January 2013

An Examination of Teacher Efficacy on Student Achievement in Regional Juvenile Detention Centers and Youth development Centers in Kentucky

Scott Tyrone Ferguson
Eastern Kentucky University

AN EXAMINATION OF TEACHER EFFICACY ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN REGIONAL JUVENILE DETENTION AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT CENTERS IN KENTUCKY

By

Scott Tyrone Ferguson

Dissertation Approved:

Chair, Advisory Committee

Member, Advisory Committee

Member, Advisory Committee

Member, Advisory Committee

Member, Advisory Committee

Dean, Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an Ed.D degree at Eastern Kentucky University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of the source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Scott L. Ferguson

Date 12-5-2013

AN EXAMINATION OF TEACHER EFFICACY ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN REGIONAL JUVENILE DETENTION AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT CENTERS IN KENTUCKY

By

SCOTT TYRONE FERGUSON

Master of Public Administration
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, Kentucky
2006

Master of Arts
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, Kentucky
2006

Bachelor of Arts
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, Kentucky
2002

Associate of Arts
Lexington Community College
Lexington, Kentucky
1998

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
Eastern Kentucky University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 2013

DEDICATION

My determination to write this dissertation after retiring from serving my country was not only important to me, but to my greatest supporter. When others would have taken the opportunity to relax and enjoy retirement, I did not. I therefore dedicate this dissertation to my wonderful mother, Mary Etta Coleman, who has stood by me when others told me I should not expect to find success. Mom, you are a wonderful person and my hero; I could not have done this without you. Understanding my strengths and weaknesses, you have inspired me to complete this process. No words will ever be able to express how much I love you for being my parent, mentor, advisor and protector. God gave me a great gift when he gave me you for a mother.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The educational process of completing a doctoral program has been long and tedious and it has involved many professors and cohorts who really cared about one another. It began with my pursuit of an Ed.S. Degree from Eastern Kentucky University and commenced with the awarding of the Ed.D. from Eastern Kentucky University. In the process I have been fortunate to be under the tutelage of many outstanding educators.

I am especially thankful to my dissertation chair, Dr. Sherwood Thompson, for accepting to work with me when it appeared no one else truly wanted to and believed enough in me to do so. In addition, I appreciate for Dr. Thompson for communicating high expectations of me and holding me to those high expectations in my daily efforts. He accepted only my best effort and, at the same time, offered to help me bring out the best in myself. I was blessed and fortunate to have him as my mentor and chair. He encouraged me to be strong, wise, and above all, dedicated to my educational pursuits and my family. I also found strength and encouragement in the help and guidance of my committee, consisting of Dr. Paul Erickson, Dr. Samuel Hinton, and Dr. Norman Powell, and Dr. Ronnie Nolan. All of them have graciously given their time to help me and their encouragement, suggestions, and direction during my proposal defense was greatly appreciated.

Above all, I completed this process for my children, Scott II, Stefon, and Ariel, because they are a part of my life that I cherish. They have inspired me to be the best example I can be for them with the help of the Almighty God. I pray my example will let each of them know that they can achieve their dreams and help them understand that the

learning process is life-long. I want them to realize that only through self-discipline can they achieve any success in life.

Dr. Thompson, you are a big reason in why I have persevered in this quest. You have often reminded me of how proud my mom is of my effort and how proud she would have been to see me complete this process of being awarded a doctorate degree. When I reflect on all of the wisdom you have imparted, I can only sum it up this way… No excuses, just results. To that I say: to God be the all the glory.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the self-efficacy of teachers who work in the juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky and how their level of self-efficacy influences their students' efforts to complete high school. This study is important because it provides information that contributes to the improvement of education for students incarcerated in juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky. A quality education for these students ensures they will have the same opportunity for success that was afforded them in their regular school.

Youth committed to the juvenile detention and youth development centers are considered at-risk of not graduating high school. Research has shown that incarcerated students do not receive the same quality of education as their peers who attend traditional high schools. A descriptive research method was employed in this study. The population for this research was high school teachers (N=70) who are employed at regional juvenile detention and youth development centers in the state of Kentucky. These participants were asked to complete the *Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale* (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). This instrument contains closed-ended items related to their expectations and beliefs about teacher efficacy. An analysis of their responses will help to determine their perceptions of teacher efficacy and its effect on the students' efforts to work toward high school graduation while incarcerated at the juvenile detention or youth development centers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter **Page**

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Background

The purpose of this study is to examine the self-efficacy of teachers who work in the juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky and how their level of self-efficacy influences their students' efforts to complete high school. This study is important because it provides information that contributes to the improvement of education for students incarcerated in juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky. A quality education for these students ensures they will have the same opportunity for success that was afforded them in their regular school.

Insufficient emphasis has been placed by educators and the legislature on those students at risk of not completing high school as a result of being committed to juvenile detention and youth development centers. Attention should be given to the efforts of teachers in these facilities to determine the impact they have on these students who are considered at-risk as they work toward high school graduation.

This study seeks to discover if the efforts of these teachers positively influence their students, whether expectations of their students are high, and whether teacher efficacy enhances the chances of their students achieving academic success.

