teacher. There is limited research regarding the combination of perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy interaction and what the results are. Past studies regarding perceived teacher stress or perceived teacher self-efficacy do not put the two variables together. Studies regarding either perceived teacher stress or perceived teacher self-efficacy are from years ago and need to be updated. The contribution to the literature will be evidence provided related to the interaction of an educator's perceived self-efficacy and their perceived level of stress. The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy in general education teachers and special education teachers. Additionally, the stress levels of both general education teachers and special education teachers were compared to see whether there was a difference. Determining this information increased the knowledge base regarding the effects perceived teacher self-efficacy and perceived teacher stress have on general and special education teachers. Understanding how perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy affect educators may lead to a beginning point of understanding what positive variables are working for teachers, and how negative situations such as teacher attrition may be avoided.

CHAPTER TWO:

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Although teaching is known as a high stress occupation, many teachers are excited and enthusiastic to get into the classroom and make a difference in their students' lives (Klassen & Durksen, 2014; Richards, 2012). There are various challenges teachers are facing that are causing stress such as accountability, lack of resources, lack of preparation time, and overloaded classrooms (Richards, 2012). Perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy are both important factors in determining the effectiveness of educators (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008); and their job satisfaction (Reilly, Dhingra, & Boduszek, 2013). Klassen and Chiu (2010) found that perceived teacher stress has a noticeable effect on perceived teacher self-efficacy when a study was completed regarding job satisfaction. According to Valli and Buese (2007) teachers' work has changed in response to accountability factors presented in federal, state, and local policies regarding education.

Statistics indicate a disheartening rate of teacher attrition (e.g., 30 – 50%), in the United States over the past 40 years (DeAngelis & Presley, 2011; Prilleltensky, Neff, & Bessell, 2016). Approximately 10% leave teaching every year while approximately one third leave within one year and about half leave within five years (Ingersoll, 2003). The field of special education has a higher attrition rate than the field of general education (McLesky, Tyler, & Flipping, 2004; Boe, Cook, Sunderland, 2008). Many of the special education teachers transfer to general education positions (Plash & Piotrowski, 2007). Research shows that there are stressors both in and out of the classroom that prompt the special education teachers to leave their jobs (Billingsley, 2004; Kaff, 2004). Friedman and Farber (1992) believed that educators who had difficulties with

classroom management and discipline were more apt to burnout and leave the teaching profession than teachers with higher levels of self-efficacy.

Stress is acknowledged as being out of balance when speaking of elements like risk and protection (Prilleltensky, Neff, & Bessell, 2016). When risk is higher than the protection factor, an individual's ability to manage problems is challenged, usually resulting in stressful situations (Prilleltensky, Neff, & Bessell, 2016). Teacher stress has a negative effect on job satisfaction, health, and the teacher attrition rate (McCarthy, Lambert, & Reiser, 2014).

Prilleltensky, Neff, and Bessell, (2016) stated there are three levels of stress. They are: (a) personal, (b) interpersonal, and (c) organizational. The risk factors at the personal level are isolation, inadequacy, anxiety, and how the students act. Examples of protective factors for isolation are: (a) support groups, (b) mentors, and (c) training programs. Inadequacy protective factors include: (a) training programs, (b) friends, and (c) self-efficacy. The protective factors for anxiety involve: (a) sleep, nutrition, exercise, (b) organizing work, (c) outside activities, and (d) meditation. The protective factors with students are: (a) classroom management, and (b) communicating with students (Prilleltensky, Neff, & Bessell, 2016).

Nasser-Abu Alhija (2015) conducted a study to research the effect of an educator's personal and job characteristics regarding the level of stress they encounter from multiple sources. In addition, the study addressed their coping strategies. There were 425 Israeli schoolteachers solicited, (e.g. 320 females and 99 males) who responded to the study. The participants completed a survey on teacher stress and coping strategies. Significant results were presented regarding the level of stress caused by stress factors and the effectiveness of coping strategies. More experienced teachers showed results of more stress than less experienced teachers in factors like students misbehaving. Women were more stressed than men when it

came to workload. The results indicated women looked for social support as a means of coping. The study indicated the importance of being aware of teacher's needs and correct interventions.

The risk factors at the interpersonal level are parents and colleagues. The protective factors with parents are: (a) communication and (b) having parents as partners. When speaking of colleagues as a risk factor, the protective factor would be to: (a) minimize competition, (b) share information, and (c) be caring and compassionate (Prilleltensky, Neff, & Bessell, 2016).

Educators share information with others in a variety of ways (Clarke, Triggs, & Nielsen, 2014). In a paper by Kelly and Antonio (2016) different types of support were discussed about teachers who used social media for support. Some of the forms of support included providing feedback, modeling practice, and reflections. Emotional support was also provided (Kelly & Antonio, 2016).

The organizational level of risk factors includes role clarification and control of policies and procedures. Some of the protective factors are: (a) define expectations, (b) clarify requirements regarding workload, (c) participation, (d) involvement in policies, and (e) increased awareness (Prilleltensky, Neff, & Bessell, 2016).

According to De Nobile (2016), organizational communication is important to keep all members in a company or organization informed about events or information. There are different types of communication such as supportive, directive, cultural, and democratic (De Nobile, 2016). Supportive communication includes moral support, encouragement, and recognition. Directive communication involves giving guidelines for completing tasks. Cultural communication encompasses information about the organization such as mission statement, goals, or values. Democratic communication includes determining rules and regulations. When individuals do not have sufficient needed information, stress increases (De Nobile, 2016).

Schwarzer and Hallum (2008) referred to self-efficacy as making a difference in how individuals think, feel, and act. Individuals with low self-efficacy have low self-esteem and have negative feelings regarding their abilities. Higher self-efficacy gives individuals a more positive outlook on their abilities (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008). There are a variety of stressors in both personal and professional lives. According to Fimian (1982), some of the stressors are related to: (a) time; (b) work; (c) emotional; and (d) behavioral.

Fimian (1984) developed an instrument to measure stress in teachers. It is called The Teacher Stress Inventory. This instrument contains ten factors that may impact stress in an individual. The stress factors that are being used in this dissertation are: (a) time management, (b) work-related stressors, (c) professional stress, (d) discipline and motivation, (e) professional investment, (f) emotional manifestations, and (g) fatigue manifestations.

Time Management

According to Fimian and Fastenau (1990), time management stressors refer to the individuals who are stressed by time problems. Peeters and Rutte (2005) conducted a study with 180 elementary school teachers from different parts of the Netherlands. The teachers completed a survey about time management, work demands, autonomy, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. There were 87 females and 37 male teachers who completed the questionnaire. The average age was 43.6 years. The results for time management indicated that when work demands are high, time management interaction is strong. The interaction is weaker when work demands are low (Peeters and Rutte, 2005).

Work-Related Stressors

Work-related stressors include: (a) too much work, (b) an overabundances of paperwork, (c) larger classes, and (d) no personal time, all due to aspects of the job (Fimian & Fastenau,

1990). Klassen and Chiu (2010) conducted a study that involved 1430 practicing teachers from western Canada. The sample of teachers were 69% women and 31% men. The average age was 40-44 years. The teachers completed a questionnaire about self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and job stress. Teachers with high teaching stress had low job satisfaction. Additionally, teachers who had high classroom stress had less self-efficacy (Klassen and Chiu, 2010).

Professional Stress

Professional stress includes all the stress factors (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990). Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2015) conducted a study with 523 Norwegian high school teachers. The participants were from three counties in central Norway. There were 58% males and 42% females who completed the questionnaire. The average age was 47.3 years. The study focused on several areas of possible stress including emotional stress, exhaustion, engagement, and motivation to leave teaching, and self-efficacy. The stress topics included: (a) discipline problems, (b) time pressure, (c) low student motivation, (d) conflict with colleagues, (e) lack of supervisory support and trust, (f) student diversity, and (g) value conflict.

The results of the survey showed that none of the stress topics were significantly related to teacher self-efficacy. Only four of the seven stress areas: (a) time pressure, (b) low student motivation, (c) lack of supervisory support, and (d) value conflict, were significantly related to areas of possible stress. Time pressure strongly projected emotional stress. The remaining three stress areas were negatively related to teacher self-efficacy which suggested engagement (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2015).

Discipline and Motivation

This generally means teachers are aware of problems in the classroom. They record student behavior, deal with poor discipline policies in schools, and believe that no one sees them

as having any authority in the school. This means some educators are stressed when working with students who are not motivated and would probably do better if they tried (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990). Westling (2010) conducted a study with 70 teachers, 38 were special education and 32 were general education teachers. They completed a survey about themselves and about their students with challenging behaviors. The most prevalent behaviors that showed up in the survey about the students were: (a) defiance, (b) noncompliance, (c) disruption, and (d) socially unacceptable behavior. The teachers all agreed that behavior could be improved. Teachers also stated in both general education and special education that they did not receive any training to work with this type of student (Westling, 2010).

Professional Investments

This is the time, job satisfaction, achievement, recognition, work, advancement, and growth that an individual contributes to employment. Individuals generally feel they have minimal investment in their careers (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990). Reilly, Dhingra, and Boduszek (2014) conducted a study to predict job satisfaction with 121 Irish primary school teachers. The sample consisted of 87 females and 34 males. The average age was 30.25. The study researched differences in job satisfaction, self-efficacy, self-esteem, and perceived stress. The results found no differences in these factors between male and female teachers. There were no significant findings between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. There was a weak positive finding between perceived stress and self-efficacy (Reilly, Dhingra, & Boduszek, 2014).

Emotional Manifestations

The different ways educators react emotionally to stressful work situations. This means they have strong feelings of insecurity, vulnerability, no coping skills, depression, and anxiety (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990). Wang, Hall, and Rahimi (2015) piloted a study to predict teacher

psychological well-being and health. The participants consisted of 523 teachers from Ontario and Quebec. The average age was 41.31 years and there were 440 females and 83 males. Each participant completed a questionnaire containing questions about self-efficacy and causal attributions for occupational stress. Results showed teachers with higher self-efficacy had a tendency to have higher job satisfaction. Teachers who showed higher stress levels in internal factors had higher levels of emotional exhaustion (Wang, Hall, & Rahimi, 2015).

Fatigue Manifestations

This includes a variety of stress-related fatigue problems. An individual may have a tendency to sleep often, procrastinate, often be tired, be physically exhausted, and feel physical weakness (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990). Yu, Wang, Zhai, Dai, and Yang (2015) performed a study with 387 middle school teachers. This study investigated work stress, job burnout and self-efficacy. Job burnout refers to the fatigue individuals feel both physically and mentally when experiencing heavy stress (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). There were 204 women and 183 men who participated in the study. The average age was 32.77. The participants completed a survey while in a school room setting. The results of this study showed that when teachers have a higher stress level, they have lower self-efficacy and feel physically tired (Yu, Wang, Zhai, Dai, and Yang, 2015).

Accountability Measures in Education

Accountability in education has been continually discussed by various individuals including the public, parents, educators, and politicians (Goertz, 2007; Manna, 2006; McDermott, 2011; McDonnell, 2012; Popham, 1971). According to McDermott (2011), the most basic question regarding accountability in education is deciding who is responsible for what and accountable to whom.

In North Carolina, an accountability program called the New ABCs of Public Education was implemented in 1996 (Jones et al., 1999). This plan introduced a school-based accountability system that increased local control with a focus on reading, writing, and mathematics (Jones et al., 1999). A study was shown by Jones et al., (1999) to determine the impact of this program on teachers' morale and instructional practices. Of the 236 individuals who responded to the survey, more than 76% of the educators believed their morale was lower and their jobs were more stressful than before the accountability program was implemented. In addition, there were various changes in how instruction was delivered to the students, which caused more teacher stress. These changes were the result of teachers trying to adapt their instruction to meet the test (Jones et al., 1999).

With NCLB, both local and federal government took a more dominant role in education where the local school boards no longer held as much authority on decisions in local schools (McDermott, 2011). Behn (2001) indicated that educational policy had changed from looking at finances and fairness to accountability for performance. According to Jones, Jones, Hardin, Chapman, Yarbrough, and Davis (1999), control of the teaching and learning process belonged to the organization that sets the exam. To increase student achievement, the teacher's work had multiplied in response to federal, state, and local policies (Valli & Buese, 2007).

ESSA has replaced NCLB. However, there is still accountability required in reading, math, science, graduation rates, and one indicator determined by each state (Agoratus, 2016). These accountability factors will not change the amount of teacher preparation, but rather the information that the teacher will be disseminating (Dennis, 2016).

CCSS were introduced in school accountability systems and had an important role in American schools (Hess & McShane, 2013). These standards had far reaching affects. According

to Hess and McShane (2013), this included state assessments and accountability, changing K-12 instruction, required changes in teacher preparation, professional development, and more.

Although CCSS is no longer required by ESSA, states do have the option to use them (Agoratus, 2016). CCSS overlapped with efforts to improve education in the United States in different areas including new tests and materials and professional development (Hess & McShane, 2013). The new tests were intended to foster the development of a rich curriculum, address the needs of students with updated instruction, and increase student achievement (Duncan, 2010). According to von der Embse, Sandilos, Pendergast, and Mankin (2016) since accountability policies regarding testing was implemented, teachers have been under increased pressure.

New materials were developed for both teachers and students to support instruction aligned to CCSS (Hess & McShane, 2013). Without these materials the teacher would not be able to teach as effectively as necessary. If poor test results were received, it would not be possible to determine whether the student learned the material or the student was never taught the material (Hess & McShane, 2013). Educators also needed to be taught through professional development so all new materials were presented in the same manner (Hess & McShane, 2013).

Braden and Schroeder (2004) defined high stakes testing as significant consequences that are influenced by test scores. High stakes testing was originally designed to have individual students be accountable for their own test scores instead of the providers of education (e.g. states, school districts, schools) being held accountable for student performance (Braden & Schroeder, 2004). According to Duncan (2010), these tests were designed to measure proficiency in a certain grade and subject. Student performance has also been used as a measure of teacher performance (Ballet, Kelchtermans, & Loughran, 2006; Popham, 1971). This is a difficult way to measure how a teacher performed because of the substantial differences in teaching styles and

weight on teaching materials (Ballet, Kelchtermans, & Loughran, 2006; Popham, 1971).

According to Ballet, Kelchtermans, and Loughran (2006), teachers have been described as working harder because of accountability measures that have been implemented.

Teacher Stress in the Field of Education

Kyriacou (2001) defined teacher stress as negative emotions resulting from a teacher's work. According to Kipps-Vaughan (2013) the definition of teacher stress involves emotions that have a negative connotation regarding work such as tension, anger and depression. Teacher stress can be prompted by the teacher's opinion that what is happening at work is threatening their confidence or happiness (Kyriacou, 2001). What is stressful to one person may not necessarily be stressful to another (Fimian, 1982). High levels of work stress may result in low self-esteem, reduced success, more absenteeism, and lower commitment to the teaching profession (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006). Stress in teaching has also been linked to how committed an educator is to the teaching profession (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006; Jepson & Fonet, 2006). According to De Nobile and McCormick (2006), teacher stress has a negative influence on job satisfaction. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2009) described job satisfaction as being crucial, due to association with work performance. Teachers who have lower work commitment generally are dissatisfied with their work. This in turn has an effect on student motivation (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1993).

Stempien and Loeb (2002) ran a study between 116 general education and special education teachers to determine which teachers are least satisfied. Eight suburban schools near Detroit, Michigan were included in the study. Six of the schools had more general education programs and two of the schools had more special education programs. Results indicated that the special education teachers were less satisfied with their jobs than the general education teachers.

One factor that is related to the special education teacher dissatisfaction is frustration (Stempien & Loeb, 2002). According to Evans (1997), special educators start their careers with the outlook that they will be able to work with any challenges they are faced with. When reality sets in and they cannot meet the challenges, the educator has a sense of not meeting their professional goals. This can result in stress, frustration, and dissatisfaction with their job (Evans, 1997).

Another factor is the amount of paperwork that is required to be done by the special education teacher. Mehrenberg (2013) guided a qualitative study of 18 new special education teachers. The participants were picked at random from throughout the United States. The average age of the participants was 33 years. There were 15 women and three men. Open ended questions were asked during 45 minute interviews to answer three main questions pertaining to paperwork in special education. Paperwork was found to be stressful and tiresome task.

Educators

The teaching profession is full of uncertainties (Kiel, Heimlich, Markowetz, Braun, & Weib, 2015). There are no specific guidelines for either teachers or students to follow. It is impossible for teachers to know everything about all students and their expectations (Kiel et al., 2015).

Gorrell, Bregman, McAllister, and Lipscomb, (1985) completed a study regarding an analysis of perceived stress with 204 elementary and secondary public school teachers and student teachers. In this study the participants rated potentially stressful school situations in five different categories including (a) student progress; (b) personal relations with students; (c) institutional demands; (d) facilities; and (e) supplies. Results of the study showed that elementary

teachers indicated higher levels of stress than secondary teachers, but all teachers rated stress levels at the stressful end of the Likert scale.

The challenges of general education teachers are increased in special education (Kiel et al., 2015). Students in special education have specific needs that often need constant support. The difficulties of teaching students with disabilities can result in high stress for special education teachers (Kiel et al., 2015).

Job stress and job satisfaction have a connection that can be seen in special education (Eighinger, 2000). Many teachers have difficulties in dealing with the disabilities that students have in special education (Crane & Iwanicki, 1986). Special education teachers who left the teaching profession rated higher in perceived teacher stress than teachers who stayed in the profession (Miller, Brownell, & Smith, 1999).

With the higher demands in special education, the job dissatisfaction of special education teachers is higher when compared to the general education teachers (Stempien & Loeb, 2002). Job dissatisfaction is why so many special educators have left the profession (Boe, Cook, & Sunderland, 2008).

Eichinger (2000) indicated that special education teachers need to have certain characteristics. They need to be independent thinkers, decision makers, and be understanding, empathetic, and compassionate (Eichinger, 2000). A study was conducted by Eichinger (2000) to examine job stress and job satisfaction of special education teachers by gender and by social role orientation. The results of the study showed only one significant difference. Females reported more stress than males.

Teacher Self-Efficacy in the Field of Education

According to Henson, Kogan, and Vacha-Haase (2001), a teacher's sense of efficacy is strongly related to the effectiveness of teachers. There are many definitions of teacher self-efficacy in the literature, each resulting from Bandura's definition of self-efficacy (Ross, Cousins, & Gadalla, 1996). Bandura's definition of self-efficacy includes self-perception of needs, wants, actions, and measures to accomplish goals (Bandura, 1977). According to Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, and Hoy (1998), self-efficacy has more to do with self-perception of an individual's ability to perform a task rather than their actual ability to perform the task. An individual who over estimates or under estimates their abilities may influence their performance (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy 1998). Teacher self-efficacy is usually identified in three different areas including: (a) instructional strategies; (b) classroom management; and (c) student engagement (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy (1998). Self-efficacy concerning instructional strategies involves educator beliefs regarding their abilities to teach using various teaching strategies. Self-efficacy regarding classroom management includes the teachers' opinions of their ability to control student behavior in the classroom. Self-efficacy about student engagement involves the belief of the educator regarding their ability to motivate students in the learning process (Wang, Hall, & Rahimi, 2015).

Since the late 1970s, teacher efficacy and teachers' belief in their ability to affect student results, has been considered critical for improving teacher education and education reform (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). According to Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, and Morrison (2012), teacher characteristics, including teacher self-efficacy, can notably predict student results. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) also found teacher self-efficacy to be a source of motivation and commitment, as well as a predictor of effectiveness.

Educators

Guo et al., (2012) performed a study to examine the effects of teacher self-efficacy, education, and years of experience on observed classroom practices relating to the literacy skills of 1043 fifth grade students. This study contained two measurements including teacher support for student learning and the teacher's time in academics. Findings for this study showed teacher self-efficacy was positively linked with teacher support for learning and negatively linked with time in academics. Teacher self-efficacy was also able to be used to predict fifth-grade literacy outcomes.

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) examined the relationships between 255 beginning teachers and experienced teachers in the areas of self-efficacy beliefs and their assessments of key resources and support in teaching. Findings indicated that the experienced teachers had higher self-efficacy beliefs than beginning teachers, although this may be a factor related to experience or inexperience (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007).

Klassen and Wilson et al. (2013) piloted a study with 1187 teachers to examine teacher stress, self-efficacy, and occupational commitment of preservice teachers from two western and two eastern countries. The results of this study indicated that self-efficacy had a positive effect on work stress, which in turn influenced their commitment to continue teaching.

Viel-Ruma, Houchins, Jolivette, and Benson (2010) examined the correlation between reported levels of teacher self-efficacy, collective efficacy, and job satisfaction in special education teachers. This study involved 104 participants in the southeastern United States. Results indicated that teacher self-efficacy had an influence on job satisfaction. Collective efficacy affected teacher self-efficacy, however it did not affect job satisfaction.

Relationship of Teacher Stress to Teacher Self-Efficacy in the Field of Education

According to Saleem and Shah (2011), many teachers define their success according to how their students achieve. A teacher who is successful has higher self-efficacy and is less likely to experience stress. Job satisfaction is also associated with work performance, physical and mental health, and career decisions (Capara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, & Steca, 2013).