The findings of this study will better inform policy makers responsible for making decisions related to teacher efficacy and student academic performance. With their ability to make laws, appropriate monies for government programs, and provide educational services and wraparound services, they are in a position to enhance the chances of these at-risk students receiving a quality education.

Powell (2007), upon reviewing the 2006-2007 KECSAC report, noted that "sweeping changes in funding and delivery of elementary and secondary education called for by the 1990 Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) did not specifically address the needs of state agency children" (p. 3). In 1992, to address the needs of state agency children, Senate Bill 260 (SB260) was passed by the Kentucky General Assembly, thereby establishing KECSAC and tasking them with overseeing "the administration of regulations governing the education of state agency children" (KECSAC, 2009, para. 9). KECSAC works with many agencies to ensure these educational needs, which include "academic, pre-vocational, vocational, special education, social skills, and post-secondary offerings" (KECSAC, 2009, p. 5), are met.

The definition of state agency children then followed an evolutionary process with the creation of the Department of Juvenile Justice Centers and KECSAC and is most recently defined by KRS 158.135(1)(a) as

> Those children of school age committed to or in custody of the Cabinet for Health and Family Services and placed, or financed by the cabinet, in a Cabinet for Health and Family Services operated or contracted institution, treatment center, facility, including those for therapeutic foster care…[as well as] those children committed to or in custody of the Department of Juvenile Justice and placed in a department operated or contracted facility or program… (Kentucky Legislative Research Commission, 2000)

KECSAC's legislative mission includes the distribution of funds to school districts that serve state agency children. "These state funds are for teacher training, data collection, interagency collaboration, and program improvement in education programs

operated by, funded by, or contracting with the Kentucky Departments of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), Community Based Services (DCBS), and Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities and Addiction Services (DMHDDAS)" (Pierce, Powell, Marshall, Nolan, & Fehringer, 2009, p. 6).

Schools and alternative programs are categorized as A1 – A6. According to the Kentucky Department of Education (2013), A1 schools are defined as "schools under administrative control of a principle and eligible to establish a school-based decision making council" (p. 1). Most schools are categorized as A1. Categories A2 – A6 are considered alternative programs. Category A2 is defined as a "district-operated, totally vocational-technical program;" A3 is defined as "a district-operated, totally special education program;" A4 is defined as "a district-operated, totally pre-school program;" A5 is defined as "an alternative program that is district-operated and district-controlled facility with no definable attendance boundaries that is designed to provide services to at-risk populations with unique needs;" and A6 is defined as "a district-operated instructional program in a non-district-operated institution or school" (p. 1).

This study focuses on the A6 alternative educational program. According to Pierce et al. (2009), "A6 education programs, as identified by the Kentucky Department of Education, are alternative education settings that serve youth from across the state, and thus serve those students most at risk of making unsuccessful transitions to adult life" (p. 6). Additionally, "Kentucky is one of the few, if not the only, states in the nation with such an innovative and viable education collaborative designed specifically to educate its youth at risk within state agency programs" (Pierce et al., 2009, p. 6). KECSAC is an attempt to link school districts, children and family services, community mental health,

juvenile justice, private providers, and an institution of higher learning in the state of Kentucky. KECSAC's poplulation varies by the level of risk of the student being served, with 48% of students being served by the Department of Juvenile Justice (Pierce et al., 2009).

This study focuses on teachers who work in juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky. The Kentucky Legislative Research Commission (2002) defines a juvenile detention center and youth alternative center in KRS 600.020 as follows:

- a juvenile holding facility [juvenile detention center] means a physically secure facility, approved by the Department of Juvenile Justice, which is an entirely separate portion or wing of a building containing an adult jail, which provides total sight and sound separation between juvenile and adult facility spatial areas and which is staffed by sufficient certified juvenile facility staff to provide twenty-four (24) hours per day supervision (para. 35); and
- a youth alternative center [youth development center] is a non-secure facility, approved by the Department of Juvenile Justice, for the detention of juveniles, both prior to adjudication and after adjudication, which meets the criteria specified in KRS 15A.320 (para. 66).

It is important to note, however, that juvenile detention facilities in Kentucky are currently located in separate buildings set apart from the adult facilities.

Kentucky's juvenile detention system provides pre-trial detention for all alleged delinquent juveniles aged 14 to18 and ensures that state-operated detention centers are available for all counties. If a youth is ordered detained at the detention hearing, the staff

of the Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice screens the youth using a risk assessment evaluation tool. Austin, Johnson, and Weitzer (2005) noted that "classification and risk assessment play a vital role in determining the number and type of youth best suited for either diversion or release from confinement" (p. 5). They define classification as "the process of determining at what level of custody an offender should be assigned" and risk assessment as "the process of determining an offender's risk of reoffending, receiving technical violations, failing to appear before the court, or other negative outcomes" (p. 5).

In Kentucky, the Kentucky Department of Juvenile to Detention Risk Screening Instrument is utilized by a Detention Alternatives Coordinator (DAC). If the youth scores between 0 – 10, a referral for a non-secure option is available. If the score is 11 or higher, secure detention is chosen. This is based on three variables: 1) the juvenile's most serious current charge; 2) the juvenile's history of criminal offending and detention alternatives within the past 12 months; 3) and the current case status. The DAC has a list of all categories of crime and separates the crime into categories of Low Risk (status and non-offender), Moderate Risk, High Risk, Highest Risk and a list of crimes that require automatic detention. The status and non-offender categories are crimes that would not warrant incarceration for adults. If a juvenile is eligible for the non-secure detention option, the DAC will use the criteria in the risk assessment instrument and will take into consideration the juvenile's family situation.