According to Klassen and Durksen (2014), the relationship between stress and self-efficacy is not very clear. The way individuals react to stressors is subjective rather than objective. Bandura (1997) believed that the manner in which an individual reacts to stress influences the person's self-efficacy.

Schwarzer and Hallum (2008) thought self-efficacy to be a factor in handling stress, as it protects an individual against stressful situations. Teachers with higher self-efficacy were able to handle stressful situations with students such as misbehaviors (Almog & Shechtman, 2007). Teachers with lower self-efficacy were more apt to leave the teaching profession (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010).

Public school teachers from 100 school districts in the southeastern United States were involved in a study that measured educator stress resulting from high-stakes testing and policies. The 1242 teachers involved in this study were from all grades, K-12. These teachers took a survey that measured teacher stress, teacher sense of self-efficacy, and teacher job satisfaction. The primary focus of the study was to determine if there was a relationship between teacher test stress and job satisfaction, with a possible influence of teacher efficacy. Results indicated a link between teacher stress and job satisfaction. The greater the teacher test stress, the lower the job satisfaction. Teacher self-efficacy was positively related to job satisfaction. There were differing results for stress and job satisfaction depending of the factor of teaching efficacy (classroom

management, instructional practices, student engagement) that were involved. One conclusion for this study involved strengthening teacher efficacy to support teachers in coping with stressors in testing (von der Embse et al., 2016).

Educators

Collie, Shapka, and Perry (2012) led a study regarding how teacher perceptions of school climate and social-emotional learning were related to teacher stress, teacher efficacy, and job satisfaction. There were 664 elementary and secondary teachers who participated in the study. The results showed that stress had an impact on teaching efficacy and job satisfaction. There was a negative relationship between workload stress and job satisfaction, but the perception of teaching efficacy had a positive relationship to job satisfaction. An important finding in this study was the correlation between the stress experienced by teachers due to student behavior and job satisfaction. The stress experienced by teachers due to student behavior did not impact job satisfaction until it was combined with a reduced sense of teaching efficacy. Then, there was a negative impact on job satisfaction.

Klassen and Durksen (2014) showed a mixed methods study to examine the self-efficacy and work stress of pre-service teachers during a teaching practicum. There were 150 pre-service teachers included in the study. Results showed stronger examples of self-efficacy as the teachers gained experience.

Reilly, Dhingra, and Boduszek (2013) directed a study with 121 primary school teachers from Dublin, Ireland. The purposes of the study were: (a) how self-efficacy, self-esteem and job satisfaction relate to each other; (b) how perceived stress compares to teacher self-efficacy, self-esteem, and job satisfaction; and (c) which of the variables (self-efficacy, self-esteem, perceived stress, age, highest level of education, and years of teaching experience) is the best indicator of

job satisfaction (Reilly, Dhingra, & Boduszek, 2013). Results of the study indicated that there was no correlation between self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010) conducted a study with 2249 teachers from 113 elementary and middle schools in Norway. The participants included both general education and special education teachers. One purpose of this study was to identify any correlation between teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout. Another purpose was to see whether teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout had an impact on teacher job satisfaction. The results showed a negative correlation for teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout. Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout also had an impact on teacher job satisfaction.

Leyser, Zeiger, and Romi (2011) examined the impact of self-efficacy on 992 general and special education preservice teachers. The variables analyzed for this study were years of preservice education, experience with children with disabilities, and training in inclusion. The self-efficacy factors used were teaching efficacy, personal efficacy, social efficacy, and low-achiever efficacy. The results showed an effect on self-efficacy in the social area. Preservice education did not result in an increase in teacher self-efficacy. The findings also showed that special education teachers had higher scores in the self-efficacy factors when compared to the general education teachers.

Summary

Teaching is a very stressful occupation (Chaplain, 2008; Kyriacou, 2001). A teacher's job stress may be enhanced by school policies, local laws, state laws, and federal laws (Klassen, 2010). Bandura's definition of self-efficacy includes self-perception of needs, wants, actions, and measures to accomplish goals (Bandura, 1977). It is important to understand how perceived stress and perceived self-efficacy affect a teacher. There is limited research regarding the factors

of perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy interaction without other factors included, and what the results are. The studies that are available contain more variables than just perceived stress and perceived self-efficacy. Understanding how perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy affect educators may lead to a beginning point of understanding what positive variables are working for teachers, and how negative situations such as teacher attrition may be avoided.

CHAPTER THREE:

METHODOLOGY

With the reauthorization and implementation of legislation in education, examinations and evaluations of teacher performance continue to happen on a regular basis (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Gibboney, 2008; Jameson & Huefner, 2006; Zeichner, 2012). Established CCSS guide what students should learn to make sure they are ready for college or the workforce (Test, Cease-Cook, Fowler, & Bartholomew, 2011). Based on these shifting expectations, the teacher's role in education is ever changing and is often perceived as stressful. Teachers are now being held responsible for what schoolchildren learn, based upon student assessment scores (Ornstein, 1986). This intense scrutiny increases a teacher's level of perceived stress. The teacher is under pressure, or perceived stress, to produce college, or workforce ready students regardless of what circumstances may exist in the classroom.

Teaching methods are also a basis for accountability. Many students have different learning needs and abilities (Sirotnek, 2002). These various educational needs must be met while teaching to the CCSS. Based on these different learning needs and abilities, teaching methods need to contain lessons that are differentiated or adapted. How an educator teaches and how a student learns impacts the identified self-efficacy of the educator (Goroshit & Hen, 2014). Current and past educational legislation also has an impact on teacher apparent self-efficacy. McCormick and Ayres (2009) referred to the components of self-efficacy in the special education teacher as: (a) self-motivation, (b) thought patterns and responses, (c) behaviors, and (d) productivity.

The objective of this study was to determine the correlation between perceived teacher stress in these areas: (a) time management, (b) work-related stressors, (c) professional stress, (d)

discipline and motivation (e) professional investment, (f) emotional manifestations, and (g) fatigue manifestations and, perceived teacher self-efficacy in general education teachers and special education teachers. Additionally, the stress levels of the general education teachers and special education teachers were compared to see whether there was a difference. Students in teacher education programs at a local university were asked to complete an on-line questionnaire in Qualtrics.

Research Questions

This study was exploratory in nature; therefore, no predictions were made. The following four research questions were addressed:

Research Question 1: Is there a difference in the levels of stress indicators between general education teachers and special education teachers?

Research Question 2: Is there a difference in the levels of perceived self-efficacy stated on the General Self-Efficacy Scale between general education teachers and special education teachers?

Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between the levels of stress indicators and the perceived self-efficacy of general education teachers?

Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between the levels of stress indicators and the perceived self-efficacy of special education teachers?

Participants

There were 142 participants invited to participate in this study (see Appendix B). However, 17 participants did not answer all questions. The individuals who did not answer all of the questions were eliminated. The total number of participants then changed to 125. They were all students in teacher education programs at a local university. The majority of participants who completed the questionnaire, 103 educators, were female. They represented educational settings including special education and general education. Grade levels included elementary, middle, and secondary. A total of 62 teachers have been teaching for less than one year up to three years. All other educators who completed the questionnaire have taught for more than three years. The majority of respondents were under the age of 35 years old.

All participants completed a digital informed consent form prior to accessing and completing the online questionnaire (see Appendix C). See Table 1 for characteristics and background information. Demographic and background information was collected from all participants (see Table 1).

Table 1. Teacher Demographic and Background Information

Characteristic	Number of Teachers N=125	General Education	Special Education
Gender			
Male	22	11	11
Female	103	45	58
Age of Teacher			
20-25	29	14	15
26-30	25	12	13
31-35	21	9	12
36-40	15	7	8
41-45	12	6	6
46-50	9	5	4
51 and over	14	3	11
Number of Years Teaching			
< - 1 year	16	6	10
1 – 3 years	46	20	26
4 – 6 years	17	9	8
7 – 9 years	13	4	9
10 – 12 years	11	3	8
> 12 years	22	14	8
Licensure Area			
General Education	56	56	69
Special Education	69		
School Level			
Early Childhood (pre-K)	36	18	18
Elementary (K-5)	48	28	20
Middle School (6-8)	16	3	13
Secondary (9-12)	25	7	18
Disability Taught (mark all that apply)			
None			
Autism	53		
Intellectual Disability (ID)	31		
Learning Disability (LD)	42		
Emotional Behavioral Disability (EBD)	20		

Instrumentation

Data for this study were collected from a questionnaire that was created by combining two existing questionnaires (see Appendix A). The existing questionnaires: (a) the *Teacher Stress Inventory* (Fimian, 1984, 1985, 1988), and (b) the *Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale* (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). The first part of the questionnaire regarding teacher stress was used to recognize the strength of different stress factors that affect teachers involved in the study. The second part of the questionnaire regarding teacher self-efficacy identified the self-efficacy traits of the teachers involved in the study.

The Teacher Stress Inventory

The Teacher Stress Inventory (TSI) defines and measures perceived teacher stress in a clear manner (Fimian, 1984, 1985, 1988). The TSI contains 10 sections of Likert-scale statements with three to eight statements in each section totaling 49 statements. A five-point scale was used to measure how strong an individual related to each statement. Permission for the use of Fimian's Teacher Stress Inventory is enclosed (see Appendix D).

The Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale

The Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale measures the strength of an individual's belief in how he/she responds to different situations, and whether they are successful or not (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). The scale contains 10 Likert-scale statements. A four-point scale was used to measure how true the statement was to the individual. The authors granted permission to use the Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale (see Appendix E).

Materials

Qualtrics

A link was provided for participants to access the questionnaire via *Qualtrics*. *Qualtrics* (2013) is a web-based survey software tool used to collect and analyze data. *Qualtrics* has been used in academic settings for experimental research, application and admission processes, classroom research, data analysis, and course evaluations (Qualtrics, 2013). Participants had the option to opt out of the survey if they decided not to participate. The data was stored in *Qualtrics* was also transferred to Excel. Reliability checkers verified the transfer by looking at a hardcopy of the data and comparing it to Excel. The data was then transferred to Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for data analysis.

Design and Procedures

This study was conducted over a four-week period. There were three phases involved in creating the study. These phases were: (a) development of questionnaire, (b) participant solicitation and distribution of questionnaire, and (c) data collection and analysis.

Phase One

The combined questionnaire, *Teacher Stress Inventory* and *The Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale*, was developed and entered into Qualtrics. The questionnaire contained demographic information, 39 statements regarding perceived teacher stress, and 10 statements regarding perceived teacher self-efficacy. An informed consent form was also developed for teachers to complete before they were granted access to the questionnaire. Once the questionnaire was completed, the data was downloaded with the demographic information.