According to the National Center for Juvenile Justice (n.d.), juvenile detention centers in Kentucky are used to hold youth pre-adjudication and pre-disposition and may be used as a disposition. Youth older than 14 but younger than 16 can serve detention dispositions of up to 45 days, and youth older than 16 can be detained for up to 90 days.

Detention can be used as a sanction, at any age, when a youth commits contempt of court. Finally, juveniles can be placed in detention for up to 35 days awaiting placement in a treatment program. Detention alternatives include home detention, home incarceration, electronic monitoring, intensive community supervision, or foster homes (National Center for Juvenile Justice, n.d. para. 2).

Youth admitted to youth development centers usually range from age 14 to 18. The population in youth development centers is usually comprised of older youth, the average being 17. There are nine youth development center facilities in Kentucky. Of those nine, eight are staff-secured, which means the staff controls the exit and entry into the facility, and the other two are secured in the same manner as an adult correctional facility. These facilities are often small and treatment-oriented. The largest facility houses up to eighty juveniles while the smallest has the capacity to house up to forty juveniles.

Statement of the Problem

In a report titled, "Rethinking Juvenile Detention in Ohio", the Children's Defense Fund (2010) noted that "an average of 26,000 children across the country are placed in detention centers facilities on a daily basis" (p. 2). Students committed to juvenile detention and youth development centers are educated in an alternative educational environment rather than a traditional school environment.

There are two categories of alternative school programs in Kentucky: A5 and A6. Alternative programs categorized as A5 are facilities operated and controlled by the district, have "no definable attendance boundaries," and are "designed to provide services to at-risk populations with unique needs" (Kentucky Department of Education, 2013).

Programs categorized as A6 are operated by the district and provide instructional programs in facilities not operated or controlled by the district. This study focuses on those programs categorized as A6.

"Alternative schools can provide a supportive environment that often includes social support and academic support, along with a sense of belonging, and a supportive connection that extends beyond the interpersonal relationships in most traditional schools" (Policy Studies Associates, 1995, p. 1). According to Raywid (1994), alternative schools are "designed to respond to a group that appears not to be optimally served by a regular program" and they "represent varying degrees of departure from standard school organization, programs, and environments" (p. 26). The support and inclusiveness is critical to changing the academic situations of the incarcerated juvenile. However, research shows that incarcerated students do not receive the same quality of education in these alternative schools compared to their peers who attend traditional schools (Costello, Hollifield, & Stinnette, 1996). While my own experiences in these schools cannot be generalized, I have observed instances that suggest the authenticity of this research, with some of my teaching co-workers failing to demonstrate a high level of interest in the students' ability to succeed academically.

Often, when students are released from juvenile detention and youth development centers and re-enter traditional schools, they face multiple challenges. Some of the challenges are the lack of collaboration between schools, the justice system, and the family. The student is transitioning from a highly structured environment to an environment of independence. Additionally, the unfamiliarity with the academic material can create challenges for the student in regards to completing their academic work and

ultimately completing high school. These youth are categorized as being at-risk for not completing high school because of these challenges (Matvya, Lever, & Boyle, 2006). This is an indication that the transitioning process is critical to the juvenile's academic success.

Pierce et al. (2009), citing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, defined transition services "as a coordinated set of activities designed to result in the improvement of both the academic and functional achievements of the student" (p. 8). Further, they stated these services "are expected to support the students' movement from education programs to post-school activities, including post-secondary, continuing and adult education opportunities, adult services, employment and community participation, and independent living" (p. 8). Additionally, they stated that "education programs must provide evaluation of, and instruction in, these activities that are based on the individual students' strengths, needs, interests and preferences" (p. 8).

According to Pierce et al. (2009), "fifty-two percent of the students in A6 programs came from an A1 school, 17% came from an A5 program and 29% from another A6 program…and 2% had not been previously enrolled in any education program" (p. 14). Upon release from an A6 program, "61% transition to a traditional A1 school, 16% transition to an A5 program, and 23% transition to another A6 program" of which "40% transition to a DJJ Program" (p. 12). Of the 15% that do not transition from an A6 program to another program, "6% age out of the system" (p. 14). The remaining 9% either joined the military, enrolled in college or vocational school, joined the workforce, returned home, transitioned into independent living, or had no plans (p. 14).

Stephens and Arnette (2000) found “young offenders making the transition back to school often are still affected by the social and personal influences that contributed to the conduct that placed them under jurisdiction of the court in the first place” (p. 2).

The experience of students from youth development centers do not vary from those in juvenile detention centers. Academic programs are comprehensive in the juvenile detention and youth development centers. The academic programs in both centers offer a regular six-hour school day with an academic track for both high school graduation and the General Educational Development (GED) test. Some students also have vocational opportunities as well as the opportunity to take college courses through a virtual university program (Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice, 2008). Alternative programs follow the traditional school calendar as the districts in which they reside; however, they provide 33 additional days beyond the traditional school calendar. According to the Kentucky Legislature (n.d.), 505 KAR 1:080 (4) defines this extension of the school calendar as “230 school days, of which at least 210 shall be instructional days and the remainder shall be determined by the local school district, as required in KRS 158.070. It is recommended that three (3) of the noninstructional days be used for professional development designed for state agency children teachers.”

KECSAC collaborates with local education agencies, the Department of Juvenile Justice, and other service providers to offer a quality education that satisfies the requirements set forth by the Department of Education of Kentucky. The academic offerings include a high school education curriculum to include GED preparation, vocational curriculum and post-secondary course work (KECSAC, 2007, p. 3). The successes of students are enhanced due to the small teacher-pupil ratio of ten students to

one teacher or fifteen students to one teacher with a classroom aide. This is smaller than the public classroom standard in Kentucky (Wolford, 2000).

A2 through A6 alternative school programs are separated into three categories: Type I, Type II, and Type III. Type I "resemble magnet schools and in some locales constitute some or all of the options in choice systems," Type II focus on modifying a student's behavior rather than curriculum modification and how the curriculum is taught, and Type III serves students who need some type of rehabilitation or academic remediation (Raywid, 1994, p. 27). Type III alternative school programs usually offer a treatment component that addresses any social and/or emotional issues that students may have and use smaller class sizes than those of traditional schools (Raywid, 1994). Students' academic performance and social and/or emotional behaviors often improve because of the supportive environment of Type III alternative schools (Raywid, 1994). Juvenile detention and youth development centers are included in the Type III category.

Several authors (e.g., Wo1ford, 2000; Drakeford, 2002, Feinstein, 2002) recognize the challenge in teaching this student population, but emphasize that educational services are critically important to helping them achieve personal goals and ultimately become productive members of society. To this end, other scholars (e.g., Platt, Casey, & Faessel, 2006) highlight the need for adequately prepared teachers and personnel who can guide these students to not only obtaining a diploma, but also acquiring the knowledge and skills to be effective professionals.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the self-efficacy of teachers who work in the juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky, and how their level of self-efficacy influences their students' efforts to complete high school. This study addresses the areas of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. "Teacher self-efficacy beliefs are very important in terms of decisions regarding classroom management, organizing courses, teaching, motivating the students for learning, and communicating with the students effectively" (Erdem & Demirel, 2007, p. 574). A teacher who has a high sense of self-efficacy will most often work with an unyielding and sustained effort and be more patient with students who are difficult to teach. This is due to the belief teachers have in themselves to accomplish the task of providing a quality education, and the belief they have in their students to be successful. In the alternative environment of a juvenile detention or youth development center, where students usually lack the academic foundations to be successful or the confidence to succeed, a high sense of self-efficacy is an important attribute for teachers to have because incarcerated juveniles are already considered at risk of not graduating high school (Erdem & Demirel, 2007).

Yeo, Ang, Chong, Huan and Quek (2008) addressed the self-efficacy of teachers in the areas of instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. Teaching in the juvenile detention and youth devleopment centers requires a high sense of self-efficacy, which encapsulates a true commitment to motivating students and performing the job at a high level everyday. "Research has shown that teachers who have a higher sense of efficacy have greater commitment to teaching and stay longer in the

profession" (Yeo et al., 2008, p. 193). The teacher's ability to create a learning environment that is conducive for learning and student success is critical to helping students at-risk. As Yeo et al. (2008) note, a "teacher's sense of self-efficacy is also one of the few teacher characteristics consistently related to student achievement" (p. 194).

Research Questions

Research Question 1. How do teachers assigned to teach in the juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky perceive their level of teacher efficacy in the area of classroom management?

Research Question 2. How do teachers assigned to teach in the juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky perceive their level of teacher efficacy in the area of classroom instructional strategies?

Research Question 3. How do teachers assigned to teach in Kentucky juvenile detention and youth development centers perceive their level of teacher efficacy in the area of student engagement?[1]

Hypotheses

H1(0): Teachers assigned to teach in the juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky perceive their level of teacher efficacy to be low in the area of classroom management.

[1] The three areas of concentration were based on a survey developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2002) with special permission from Dr. Anita Woolfolk Hoy.

H1: Teachers assigned to teach in the juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky perceive their level of teacher efficacy to be high in the area of classroom management.

H2(0): Teachers assigned to teach in the juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky perceive their level of teacher efficacy to be low in the area of classroom instructional strategies.

H2: Teachers assigned to teach in the juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky perceive their level of teacher efficacy to be high in the area of classroom instructional strategies.

H(3)0: Teachers assigned to teach in Kentucky juvenile detention and youth development centers perceive their level of teacher efficacy to be low in the area of student engagement.

H3: Teachers assigned to teach in Kentucky juvenile detention and youth development centers perceive their level of teacher efficacy to be high in the area of student engagement.