Phase Two

The instrument and protocol for human subjects was submitted to the university Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval. Once approval was received from IRB, a link to the on-line questionnaires was available to general and special education teachers enrolled in teacher education classes at a local university. Elementary, middle, and secondary educators were included as participants in the study. A consent form was completed before the teacher accessed the questionnaire. If the teacher decided not to participate in the study they opted out and did not complete the questionnaire. Continuation in the questionnaire meant the teacher consented to participation in the survey. Participants were asked to complete the questionnaire within a four-week period.

Phase Three

The questionnaire for the study was available for a four-week period. Responses were collected and stored in a spreadsheet. Data was reviewed and downloaded into Excel, a database system. SPSS (SPSS Inc., 2001) was used for statistical analysis of the collected data.

Stress and Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) used for this study included two scales. The *Teacher Stress Inventory* (Fimian, 1984, 1985, 1988) was used to collect information concerning teacher stress including (a) Time Management, (b) Work-Related Stressors, (c) Professional Stress, (d) Discipline and Motivation, (e) Professional Investment, (f) Emotional Manifestations, and (g) Fatigue Manifestations. This scale has a total of 49 statements. For each statement, teachers indicated on a 5-point Likert scale: (1) no strength; not noticeable, (2) mild strength; barely noticeable, (3) medium strength; moderately noticeable, (4) great strength; very noticeable, and (5) major strength; extremely noticeable.

Questions one to seven were about participant demographics. The next set of questions, seven to 14, dealt with time management stressors. These questions represented issues such as (a) over commitment of oneself, (b) impatience due to others, (c) multi-tasking, (d) little or no relaxation time during the day, (e) mind wandering, (f) wasting time, (g) insufficient time, and (h) rushing speech. Work-related stressors encompassed question 15 to 20. The issues addressed pertained to (a) time for lesson or responsibility preparation, (b) too much work, (c) fast pace of the school day, (d) size of caseload or class, (e) lack of time for personal priorities, and (f) too much paperwork. Professional stress factors focused on questions 21 to 25. These questions considered areas such as (a) lack of promotion or advancement opportunities, (b) job progression, (c) respect on the job, (d) inadequate salary, and (e) work recognition. Discipline and motivation stressors included questions 26 to 31. These questions represented frustration issues such as (a) discipline, (b) monitoring student behavior, (c) lack of student motivation, (d) students' laziness, (e) inadequate or poorly defined discipline rules, and (f) rejected authority. Professional investment stressors included questions 32 – 35. These questions examined (a) personal opinions, (b) control over decisions in the classroom or the school, (c) emotional and intellectual stimulation on the job, and (d) opportunities for professional improvement. Emotional investment stressors involved questions 36 – 40. These questions addressed how individuals responded to stress such as (a) feeling insecure, (b) feeling vulnerable, (c) feeling unable to cope, (d) feeling depressed, and (e) feeling anxious. Fatigue manifestation stressors encompassed questions 41 to 45. These questions examined how individuals responded to stress such as (a) sleeping more than usual, (b) procrastinating, (c) becoming fatigued in a very short time, (d) physical exhaustion, (e) physical weakness.

The *Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale* (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) was used to measure the strength of an individual's belief in how he/she responds to different situations, and whether they are successful or not (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). This scale used a 4-point Likert scale for each statement: (1) not at all true, (2) barely true, (3) moderately true, and (4) exactly true. Questions 46 to 55 addressed the self-efficacy issues. Question 46 addressed solving difficult problems in the classroom. Question 47 confirmed opposition at school or in the classroom and whether an individual is able to find a way to get what they want. Question 48 indicated whether an individual can stick to aims and accomplish goals regarding the classroom. Question 49 showed how confident an individual is to deal efficiently with unexpected events in the classroom. Question 50 addressed an individual's resourcefulness in knowing how to handle unforeseen situations in the classroom. Question 51 signified an individual's ability to solve problems in a classroom if effort is put forth. Question 52 indicated an individual's ability to remain calm when facing difficulties in the classroom because of the individual's coping abilities. Question 53 demonstrated the ability of an individual to find several solutions when confronted with a problem in the classroom. Question 54 addressed an individual's ability to think of something to do when in a bind in the classroom. Question 55 showed the ability of an individual to handle any problems or issues that may occur in the classroom.

Treatment of the Data

Responses from the teachers were analyzed to answer the research questions.

Research Question 1: Is there a difference in the levels of stress indicators between general education teachers and special education teachers?

Analysis: Data were submitted to independent t tests to ascertain whether there were statistically and meaningfully significant differences between general education teachers and

special education teachers with respect to the various types of stress. In the analysis, teacher type (e.g. general education, special education) served as the between-subjects factor and the various stress types served as dependent variables.

Research Question 2: Is there a difference in the levels of perceived self-efficacy between general education teachers and special education teachers?

Analysis: An independent t-test was selected to answer this research question. Teacher type (e.g. general education, special education) served as the between-subjects factor and self-efficacy served as the outcome.

Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between the levels of stress indicators and the perceived self-efficacy of general education teachers?

Analysis: A zero-order (bivariate) Pearson-product moment correlation analysis was conducted to answer this research question.

Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between the levels of stress indicators and the perceived self-efficacy of special education teachers?

Analysis: As with the previous research question, a zero-order correlation analysis was conducted to answer this research question.

Limitations

The limitations of this study included the following:

1. Data was collected at one time, but individual perceptions may have changed.
2. The design of the questionnaire and statements may have contributed to a low response rate.
3. Statements in the questionnaire may have been misunderstood.

4. The majority of responses came from educators who have been teaching less than three years.
5. The majority of educators taught students under grade five.
6. The majority of educators were under the age of 35.
7. The majority of educators were female.

CHAPTER FOUR:

RESULTS

The objective of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between perceived teacher stress in these areas: (a) time management, (b) work-related stressors, (c) professional stress, (d) discipline and motivation (e) professional investment, (f) emotional manifestations, and (g) fatigue manifestations, and perceived teacher self-efficacy in general education teachers and special education teachers. Additionally, the stress levels of both general education teachers and special education teachers were compared to see whether there was a difference. Determining this information increases the knowledge base regarding the effects of perceived teacher self-efficacy and perceived teacher stress on general education teachers and special education teachers.

An online questionnaire was developed for use in this study and distributed through *Qualtrics* (Qualtrics, 2013), a web-based online software. Demographic information was collected from both special education teachers and general education teachers. Educators in a southwestern United States school district completed the questionnaire. A total of 142 questionnaires were accessed. However, only 125 (see Table 1) were analyzed due to missing data. Data were collected across a four-week period and the data was analyzed using quantitative methods.

The data from the questionnaires were analyzed to answer the following questions:

Research Question 1: Is there a difference in the levels of stress indicators between general education teachers and special education teachers?

Tests of normality and homogeneity of variance were run to assure that the data met assumptions for parametric tests which they did. Independent t tests were then run for each of the

stressors (see table 2) (i.e., time management, work related stressors, professional stress, discipline and motivation, professional investment, emotional investment, fatigue manifestation) for both general and special educators. Alpha was set at .007 (.05/7) to protect against type 1 errors when conducting seven t-tests. Results of the independent t tests revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between general education teachers and special education teachers in the levels of stress indicators. Table 3 shows the average mean for each category of stressor.

Table 2. Independent Samples t-Test

	t-test for Equality of Means				
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Time_Mgmt	.600	119	.550	.618	1.031
Work_Rel	-.378	122	.706	-.368	.974
Prof	1.075	122	.284	.988	.919
Disc_Mo	2.134	121	.035	2.330	1.092
Pro_Invest	.531	122	.596	.362	.682
Emo_Invest	-.539	117	.591	-.577	1.071
Fatigue_Man	-.849	121	.398	-.794	.936
Self_Efficacy	.370	119	.712	.353	.955

Table 3. Group Statistics

	License	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Time_Mgmt	General Ed	55	27.35	5.860	.790
	Special Ed	66	26.73	5.462	.672
Work_Rel	General Ed	55	21.40	5.373	.725
	Special Ed	69	21.77	5.396	.650
Prof	General Ed	55	15.80	5.129	.692
	Special Ed	69	14.81	5.051	.608
Disc_Mo	General Ed	56	17.55	6.075	.812
	Special Ed	67	15.22	5.989	.732
Pro_Invest	General Ed	56	9.80	3.896	.521
	Special Ed	68	9.44	3.683	.447
Emo_Invest	General Ed	52	12.56	5.596	.776
	Special Ed	67	13.13	5.941	.726
Fatigue_Man	General Ed	55	13.31	5.329	.719
	Special Ed	68	14.10	5.017	.608
Self_Efficacy	General Ed	53	31.87	5.008	.688
	Special Ed	68	31.51	5.363	.650

Research Question 2: Is there a difference in the levels of perceived self-efficacy between general education teachers and special education teachers?

Results of the independent t tests revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference in self-efficacy between general education teachers and special education teachers ($t_{119} = 0.37$, $p = .712$).

Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between the levels of stress indicators and the perceived self-efficacy of general education teachers?

Table 4. General Education Teachers Pearson's r

	Time Management	Work-related Stressors	Professional Stress	Discipline & Motivation	Professional investment	Emotional Manifestations	Fatigue Manifestations
r	.139	.008	.001	-.126	-.254	-.140	-.116
p	.321	.954	.995	.369	.067	.336	.415
N	53	53	52	53	53	49	52

Results of the Pearson's r test revealed that there were no statistically significant relationships between any stress indicators for general education teachers. When r is close to 0 there is a weak relationship between the two variables.

Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between the levels of stress indicators and the perceived self-efficacy of special education teachers?

Table 5. Special Education Teachers Pearson's r

	Time Management	Work-related Stressors	Professional Stress	Discipline & Motivation	Professional investment	Emotional Manifestations	Fatigue Manifestations
r	-.032	-.175	-.031	-.200	-.141	-.185	-.004
p	.799	.153	.803	.107	.255	.137	.976
N	66	68	68	66	67	66	67

Results of the Pearson's r tests revealed that there were no statistically significant differences in stress indicators for special education teachers. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010) conducted a study with 2249 teachers from 113 elementary and middle schools in Norway. The participants included both general education and special education teachers. One purpose of this study was to identify any correlation between teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout. Another

purpose was to see whether teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout had an impact on teacher job satisfaction. The results showed a negative correlation for teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout. Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout also had an impact on teacher job satisfaction.