The theoretical rationale used in this study is based on Emile Durkheim's (1956) functionalist theory as it relates to education. Additionally, the theory of symbolic interaction, which is the view that human actions are governed by the meanings that actors give to their situations and that these meanings are established in interaction, is used because the perceptions we have of what we do are often times a reflection of what we expect.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to teachers assigned to teach at juvenile detention and youth development centers in the state of Kentucky in A6 alternative programs. Teachers were slow to respond to the survey due to the existing technology gap between the State Department of Education and the State Department of Juvenile Justice. The Department of Juvenile Justice's e-mail system currently prevents teachers from accessing unsecured pages from their classroom desktop computer, which ensures limited access for students. The software programs purchased by local school districts, the Kentucky Department of Education, and the Department of Juvenile Justice do not interface and therefore limited access to the online survey. Teachers had to access a computer in another area of the facility that allowed more access to web-based sites or had to complete the survey on their personal home computers. Additionally, there is limited research available in the literature on teacher self-efficacy in Department of Juvenile Justice programs.

Need for the Study

There is scarce research currently available on how the level of self-efficacy of teachers employed to teach in Kentucky juvenile detention and youth development centers affects the graduation rates of their students. This study examines how teachers who work in Kentucky juvenile detention and youth development centers perceive their level of self-efficacy and how that perception influences their students' efforts to complete high school.

"Teacher [self]-efficacy is an important attribute of effective teachers" (Yeo, Ang, Chong, Huan, & Quek, 2008, p. 192). Teacher self-efficacy not only impacts

students' achievement, but also the continued professonal development of teachers and whether they remain in the teaching profession. For those teachers who remain in the profession, there are two distinct factors discussed in Bandura's theoretical framework grounded in social cognitive theory for studying self-efficacy. These factors are "outcome expectation and efficacy expectation" (Yeo, et al., 2008, p. 193): "[O]utcome expectation refers to a person's estimate that a given behavior will lead to certain outcomes; efficacy expectations refers to a person's conviction that he or she can successfully orchestrate necessary actions to perform a task."

Teachers' perception of their use of efficacy in the classroom is critical. Perception of self-efficacy affects the decisions they make about classroom management, how their courses are organized, what teaching methods they will employ, how effectively they communicate with students, and the level of motivation for learning they instill in their students (Erdem & Demirel, 2007). A teacher's perception of self-efficacy in the classroom is critical to the future academic success of students already at risk for not graduating high school due to their alternative educational environment.

The lack of a quality education and the impact it has on students incarcerated at juvenile detention and youth development centers needs to be considered. Students who obtain a quality education receive the tools necessary to help them become productive members of society. The Alliance for Excellent Education (2011) reported that "[h]igh school graduates live longer, are less likely to be teen parents, and are more likely to raise healthier, better-educated children" (p. 3). Other benefits include a decrease of their dependence on government sponsored programs, a lower likelihood of committing crimes, and a higher likelihood of becoming more involved in their community (Buck,

2011; Mitra, 2011). The juvenile detention and youth development centers are thus tasked with providing an education program in an alternative setting for students at risk of not graduating high school in order to give them the chance to complete high school.

This study provides information that can contribute to the improvement of education for students incarcerated in juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky. The implications from this study can be a source of motivation for educators at Kentucky juvenile detention and youth development centers. Moreover, this may lead to other education initiatives and programs being implemented. Finally, the findings of this study will better inform policy makers with their decisions about the issues that impact teacher efficacy in the alternative setting.

Participants in the Study

Sixty-seven teachers employed at juvenile detention and youth development centers in rural and urban geographical regions throughout the state of Kentucky were asked to complete a survey containing questions directly related to their self-efficacy in the alternative setting they were employed to teach. Permission was granted by Dr. Anita Hoy from The Ohio State University to use the survey and to make any necessary adjustments for this study. The survey is designed to help identify areas of difficulty experienced by teachers in a classroom setting, with attention given to efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management (Tscahnnen-Moran & Woolfolk, 2002). Teachers were chosen for the common teaching environment they share and the similar types of students they teach.

Functional Theory

Emile Durkheim argued that every social system has a function in society. Functionalism seeks to explain the changes in conditions of our society. From a functional perspective, education helps our children grow up and become valuable members of our society through citizenship and becoming workers that contribute to a strong healthy society. Education prepares the children to take on various roles in our society. Some of the roles have prestige and status while other roles do not. Additionally, functionalists believe an education reflects the needs of our society, which include the enhancement of cognitive skills, the separation and selection of talent, and the production of good citizens. Through education, children are socialized into larger groups outside their families and become prepared to work in certain jobs and take roles in our society. This renders the role of education in our society quite a practical one.

Functionalist theory stresses the need for a quality education to be equally available to every eligible person, regardless of whether it derives from a general or alternative academic setting, in order to foster an orderly society. If every student has access to the same quality education, regardless of class or academic setting, society may begin to accept these students because they have been afforded a chance at the same opportunities as their peers and those opportunities will improve the quality of their lives.

The Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (2003) indicated that “children and youth learn and develop best in settings that provide safety, supportive relationships, high expectations, positive social norms, appropriate structure, opportunities to build knowledge and skills, opportunities for service, and opportunities to belong” (p. 8).

The following chapters include a review of related literature in chapter two; a discussion of the methodology in chapter three; research findings in chapter four, and conclusions and suggestions for further research in chapter five.

Definition of Key Terms

Juvenile Detention Center, also known as juvenile holding facility, means "a physically secure facility, approved by the Department of Juvenile Justice, which is an entirely separate portion or wing of a building containing an adult jail, which provides total sight and sound separation between juvenile and adult facility spatial areas and which is staffed by sufficient certified juvenile facility staff to provide twenty-four (24) hours per day supervision" (Kentucky Legislature, 2012, para. 35).

Youth Development Center, also known as "Youth alternative center," means a non-secure facility, approved by the Department of Juvenile Justice, for the detention of juveniles, both prior to adjudication and after adjudication, which meets the criteria specified in Kentucky Legislature 15A.320 (Kentucky Legislature, 2012, para. 66).

KECSAC is an acronym for Kentucky Educational Collaborative for State Agency Children. The Kentucky General Assembly passed Senate Bill 260 (SB 260) in 1992, which called for the establishment of the Kentucky Educational Collaborative for State Agency Children (KECSAC) (Kentucky Legislature, 2012). The purpose of KECSAC was to specifically address the needs of State Agency Children. State Agency Children to include youth in therapeutic foster care placements and those confined in state operated juvenile detention facilities state operated and contracted day treatment, group homes, and residential placements (KECSAC, 2009).

Alternative Education Programs and Intervention Services is defined as "any preventive, developmental, corrective, supportive services, or treatment provided to a student who is at risk of school failure, is at risk of participation in violent behavior or juvenile crime, or has been expelled from the school district" (Wirth et al. n.d.).

Successful student "is a student who succeeds by balancing aspects of their lives, academically and socially, by way of post-secondary education (two-year, four-year, or professional institution) and/or vocation after high school graduation" (Brockman & Russell, 2012, p. 1).

Teacher Self-Efficacy is defined as the "teachers' confidence in their ability to promote how well students' learn, even if they are difficult to teach or motivated to learn (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

At Risk is defined as "when students experience a significant mismatch between their circumstances and needs, and the capacity or willingness of the school to accept, accommodate, and respond to them in a manner that supports and enables their maximum social, emotional, and intellectual growth and development" (Costello, Hollifield, & Stinnette, 1996, p. 2).

Academic achievement is defined as "the level of actual accomplishment or proficiency one has achieved in an academic area, as opposed to one's potential" (Packer, 2002, p. 1).

Academic success is defined as "(a) passing grades throughout high school, (b) "reasonable" scores on standardized achievement tests, and (c) graduating from high school on time" (Finn & Rock, 1997, p. 221).

Chapter two will discuss the literature related to this study, with close attention directed to the importance of quality educational experiences for at-risk students.

CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to examine the self-efficacy beliefs of teachers who are assigned to teach in juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky and how their beliefs influence student efforts to complete high school. The section will conclude with a discussion about student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management.

Juveniles, while incarcerated, still need to be able to access the education system to reduce the chance of recidivism. Educators trying to serve students in the juvenile corrections setting frequently struggle to find the appropriate supports and enhancements for their programming. Taylor's (1993) work (as cited in Drakeford, 2002, p. 143) indicated that "educational services in juvenile corrections provide incarcerated youth with a chance to increase their academic skills, to develop confidence, to achieve personal goals, and to become productive citizens of society." Therefore, it is imperative that there is a system in place that offers the appropriate education and necessary services to our incarcerated youth.

The Literature Review will begin with a review of juvenile justice services, assessing studies on teacher efficacy across its many dimensions. Additionally, there will be individual examinations of the juvenile detention centers and youth development centers, students at-risk, alternative education, Kentucky Education Collaborative of State Agency Children (KECSAC), teacher efficacy, student achievement. Upon completion of this study, the findings will add to the body of literature related to the education offered to students in the juvenile corrections education system, and more specifically, students at regional juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky.

Juvenile Justice Services

The law has defined the difference between juvenile offenders and adult offenders. The line has been drawn at different times and places and for various reasons. In early United States history, our laws were influenced by the common law of England. From a historical perspective, juveniles as young a seven years of age, if accused of wrong doing, would be imprisoned with adults. Because of this problem, the idea of reforming youth offenders began to develop in the United States, thereby prompting the creation of industrial schools and reformatories. The House of Refuge in New York was opened in 1824 and was the first of its kind to house juveniles and be considered a reformatory. This was considered the first effort to house juvenile offenders separately. The state of Maryland soon followed (Maryland Department of Juvenile Services, 1999).

The start of what we refer to as juvenile services began in the 16th century in England. During the educational reform movement, youth were perceived to be different from adults. It was assumed they had not fully developed and had less cognitive capacity and that provided support for juvenile justice reform in America (CJCJ, 2013).

Many efforts from these movements led to the establishment of the first juvenile court in 1899 in Cook County, Illinois. That court was founded on the legal doctrine of *parens patriae* (Latin for the state as parent). The establishment of juvenile courts provided the primary difference between the two courts: Juvenile courts were mostly civil in nature while the adult courts were criminal. The term *parens patriae* established the right of the court to be able to make decisions on behalf of the student as if it were a parent. This doctrine continues today in the juvenile court system.