CHAPTER FIVE:

DISCUSSION

Teaching is a very stressful occupation (Chaplain, 2008; Kyriacou, 2001). There are factors such as school policies, local laws, state laws, and federal laws that contribute to this stress (Klassen, 2010). According to Goroshit and Hen (2014), self-efficacy relates to how an educator teaches and how a student learns. It is important to understand how stress and self-efficacy affect a teacher. The studies that are available have not examined only the variables of perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy and how these two variables affect a teacher (Stempien & Loeb, 2002; Gorrell, Bregman, McAllister, & Lipscomb, 1985; Guo et al., 2012; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007).

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between perceived teacher stress in these areas: (a) time management, (b) work-related stressors, (c) professional stress, (d) discipline and motivation (e) professional investment, (f) emotional manifestations, and (g) fatigue manifestations and, perceived teacher self-efficacy in general and special education teachers. Additionally, the stress levels of both general education teachers and special education teachers were compared to see whether there was a difference. Data were collected using an online questionnaire created for the study.

The questionnaire was developed by combining two existing questionnaires with each author's permission. The existing questionnaires: (a) the *Teacher Stress Inventory* (Fimian, 1984, 1985, 1988), and (b) the *Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale* (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995), were both validated. The first part of the questionnaire addressed stress factors. The second part of the questionnaire addressed perceived self-efficacy.

Stress and Self-Efficacy Indicators for Educators

Question One analyzed the levels of stress indicators stated on the questionnaire between general education and special education teachers. The results of the independent t tests indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between general education teachers and special education teachers in the levels of stress indicators.

Reilly, Dhingra, and Boduszek (2014) conducted a study to predict job satisfaction with 121 Irish primary school teachers. The sample consisted of 87 females and 34 males. The average age was 30.25. The study researched differences in job satisfaction, self-efficacy, self-esteem, and perceived stress. The results found no differences in these factors between male and female teachers. There were no significant findings between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. There was a weak positive finding between perceived stress and self-efficacy (Reilly, Dhingra, & Boduszek, 2014).

Question Two focused on whether there was a difference in the levels of perceived self-efficacy among general education and special education teachers. The results of the independent t-tests indicated there was no statistically significant difference between the self-efficacy of general education teachers and special education teachers.

Public school teachers from 100 school districts in the southeastern United States were involved in a study that measured educator stress resulting from high-stakes testing and policies. The 1242 teachers involved in this study were from all grades, K-12. These teachers took a survey that measured teacher stress, teacher sense of self-efficacy, and teacher job satisfaction. The primary focus of the study was to determine if there was a relationship between teacher test stress and job satisfaction, with a possible influence of teacher efficacy. Results indicated a link between teacher stress and job satisfaction. The greater the teacher test stress, the lower the job

satisfaction. Teacher self-efficacy was positively related to job satisfaction. There were differing results for stress and job satisfaction depending of the factor of teaching efficacy (classroom management, instructional practices, student engagement) that were involved. One conclusion for this study involved strengthening teacher efficacy to support teachers in coping with stressors in testing (von der Embse et al., 2016).

Relationship Between Stress, Self-Efficacy, and Educator

Question Three focused on whether there was a relationship between the stress factors in the questionnaire and perceived self-efficacy for general education teachers. The data indicated that there were no statistically significant relationships between the stress factors and perceived self-efficacy for general education teachers.

In the study led by Klassen et.al, (2013) the results indicated that teacher self-efficacy had a positive effect on teacher stress. However, there was no indication as to whether there was a relationship between general education teachers and special education teachers.

Collie, Shapka, and Perry (2012) led a study regarding how teacher perceptions of school climate and social-emotional learning were related to teacher stress, teacher efficacy, and job satisfaction. There were 664 elementary and secondary teachers who participated in the study. The results showed that stress had an impact on teaching efficacy and job satisfaction. There was a negative relationship between workload stress and job satisfaction, but the perception of teaching efficacy had a positive relationship to job satisfaction. An important finding in this study was the correlation between the stress experienced by teachers due to student behavior and job satisfaction. The stress experienced by teachers due to student behavior did not impact job satisfaction until it was combined with a reduced sense of teaching efficacy. Then, there was a negative impact on job satisfaction.

Question Four examined whether there was an impact in the relationship between the stress factors stated in the questionnaire and perceived self-efficacy for special education teachers. The results indicated that there were no statistically significant results between the stress factors and perceived self-efficacy for special education teachers.

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) examined the relationships between 255 beginning teachers and experienced teachers in the areas of self-efficacy beliefs and their assessments of key resources and support in teaching. Findings indicated that the experienced teachers had higher self-efficacy beliefs than beginning teachers, although this may be a factor related to experience or inexperience (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007).

Conclusions

Based on the collected quantitative data, the following conclusions may be drawn from this study. These conclusions should be considered in light of the noted limitations of the study.

1. There are no statistically significant differences between general education teachers and special education teachers in the stated stress factors.
2. There is no statistically significant difference between the self-efficacy of general education teachers and special education teachers.
3. Based on the research, stress factors and self-efficacy by themselves do not have an impact on how teachers perform. In addition, these two variables alone do not have a positive or negative impact on the teacher. They need to be combined with other factors (e.g., job satisfaction).
4. The majority of responders had been teaching for under three years. This may have skewed the results of the study.

5. The majority of responders are teaching either elementary or early childhood classes. The results of the study may be different with educators teaching older students.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the results of this study, the following areas are suggested for future research:

1. Additional longitudinal research should be completed to determine if there are any trends (i.e., different time of year) related to levels of perceived stress and perceived self-efficacy with another variable (e.g., job satisfaction, teacher training).
2. Further research should be organized to delineate if stress factors and/or self-efficacy combined with another variable (e.g., job satisfaction, teacher training) are contributing to teacher attrition.
3. Further research should be completed to identify whether levels of stress are higher in elementary, middle, or secondary school teachers.
4. Further research should be completed to determine whether levels of stress are related to the number of years educators have been teaching.
5. Further research should be completed to determine whether levels of stress are related to the age of educators.

Summary

Prior to this study, limited research has been performed within the past two decades concerning the relationship between the two variables of teacher perceived stress and teacher perceived self-efficacy by themselves on general education and special education teachers. This study determined whether a teacher's perceived level of self-efficacy had a positive, negative, or

no effect on the teacher's perceived stress level relating to the stress factors of: (a) time management, (b) work-related stressors, (c) professional stress, (d) discipline and motivation (e) professional investment, (f) emotional manifestations, and (g) fatigue manifestations. In addition, the stress levels of both general education teachers and special education teachers were compared to see if there was a difference. Results from the study showed that the level of self-efficacy did not have an impact on the level of stress.

In a study by Reilly, Dhingra, and Boduszek (2013) the researchers wanted to determine how self-efficacy, self-esteem and job satisfaction relate to each other. They also wanted to evaluate how perceived stress compared to teacher self-efficacy, self-esteem, and job satisfaction. Results of this study showed no correlation between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. But nothing was indicated about the relationship between self-efficacy and teacher stress. Collie, Shapka, and Perry, (2012) showed a study that indicated teacher efficacy does have an impact on job satisfaction. According to their study, there was a negative relationship between teacher stress and job satisfaction and a positive relationship between teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Neither study indicated any difference between general education teachers and special education teachers. The relationship between stress and self-efficacy do not have an impact on teachers until other variables are added. Although a teacher might have high self-efficacy, there is no indication that the teacher would have high or low stress as a result. The same would be true for a teacher who has low self-efficacy. There is no indication whether the teacher would have high or low stress.

APPENDIX A:
QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 1:

Participant Demographic Information

Please answer the following questions:

1. Gender

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

2. Age of Teacher

- ☐ 20-25
- ☐ 26-30
- ☐ 31-35
- ☐ 36-40
- ☐ 41-45
- ☐ 46-50
- ☐ 51 and over

3. Number of Years Teacher

- ☐ < 1 year
- ☐ 1-3 years
- ☐ 4-6 years
- ☐ 7-9
- ☐ 10-12 years
- ☐ > 12 years

4. Licensure Area

- ☐ General Education
- ☐ Special Education

5. If Special Education, Disability (ies) taught – Please mark all that apply.

- ☐ Autism
- ☐ Intellectual Disability
- ☐ Learning Disability
- ☐ Emotional Behavioral Disability

6. School Level Taught

- ☐ Early Childhood (pre-K)
- ☐ Elementary (K-5)
- ☐ Middle School (6-8)
- ☐ Secondary (9-12)

SECTION 2:

Perceived Stress Factors for General and Special Educators

This portion of the questionnaire was designed to determine which stress factors may have impact on general education and special education teachers.

Stress Factors: Write your definition of stress factors as defined in your definition with the reference here.

- Select if there is No strength; not noticeable
- Select if there is Mild strength; barely noticeable
- Select if there is Medium strength; moderately noticeable
- Select if there is Great strength; very noticeable
- Select if there is Major strength; extremely noticeable

Please select the choice that best reflects your experience with the statements.

	No strength; not noticeable	Mild strength; barely noticeable	Medium strength; moderately noticeable	Great strength; very noticeable	Major strength; extremely noticeable
7. I easily overcommit myself.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
8. I become impatient if others do things too slowly.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
9. I have to try doing more than one thing at a time.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
10. I have little time to relax/enjoy the time of day.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
11. I think about unrelated matters during conversations.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
12. I feel uncomfortable wasting time.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5

Please select the choice that best reflects your experience with the statements.	No strength; not noticeable	Mild strength; barely noticeable	Medium strength; moderately noticeable	Great strength; very noticeable	Major strength; extremely noticeable
13. There is not enough time to get things done.					
General Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
Special Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
14. I rush in my speech.					
General Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
Special Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
15. There is little time to prepare for my lessons/responsibilities.					
General Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
Special Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
16. There is too much work to do.					
General Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
Special Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
17. The pace of the school day is too fast.					
General Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
Special Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
18. My caseload/class is too big.					
General Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	
Special Education Teachers 1	2	3	4	5	

Please select the choice that best reflects your experience with the statements.

	No strength; not noticeable	Mild strength; barely noticeable	Medium strength; moderately noticeable	Great strength; very noticeable	Major strength; extremely noticeable
19. My personal priorities are being shortchanged due to time demands.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
20. There is too much administrative paperwork in my job.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
21. I lack promotion and/or advancement opportunities.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
22. I am not progressing in my job as rapidly as I would like.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
23. I need more status and respect on my job.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
24. I receive an inadequate salary for the work I do.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5

Please select the choice that best reflects your experience with the statements.

	No strength; not noticeable	Mild strength; barely noticeable	Medium strength; moderately noticeable	Great strength; very noticeable	Major strength; extremely noticeable
25. I lack recognition for the extra work and/or good teaching I do.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
26. I feel frustrated because of discipline problems in my classroom.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
27. I feel frustrated having to monitor pupil behavior.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
28. I feel frustrated because some students would do better if they tried.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
29. I feel frustrated when I attempt to teach students who are poorly motivated.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5

Please select the choice that best reflects your experience with the statements.

	No strength; not noticeable	Mild strength; barely noticeable	Medium strength; moderately noticeable	Great strength; very noticeable	Major strength; extremely noticeable
30. I feel frustrated because of inadequate/poorly defined discipline problems.					
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
31. I feel frustrated when my authority is rejected by pupils/administration.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
32. My personal opinions are not sufficiently aired.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
33. I lack control over decisions made about classroom/school matters.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
34. I am not emotionally/intellectually stimulated on the job.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1

Please select the choice that best reflects your experience with the statements.

	No strength; not noticeable	Mild strength; barely noticeable	Medium strength; moderately noticeable	Great strength; very noticeable	Major strength; extremely noticeable
35. I lack opportunities for professional development.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
36. I respond to stress by feeling insecure.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
37. I respond to stress by feeling vulnerable.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
38. I respond to stress by feeling unable to cope.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
39. I respond to stress by feeling depressed.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
40. I respond to stress by feeling anxious.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1

Please select the choice that best reflects your experience with the statements.

	No strength; not noticeable	Mild strength; barely noticeable	Medium strength; moderately noticeable	Great strength; very noticeable	Major strength; extremely noticeable
41. I respond to stress by sleeping more than usual.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
42. I respond to stress by procrastinating.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
43. I respond to stress by becoming fatigued in a very short time.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
44. I respond to stress with physical exhaustion.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
45. I respond to stress with physical weakness.					
General Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Special Education Teachers	5	4	3	2	1

SECTION 3:

Self-Efficacy Scale for Educators

This portion of the questionnaire was designed to determine which characteristics of self-efficacy were most evident for general education and special education teachers in relation to posed stress factors.

Self-Efficacy: Write your operational definition with a reference here.
--

- Select if it is Not at all true
- Select if it is Barely true
- Select if it is Moderately true
- Select if it is Exactly true

Please select the choice that best reflects your experience with the statements.

	Not at all true	Barely true	Moderately true	Exactly true
46. I can always manage to solve difficult problems in my classroom if I try hard enough.				
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
47. If someone opposes me at school or in my classroom, I can find means to get what I want.				
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
48. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals regarding my classroom.				
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
49. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events in my classroom.				
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
50. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations as they happen in my classroom.				
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4

Please select the choice that best reflects your experience with the statements.	Not at all true	Barely true	Moderately true	Exactly true
51. I can solve most problems in my classroom if I invest the necessary effort.				
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
52. I can remain calm when facing difficulties in my classroom because I can rely on my coping abilities.				
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
53. When I am confronted with a problem in my classroom, I can usually find several solutions.				
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
54. When I am in a bind in my classroom, I can usually think of something to do.				
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
55. No matter what comes my way in my classroom, I'm usually able to handle it.				
General Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX B:
PARTICIPANT INVITATION



Dear Survey Participant:

You are being invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to determine if there is any correlation between perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy for general and special educators.

Participation involves the completion of an online questionnaire; containing 49 items. It will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. No identifying information will be collected.

If you wish to participate, please [click here](#).

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact Dr. Jeffrey Gelfer at 702-895-1327. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Office of Research Integrity – Human Subjects Research, at (702) 895-0964.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Gelfer, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

Joanne Ringer, M.Ed.
Student Investigator

Department of Educational and Clinical Studies
Box 453014 • 4505 S. Maryland Parkway • Las Vegas, NV 89154-3014
Tel: 702-895-3205 • Fax: 702-895-0984

APPENDIX C:
INFORMED CONSENT

UNLV
EXEMPT RESEARCH STUDY
INFORMATION SHEET
Department of Educational & Clinical Studies

TITLE OF STUDY: An Analysis of Stress and Self-Efficacy Experienced by General and Special Educators

INVESTIGATOR(S) AND CONTACT PHONE NUMBER: Jeffrey Gelfer, Ph.D. and Joanne Ringer, M.Ed. 702-895-1327

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is any correlation between perceived teacher stress and perceived teacher self-efficacy for general and special educators. This study will survey active practicing general and special education teachers in the Clark County School District. You are being asked to participate in the study because you meet the following criteria: You are currently an active practicing teacher (general or special education) in the Clark County School District.

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following: complete an online questionnaire containing 49 items.

This study includes only minimal risks. The study will take 15 minutes of your time. You will not be compensated for your time. Giving consent below will allow you access to the questionnaire. Once started, the questionnaire must be completed in one session. Incomplete questionnaires will not be included in the research. You may access the questionnaire only one time. All responses are confidential and cannot be traced to the individual respondents.

For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact **the UNLV Office of Research Integrity – Human Subjects at 702-895-2794, toll free at 877-895-2794, or via email at IRB@unlv.edu.**

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may withdraw at any time. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the research study.

Participant Consent:

- ☐ Yes, I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. I am at least 18 years of age. (By clicking here, you will be directed to the questionnaire.)
- ☐ No, I do not want to participate at this time. (By clicking here, you will exit the questionnaire.)

APPENDIX D:
PERMISSION FROM FIMIAN

file:///F:/Teacher%20Stress%20Inventory%20-%20dissertation.htm

Welcome to the *Teacher Stress Inventory* Site...

Thanks for your interest in the Teacher Stress Inventory (TSI). Though the Inventory is out of print, there is still considerable interest in its use among Master- and Doctoral-level students. As a support to their research activities, TSI-related information is being offered here free of charge. Also offered is the use of the Inventory, at no charge, for research purposes.

Permission for Use

Consider this memo as permission to use the TSI at no cost to you; you may want to print this for your committee and for the Graduate School. Usually, they want and need some proof that you are legally using a scale. Please honor the copyright policy by using the Inventory for only research and other not-for-profit purposes. You will need to provide us with basic information about who you are, however, so that we can stay in touch with you...

If you haven't already done so, take a moment and contact Michael
at Fimian@InstructionalTech.net to inform him of your interest in using the TSI.

APPENDIX E:
PERMISSION FROM SCHWARZER



Freie Universität Berlin, Gesundheitspsychologie (PF 10),
Habelschwerdter Allee 45, 14195 Berlin, Germany

Fachbereich Erziehungs-
wissenschaft und Psychologie
- Gesundheitspsychologie -

Professor Dr. Ralf Schwarzer
Habelschwerdter Allee 45
14195 Berlin, Germany

Fax +49 30 838 55634
health@zedat.fu-berlin.de
www.fu-berlin.de/gesund

Permission granted

to use the General Self-Efficacy Scale for non-commercial research and development purposes. The scale may be shortened and/or modified to meet the particular requirements of the research context.

<http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/selfscal.htm>

You may print an unlimited number of copies on paper for distribution to research participants. Or the scale may be used in online survey research if the user group is limited to certified users who enter the website with a password.

There is no permission to publish the scale in the Internet, or to print it in publications (except 1 sample item).

The source needs to be cited, the URL mentioned above as well as the book publication:

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp.35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.

Professor Dr. Ralf Schwarzer
www.ralfschwarzer.de

REFERENCES

- ACT, (2012). *The condition of college & career readiness*. Retrieved from <https://www.act.org/research/policy/college-career-readiness-report-2012>
- Albee, J. J., & Pivotal, J. A. (2003). Management process for defining and monitoring teacher dispositions. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 17, 346-356.
- Allen, J., Altwerger, B., Edelsky, C., Larson, J., Rios-Aguilar, C., Shannon, P., & Yatvine, J. (2007). Focus on policy: Taking a stand on NCLB. *Language Arts*, 84, 456-464.
- Almog, O., & Shechtman, Z. (2007). Teachers; democratic and efficacy beliefs and styles of coping with behavioral problems of pupils with special needs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 22, 115-129.
- Anisman, H., & Merali, Z. (1999). Understanding stress: Characteristics and caveats. *Alcohol Research & Health*, 23, 241-249.
- Ballet, K., Kelchtermans, G., & Loughran, J. (2006). Beyond intensification towards a scholarship of practice: Analyzing changes in teachers' work lives. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 12, 209-229.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Behn, R. (2001). *Rethinking democratic accountability*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Bembenuitty, H. (2007). Teachers' self-efficacy and self-regulation. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 11, 155-161.

- Betoret, F. D. (2006). Stressors, self-efficacy, coping resources, and burnout among secondary school teachers in Spain. *Educational Psychology, 26*, 519-539.
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (2009). *College Ready*. Retrieved from <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/learning/Documents/College-ready-education-plan-brochure.pdf>
- Billingsley, B. S. (2004). Special education teacher retention and attrition: A critical analysis of the research literature. *The Journal of Special Education, 38*, 39-55.
- Billingsley, B., Carlson, E., & Klein, S. (2004). The working conditions and induction support of early career special educators. *Exceptional Children, 70*, 333-347.
- Billingsley, B. S., Griffin, C. C., Smith, S. J., Kamman, M., & Israel, M. (2009). A review of teacher induction in special education: Research, practice, and technology solutions. (NCIPP Doc. No. RS-1). Retrieved March 2, 2010, from University of Florida, National Center to Inform Policy and Practice in Special Education Professional Development Website: <http://www.ncipp.org/reports>
- Boe, E. E., Bobbitt, S. A., Cook, L. H., Whitener, S. D., & Weber, A. L. (1997). Why didst thou go? Predictors of retention, transfer, and attrition of special and general education teachers from a national perspective. *The Journal of Special Education, 30*, 390-411.
- Boe, E. E., Cook, L. H., & Sunderland, R. J. (2008). Teacher turnover: Examining exit attrition, teaching area transfers and school migration, *Exceptional Children, 75*, 7-31.
- Bomer, R., & Maloch, B. (2011). Relating policy to research and practice: The common core standards. *Language Arts, 89*, 38-43.

- Boyer, L., & Gillespie, P. (2000). Keeping the committed: The importance of induction and support programs for new special educators. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 33*, 10–15.
- Braden, J. P., & Schroeder, J. L. (2004). High-stakes testing ad no child left behind: Information and strategies for educators. *National Association of School Psychologists, 3*, 73-77.
- Brownell, M. T., & Pajares, M. F. (1999). Teacher efficacy and perceived success in mainstreaming students with learning and behavior problems. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 22*, 154–164.
- Brownell, M. T., & Smith, S. W. (1993). Understanding special education teacher attrition: A conceptual model and implications for teacher educators. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 16*, 270-282.
- Bushaw, W. J., & Lopez, S. J. (2010). A time for change: The 42nd annual phi delta kappa/gallup poll of the public’s attitudes toward the public schools. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 92*, 9-26.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., & Steca, P. (2003). “Efficacy beliefs as determinants of teachers’ job satisfaction”. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 821.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students’ academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*, 473-490.
- Chaplain, R. P. (2008). Stress and psychological distress among trainee secondary teachers in England. *Educational Psychology, 28*, 195-209.
- Clark, M. A., Michel, J. S., Early, R. J., & Baltes, B. B. (2014). Strategies for coping with work stressors and family stressors: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 29*, 617-638.