Until as late as the 1960s, youth did not have constitutional rights in the juvenile courts. The 1966 court case, *Kent v. United States,* helped to establish due process for juveniles. The juvenile in this case had his case waived to criminal court after his attorney filed motions filed seeking an alternative adjudication; the court waived the jurisdiction to a higher court without a hearing. The Supreme Court heard the case and issued a ruling that the juvenile was entitled to a hearing and the reason for the juvenile court waiving the case to a criminal court (ABA, 2007).

A year later, in 1967, another significant court case, *In re Gault,* occurred as a result of a juvenile on probation being reported for a harassing phone call and subsequently arrested. His parents were given no notice that he had been arrested or any notice before his hearing as to the charges that were pending against him. His parents followed with a request for the release of their son because he had been denied due process of the law. The case also made it to the Supreme Court and the courts issued a ruling that juveniles subject to a delinquency hearing were entitled to the elements of due process to ensure the fairness of their hearing (ABA, 2007).

In the 1970 case *In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358 (1970),* "the Supreme Court took further steps that made the juvenile justice courts more like criminal courts. In this case the government had to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the juvenile committed the crime he/she was charged with committing. The momentum in the changes of the juvenile court slowed in the 1971 case, *McKeiver v. Pennsylvania, 403 U.S. 528 (1971),* when the Supreme Court ruled that juveniles were *not* entitled to a trial by jury in a juvenile court proceeding" (ABA, 2007).

In 1974, Congress passed the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Act. The act extended the protections for juveniles by requiring (1) youth offenders to be kept separate from adults by sight and sound.; (2) juveniles who have committed "status" offenses (such as curfew violations, truancy, alcohol possession) to be kept out of juvenile or adult detention facilities; (3) youth to be kept out of adult facilities unless certain requirements were met; and (4) that the state create plans to reduce the number of minority youth (i.e., disproportionate minority contact) in the juvenile system (p. 1). The act also created the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), which is now a division of the United States Department of Justice and the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Prevention (Maryland Department of Juvenile Services, 1999).

In the 1980s and 1990s, crime among juveniles rose. Some states enacted laws that required the law enforcement agencies and the courts to charge the youths as adults if it had been determined that a certain violent crime had been committed and there was weapon offense the youth could be charged as an adult (ABA, 2007).

History and Function of Juvenile Facilities

Hogeveen (2005) indicated that in the early 18th and 19th centuries, delinquent juvenile behavior was punished by the local community. The society's goal was not to exclude the juvenile from society, but to correct his/her behavior and promote good citizenry. Around the 19th century, however, there was a proposal for juvenile detention centers such as reformatories, industrial schools and houses of refuge to reclaim deviant youths.

Detention centers are features of the juvenile justice system. These facilities were in place prior to the juvenile courts. These facilities took the forms of houses of refuge, industrial schools, and reformatories, all of which housed juvenile delinquents (Hogeveen, 2005). Houses of refuge were institutions designed to house youth who were believed to be on a path to becoming chronic offenders. Many of these youths were poor, destitute and vagrant. New York, having the first house of refuge, would eventually spearhead the movement and the development of the juvenile justice system (CJCJ, 2013). Reformatories and industrial schools were similar to houses of refuge, except that they concentrated on supplementing the educational component. The houses of refuge soon began to become overcrowded institutions, plagued by staff abuse. As the conditions in which the youth were housed deteriorated, the institutions were confronted with many of the issues dealt with by adult facilities. Today those institutions have become an important part of the juvenile correctional system and still use a model similar to that of the penitentiary or other facilities (CJCJ, 2013). Today's juvenile facilities focus on the concerns about education as attempts are made at reforming youths.

Alternative or correctional schools have grown since the 1960s (Franklin, 1992). Alternative schools provide a supportive environment by the social support, sense of belonging, and bonding that extends beyond the interpersonal relationships in most traditional schools (Dollar, 1983; Gruber & Trickett, 1987).

Regional juvenile detention centers and/or youth development centers are similar in many ways, except for the length of time each student or resident is placed at each facility. Kentucky's juvenile detention system provides pre-trial detention of all alleged delinquent juveniles (age 14 to 18 years old), and ensures state-operated detention centers

to be available for all counties. If a youth is ordered detained at the detention hearing, the staff of the Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice screen the youth using a risk assessment evaluation tool. If the youth makes a score between one and 10, they are eligible for a custody option other than secure detention. The facility's Detention Alternatives Coordinator (DAC) makes a decision as to which option is most suitable based upon the youth and his/her family's circumstances. The detention centers are not designed for long-term stays. Meanwhile, youth placed in youth development centers are usually between the ages of 14 and 18 years old (Kentucky Department Juvenile Justice, 2008).

According to Austin, Johnson, and Weitzer (2005), "classification" refers to the process of determining at what level of custody an offender should be assigned, while "risk assessment" refers to the process of determining an offender's risk of reoffending, receiving technical violations, failing to appear before the court, or other negative outcomes. Classification and risk assessment play a vital role in determining the number and type of youth best suited for either diversion or release from confinement (Austin, Johnson, & Weitzer, 2005, p. 5). In Kentucky, the Kentucky Department of Juvenile Detention Risk Screening Instrument is utilized by Detention Alternatives Coordinator (DAC). If the youth makes a score between 0 – 10, a referral for a nonsecure option is available. If the score is 11 or higher, the secure detention is the option. This is based on three variables: The first being to see if the youth's crime warranted automatic secure detention, which includes but is not limited to being a fugitive from another jurisdiction, transferred to Circuit Court, and using a firearm in commission of an offense. The other variables include a consideration of the severity of the crime the youth committed, the

youth's criminal history, and of course the current case status that caused the youth to be incarcerated.