- Clarke, A., Triggs, V., & Nielsen, W. (2014). Cooperating teacher participation in teacher education a review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 84*, 163-202.
- Claycomb, C. (2000). High-quality urban school teachers: What they need to enter and to remain in hard-to-staff schools. *The State Education Standard, 1*, 17–20.
- Cohen, S, Janicki-Deverts, D., & Miller G. E. (2007). Psychological stress and disease. *JAMA, 298*, 1685-1687.
- Coladarci, T., & Breton, W. (1997). Teacher efficacy, supervision, and the special education resource room teacher. *Journal of Educational Research, 90*, 230-240.
- Crane, S. J., & Iwanicki, E. F. (1986). Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and burnout among special education teachers. *Remedial and Special Education, 7*, 24-31.
- Cunningham, P., & Allington, R. L. (2015). *Classrooms that work: They can all read and write* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Cupertino, A. P., Berg, C., Gajewski, B., Hui, S., K. A., Richter, K., Catley, D. (2012). Change in self-efficacy, autonomous and controlled motivation predicting smoking. *Journal of Health Psychology, 17*, 640-652.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*, 35-47.
- Davis, J., & Wilson, S. M. (2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 73*, 349-353.
- DeAngelis, K. J., & Presley, J. B. (2011). Toward a more nuanced understanding of new teacher attrition. *Education and Urban Society, 43*, 598-656.

- DeLamater, J. D., & SpringerLink (Online service). (2006). *Handbook of social psychology*.
Dordrecht: Springer.s
- Dennis, D. (2016). Learning from the past: What ESSA has the chance to get right. *The Reading Teacher*, 70, 395-400.
- De Nobile, J. J. & McCormick, J. (2006). Job satisfaction and occupational stress in Catholic primary schools: Implications for school leadership, *Leading and Managing*, 13, 31-41.
- Duncan, A. (2010). *Beyond the bubble tests: The next generation of assessments*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Eichinger, J. (2000). Job stress and satisfaction among special education teachers: effects of gender and social role orientation. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 47, 397-412.
- Elias, S. M., Barney, C. E., & Bishop, J. W. (2013). The treatment of self-efficacy among psychology and management scholars. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 811-822.
- Emery, D. W., & Vandenberg, B. (2010). Special education teacher burnout and act. *International Journal of Special Education*, 25, 119-131.
- Eppley, K. (2015). Seven traps of the common core state standards. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 59, 207-216.
- Erdem, E., & Demirel, O. (2007). Teacher self-efficacy belief. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 35, 573-586.
- Evans, L. (1997). Understanding teacher morale and job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 831-845.
- Farber, B. A. (2000). Treatment strategies for different types of teacher burnout. *Journal*

- of Clinical Psychology*, 10, 675-689.
- Fimian, M. J. (1982). What is teacher stress? *The Clearing House*, 56, 101-105.
- Fowler, C. H., Test, D. W., Cease-Cook, J., Toms, O., Bartholomew, A., & Scroggins, L. (2014). Policy implications of high school reform on college and career readiness of youth with disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 25, 19-29.
- Franquiz, M. E., & Ortiz, A. A. (2016). Co-editors' introduction: Every student succeeds act – A policy shift. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39, 1-3.
- Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. D. (2009). Including students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Friedman, I. A., & Farber, B. A. (1992). Professional self-concept as a predictor of teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86, 28-35.
- Gavriel, J. (2016). Perceived self-efficacy. *Education for primary care*, 27, 144-145.
- Gecas, V. (1989). The social psychology of self-efficacy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 291-316.
- Geving, A. M. (2007). Identifying the types of student and teacher behaviors associated with teacher stress. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 624-640.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on academic achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 479-507.
- Gorrell, J. J., Bregman, N. J., McAllister, H. A., & Lipscomb, T. J. (1985). An analysis of perceived stress in elementary and secondary student teachers and full-time teachers. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 54, 11-14.

- Gray, L., and Taie, S. (2015). *Public School Teacher Attrition and Mobility in the First Five Years: Results From the First Through Fifth Waves of the 2007–08 Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study* (NCES 2015-337). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved [date] from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.
- Guo, Y., Connor, C. M., Yang, Y., Roehrig, A. D., & Morrison, F. J. (2012). The effects of teacher qualification, teacher self-efficacy, and classroom practices on fifth graders' literacy outcomes. *The Elementary School Journal*, 113, 3-24.
- Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B. & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 495-513.
- Heilig, J. V., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Accountability Texas-style: The progress and learning of urban minority students in a high-stakes testing context. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 30, 75-110.
- Henson, R. K., Kogan, L. R., & Vacha-Haase, T. (2001). A reliability generalization study of the teacher efficacy scale and related instruments. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 61, 404-420.
- Hess, F. M., & McShane, M. Q. (2013). Common core in the real world. *Kappan Magazine*, 95, 61-66.
- Hirsch, E., Rorrer, A., Sindelar, P. T., Dawson, S. A., Heretick, J., & Jia, C. L. (2009). State policies to improve the mentoring of beginning special education teachers. (NCIPP Doc. No. PA- 1). Retrieved March 10, 2010, from University of Florida, National Center to Inform Policy and Practice in Special Education Professional Development Website: <http://www.ncipp.org/reports>.

- Holahan, C. J., Moos, R. H., Holahan, C. K., Brennan, P. L., & Schutte, K. K. (2005). Stress generation. Avoidance, coping, and depressive symptoms. A 10-year model. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*, 658-666.
- Horvat, E. M., & Baugh, D. E. (2015). Not all parents make the grade in today's schools. *Kappan, 96*, 8-13.
- Horvat, E. M., Weininger, E. B., & Lareau, A. (2003). From social ties to social capital: Class differences in the relationships between schools and parent networks. *American Education Research Journal, 40*, 319-351.
- Howard, S., & Johnson, B. (2004). Resilient teachers; resisting stress and burnout. *Social Psychology of Education, 7*, 399-420
- Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy du-ring the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 343-356.
- Hyun, E. (2003). What does the no child left behind act mean to early childhood teacher educators? A call for a collective professional rejoinder. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 31*, 119-125.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 *et seq*
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*, 499-534.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Is there really a teacher shortage?* Washington DC. Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Jacobsen, R., & Saultz, A. (2012). The polls-trends: Who should control education? *Public Opinion Quarterly, 76*, 379-390.

- Jepson, E., & Forrest, S. (2006). Individual contributory factors in teacher stress: The role of achievement striving and occupational commitment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 183-197.
- Jones, M. G., Jones, B. D., Hardin, B., Chapman, L., Yarbrough, T., & Davis, M. (1999). The impact of high-stakes testing on teachers and students in North Carolina. *Phi Delta Kappan*, November, 1999, 199-203.
- Johnson, S., Cooper, C., Cartwright, S., Donald, I., Taylor, P., & Millet, C. (2005). The experience of work-related stress across occupations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20, 178-187.
- Jones, M. G., Jones, B. D., Hardin, B., Chapman, L., Yarbrough, T., & Davis, M. (1999). The impact of high-stakes testing on teachers and students in North Carolina. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 199-203.
- Joseph, R., (2000). Stress Free Teaching, A Practical Guide to Tackling Stress in Teaching < Lecturing and Tutoring. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Jowett, S., & Baginsky, M. (1991). Parents and education –issues, options and strategies. *Educational Research*, 33, 199-204.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 80-92.
- Kaff, M. S. (2004). Multitasking is multi-taxing. Why special educators are leaving the field. *Preventing School Failure*, 48, 10-17.
- Katsiyannis, A., Zhang, D., & Conroy, M. (2003). Availability of special education

- teachers: Trends and issues. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24, 246-253.
- Kelly, N., & Antonio, A. (2016). Teacher peer support in social network sites. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 56, 138-149.
- Kiel, E., Heimlich, U., Markowetz, R., Braun, A., & Weib, S. (2015). How to cope with stress in special needs education? Stress-inducing dysfunctional cognitions of teacher students: the perspective of professionalization. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 31, 202-219.
- King-Sears, M. E. (2008). Facts and fallacies: differentiation and the general education curriculum for students with special educational needs. *Support for Learning*, 23, 55-62.
- Kipps-Vaughan, D. (2013). Supporting teachers through stress management. *The Education Digest*, 79, 43.
- Klassen, R. M., & Anderson, C. J. K. (2009). How times change: secondary teachers' job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in 1962 and 2007. *British Educational Research Journal*, 35, 745-759.
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects of teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102, 741-756.
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2011). The occupation commitment and intention to quit of practicing and pre-service teachers: Influence of self-efficacy, job stress, and teaching context. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36, 114-129.
- Klassen, R., Wilson, E., Siu, A. F. Y., Hannok, W., Wong, M. W., Wongsri, N., ...Janssen, A. (2013). Preservice teachers' work stress, self-efficacy, and occupational commitment in four countries. *European Journal of Psychological Education*, 28, 1289-1309.

- Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 53, 27-35.
- Lee, V. E., Dedrick, R. F., & Smith, J. B. (1991). The effect of the social organization of schools on teachers' efficacy and satisfaction. *Sociology of Education*, 64, 190-208.
- Lee, Y., Patterson, P. P., & Vega, L. A. (2011). Perils to self-efficacy perceptions and teacher-preparation quality among special education intern teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38, 61-76.
- Lewis, R. (1999). Teachers coping with the stress of classroom discipline. *School Psychology of Education*, 3, 155-171.
- Mahan, P. L., Mahan, M. P., Park, N., Shelton, C., Brown, K. C., & Weaver, M. T. (2010). Work environment stressors, social support, anxiety, and depression among secondary school teachers. *AAOHN Journal*, 58, 197-205.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- McCormick, J., & Ayres, P. L. (2009). Teacher self-efficacy and occupational stress. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47, 463-476.
- McDermott, K. A. (2011). *High stakes reform: The politics of educational accountability*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- McDonald, D. (2002). School choice options for parents: Round two. *Momentum*, 33, 75-76.
- McDonnell, L. M. (2012). Educational accountability and policy feedback. *Educational Policy*, 27, 170-189.

- McLeskey, J., Waldron, N. L., So, T.-S. H., Swanson, K., & Loveland, T. (2001). Perspectives of teachers toward inclusive school programs. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 24, 108–115.
- McLeskey, J., Tyler, N. C., & Flipping, S. S. (2004). The supply and demand for special education teachers: A review of research regarding the chronic shortage of special education teachers. *The Journal of Special Education*, 38, 5-21.
- Mehrenberg, R. L. (2013). Red tape and green teachers: The impact of paperwork on novice special education teachers. *International Journal of Special Education*, 28, 80-87.
- Miller, M. D., Brownell, M. T., & Smith, S. W. (1999). Factors that predict teachers staying in, leaving, or transferring from the special education classroom. *Exceptional Children*, 65, 201-218.
- Minke, K. M., Sheridan, S. M., Kim, E. M., Ryoo, J. H., & Koziol, N. A. (2014). Congruence in parent-teacher relationships: The role of shared perceptions. *The Elementary School Journal*, 114, 527-546.
- Mulholland, J., & Wallace, J. (2001). Teacher induction and elementary science teaching; Enhancing self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 243-261.
- Nasser-Abu Alhija, F. (2015). Teacher stress and coping: The role of personal and job characteristics. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 185, 374-380.
- Nichols, A. S., & Sosnowsky, F. L. (2002). Burnout among special education teachers in self-contained cross-categorical classrooms. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 25, 71-86.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. 107-110, 1001, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).
- O'Donnell, M., Lambert, R. G., & McCarthy, C. J. (2008). School poverty status, time of

- year, and elementary teachers' perceptions of stress. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 102, 152-160.
- Ornstein, A. C. (1986). Teacher accountability trends and policies. *Education and Urban Society*, 18, 221-229.
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 543-578.
- Pearlin, L. I. (1989). The sociological study of stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 30, 241-256.
- Pettegrew, L. S., & Wolf, G. E. (1982). Validating measures of teacher stress. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 373-396.
- Pithers, R. T., & Soden, R. (1998). Scottish and Australian teacher stress and strain: A comparative study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, 269-279.
- Plash, S., & Piotrowski, C. (2007). Retention issues: A study of Alabama special education teachers. *Education*, 127, 125-128.
- Platsidou, M. & Agaliotis, I. (2017). Does empathy predict instructional assignment-related stress: A study in special and general education teachers. *International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education*, 64, 57-75.
- Popham, W. J. (1971). Teaching skill under scrutiny. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 52, 599-602.
- Prabhat S. (2011). Difference between psychology and sociology. DifferenceBetween.net. January 17, 2011 < <http://www.differencebetween.net/science/difference-between-psychology-and-sociology>.
- Prilleltensky, I., Neff, M., & Bessell, A. (2016). Teacher stress: What it is, why it's important, how it can be alleviated. *Theory Into Practice*, 55, 104-111.

- Ritz, R., Burris, S., Brashears, T., & Frazee, S. (2013). The effects of a time management professional development seminar on stress and job satisfaction of beginning agriscience teachers in West Texas. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 5, 1-14.
- Ross, J. A., Cousins, J. B., & Gadalla, T. (1996). Within-teacher predictors of teacher efficacy. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 12, 385-400.
- Saleem, A., & Shah, A. (2011). Self-efficacy as a stress-coping mechanism among teachers: A critical literature review. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5, 13435-13441.
- Schwitzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology*, 57, 152-171.
- Sirotnik, K. A. (2002). Promoting responsible accountability in schools and education. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 83, 662-673.
- 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.
- Skaalvik, E. M. & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1059-1069.
- Skaalvik, E. M. & Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 1029-1038.
- Skaalvik, E. M. & Skaalvik, S. (2016). Teacher stress and teacher self-efficacy as predictors of engagement, emotional exhaustion, and motivation to leave the teaching profession. *Creative Education*, 7, 1785-1799.

- Smith, T. (2007). How do state-level induction and standards-based reform policies affect induction experiences and turnover among new teachers. *American Journal of Education*, 113, 273-311.
- Smith-Davis, J. & Billingsley, B. (1993). The supply/demand puzzle. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 16, 205-220.
- Soodak, L. C., Podell, D. M., & Lehman, L. R. (1998). Teacher, student and school attributes as predictors of teachers' responses to inclusion. *Journal of Special Education*, 31, 480-497.
- Spielberger, C., Spielberger, C., & Spielberger C. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of applied psychology*. Oxford, United Kingdom; Elsevier Science & Technology.
- Stempien, L. R., & Loeb, R. C. (2002). Differences in job satisfaction between general education and special education teachers. *Remedial and Special Education*, 23, 258-267.
- Sutton, R. I. (1984). Job stress among primary and secondary schoolteachers. *Work and Occupations*, 11, 7-28.
- Swich, K., & Hanley, P. (1980). *Stress and the Classroom Teacher*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Tatar, N., & Buldur, S. (2013). Improving pre-service science teachers' self-efficacy about the use of alternative assessment: Implication for theory and practice. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 12, 452-464.
- Test, D. W., Cease-Cook, J., Fowler, C. H., & Bartholomew, A. (2011). Tool for college and career ready standards and secondary transition planning for students with disabilities: 101. *National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center*.
- Thornton, B., Peltier, G., & Medina, R. (2007). Reducing the special education teacher

- shortage. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 80, 233-238.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 944-956.
- Vaezi, S., & Fallah, N. (2011). The relationship between self-efficacy and stress among Iranian E.F.L. teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Resource*, 2, 1168-1174.
- Valli, L., & Buese, D. (2007). The changing roles of teachers in an era of high-stakes accountability. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44, 519-558.
- Viel-Ruma, K., Houchins, D., Jolivette, K., & Benson, G. (2010). Efficacy beliefs of special educators: The relationships among collective efficacy, teacher self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33, 225-233.
- von der Embse, N. P., Sandilos, L. E., Pendergast, L., & Mankin, A. (2016). Teacher stress, teaching-efficacy, and job satisfaction in response to test-based educational accountability policies. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 50, 308-317.
- Wang, H., Hall, N. C., & Rahimi, S. (2015). Self-efficacy and causal attributions in teachers: Effects on burnout, job satisfaction, illness, and quitting intentions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 47, 120-130.

- Westling, D. L. (2010). *Remedial and Special Education*, 31, 48-63.
- Wheatley, K. F. (2002). The potential benefits of teacher efficacy doubts for educational reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 5-22.
- Whitaker, S. D. (2000). What do first-year special education teachers need? Implications for induction programs. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 33, 28-36.
- Whitaker, S. D. (2000). Mentoring beginning special education teachers and the relationship to attrition. *Exceptional Children*, 66, 546-566.
- Wolters, C. A., & Daugherty, S. G. (2007). Goal structures and teachers' sense of efficacy: Their relation and association to teaching experience and academic level. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99, 181-193.
- Yu, X., Wang, P., Zhai, X., Dai, H., & Yang, Q. (2015). The effect of work stress on job burnout among teachers: The mediating role of self-efficacy. *Social Indicators Research*, 122, 701-708.
- Yeo, L. S., Ang, R. P., Chong, W. H., Huan, V. S., & Quek, C. L. (2008). Teacher efficacy in the context of teaching low achieving students. *Current Psychology*, 27, 192-204.
- Zabel, R. H., & Zabel, M. K. (2001). Revisiting burnout among special education teachers: Do age, experience, and preparation still matter? *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 2, 128-139.
- Zhang, D., Wang, Q., Losinski, M., & Katsiyannis, A. (2014). An examination of preservice teachers' intentions to pursue careers in special education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65, 156-171.
- Zhang, Y. (2002). Administrative strategies for occupational stress on secondary and elementary school teachers. *Modern Elementary and Secondary School*

Education, 56-57.

CURRICULUM VITAE

JOANNE L. RINGER

(702) 557-7828

jojlr@yahoo.com

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Special Education

Department of Educational and Clinical Studies

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Graduation Date: May 13, 2017

Dissertation Title: *An Analysis of Stress and Self-Efficacy Experienced by General and Special Educators*

Areas of Specialized Expertise: Autism, Learning Disabilities, and Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities

M. Ed., Special Education

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada

May 2009

B.S., Management

Cardinal Stritch University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

December 1994

EDUCATIONAL CERTIFICATIONS

Special Education Teacher Certification

2009 - Present

Special Education Teacher Generalist, K-12

2009 - Present

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

2014 - Present

Special Education Teacher, Specialized Learning Disabilities (SLD)

Clark County School District, Silverado High School

2011-2014

Special Education Teacher, Specialized Emotionally Challenged (SEC)

Clark County School District, Chaparral High School

2008-2011

Special Education Teacher, Specialized Emotionally Challenged (SEC)

Clark County School District, Liberty High School

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Council on Learning Disabilities

Division on Learning Disabilities

Council for Exceptional Children

Division on Autism and Developmental Disabilities

Division on Technology and Media

Division on Learning Disabilities

Division on Teacher Education

National Association Multicultural Education

TEACHING

2015

On-Line Instructor

Educational & Clinical Studies Department

University of Nevada Las Vegas

ESP 701: Introduction to Special Education and Legal Issues

2016

Touro University

ADSV 603: Characteristics and Developmental Progression of Students with ASD

Research Assistantships

Spring 2013

Effects of Cooperation Games on Social Interactions of Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders

Reliability Assessment, Data Collection (Quantitative)

Principle Investigators: Pierce, Marx, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Spring 2013

An Analysis of Co-Teaching Instruction Provided in Teacher Education and Inservice Training for Special Education and General Education Teachers

Reliability Assessment, Data Collection (Quantitative)

Principle Investigators: Higgins, Howerter, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Summer 2016

Reliability Assessment, Data Collection (Quantitative)

Principle Investigators: Morgan, Billows, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Refereed Academic Conference Presentations

Co-Presenter (with Zionch, A., and Juniel, P.), “Research-based Technological Applications to Engage Students with Intellectual Disabilities and Autism.” Council for Exceptional Children, Division for Developmental Disabilities and Autism (DADD). Honolulu, HI. January 20-22, 2016.

Co-Presenter, (with Zionch, A., and Juniel, P.), “Study Concerning School District Professional Development Considerations.” Council for Learning Disabilities. Las Vegas, NV October 1-2, 2015.

Co-Presenter, (with Marx, T.), “Supporting Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgendered, and Questioning (GLBTQ) Populations in High School Settings: A Multidisciplinary Approach.” 21st Annual International NAME Conference, Chicago, IL. November, 2011.

Presenter, “Student Engagement and Positive Behavior Supports for Students with Emotional Behavior.” Graduate College and Graduate and Professional Student Association Research Symposium, Las Vegas, NV. March, 2011.