The DAC has a list of all categories of crime and it separates the crime into categories of Low Risk (status and non-offender), Moderate Risk, High Risk, and Highest Risk that contains a list that contains crimes that require automatic detention. The status and non-offender categories would be crimes that if the youths were adults they would not be incarcerated for committing. Additionally, for a custody option other than secure detention, the facility's Detention Alternatives Coordinator (DAC) makes a decision as to which option is most suitable based upon the youth's and family's circumstances. Detention is used to hold youth pre-adjudication and predisposition and may be used as a disposition.

Youth older than 14 but younger than 16 can serve detention dispositions of up to 45 days, and youth older than 16 can be detained for up to 90 days. Detention can be used as a sanction, at any age, when a youth commits contempt of court. Finally, juveniles can be placed in detention for up to 35 days while awaiting placement in a treatment program. Detention alternatives include home detention, home incarceration, electronic monitoring, intensive community supervision, or foster homes (National Center for Juvenile Justice, n.d.).

A youth development center, by contrast, is a facility that is approved by the Department of Juvenile Justice to house juveniles prior to and after adjudication (Kentucky Legislative Research Commission, 2000). Kentucky takes pride in the fact that its facilities are small and treatment-oriented. There are a total of nine youth development centers (YDC's) throughout the state. The largest facility has an 80-bed capacity, while

the facilities with the smallest capacity can hold 40 (Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice, 2012).

Youth placed in youth development centers are usually between the ages of 14 and 18. The vast majority of the youth development center populations are older youth, with an average age of 17. There are nine facilities in Kentucky, with some being a secure setting and others being staff-secure (Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice, 2012). The staff-secure settings are settings in which the staff controls the exit and entry to the facility. The secure setting is a secure facility used to house the juveniles in the same manner as an adult facility (Kentucky Legislative Research Commission, 2000).

The juvenile detention centers and youth development centers are tasked with providing an education program in an alternative setting for students at risk of not graduating high school in order to give them the chance to complete high school. Franklin (1992) indicated there is a minimum review of alternative juvenile education programs in social work literature. Facilities such as the juvenile detention centers and youth development centers need to evaluate the success of their educational programs.

In sum, this study examines the influence of teacher efficacy on the academic success of students located in these facilities. The study thus provides information that can contribute to the improvement of education for said students in Kentucky. The implications from this study can be a source of motivation for educators at Kentucky juvenile detention centers and youth development centers. Moreover, this may lead to other education initiatives and programs being implemented. Additionally, this study's secondary purpose is to better inform policy makers with regard to their decisions that impact teacher efficacy in the alternative setting.

Gemignani (1994, p. 2) stated that classrooms in correctional settings often reflect the old model, which emphasized workbook exercises, remediation, drill, and practice in the basics. Under this model, educational assessments have focused on what students cannot do in order to provide remedial instruction. Classroom management has centered on discipline and control, with time-out periods in which unruly offenders are separated from other students.

A more effective model involves changes in educational philosophy, curriculum, and instructional techniques. The academic curriculum features comprehension and complex problem-solving tasks, allowing students to develop their cognitive skills. The curriculum integrates basic skills into more challenging tasks that allow students to apply these skills to real-life situations. The curriculum allows for a number of discrete skills to be combined and more complex tasks to be performed. Knowledge sharing is emphasized through cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and team problem-solving.

In his qualitative study, Feinstein (2002) agreed with Gemignani (1994), stating that "conventional wisdom has been to emphasize basic skills such as phonics, spelling, and math facts; the assumption being these skills would best serve them in the real world. The commonly held belief resulted in the emphasis of basic skills, while neglecting higher level thinking skills and problem solving activities in the curriculum scope and sequence" (p. 9). Feinstein further indicated that, with regard to correctional facilities, the U.S. Department of Education recommended a change in the paradigm (p. 9).

Feinstein's (2002) case study was designed to understand and describe the impact of implementing performance assessment on secondary students in facilities designed for adjudicated youth. Data was collected through observational notes and semi-structured

interviews. Each youth was observed twice for a 40-minute period. Teachers and students were interviewed twice, once midway through the performance assessment and again at the conclusion. The results from the study indicated that students were able to achieve a passing grade on their performance assessment.

Additionally, elements that were embedded in the performance assessment gave indications of how students will achieve academically. Some strategies included were different learning styles, creating small goals and individualizing assignments (Feinstein, 2002, p. 10). Implications from this study are the best practices in teaching, which apply both to a juvenile corrections education program and a regular classroom (Feinstein, 2002, p. 11).

Teachers in correctional institutions should incorporate innovative teaching methods to stimulate incarcerated youth to learn. “Education being one of the keys to making a difference, rather than just “drill and practice” in our middle and high schools and juvenile correction facilities, we must teach “real skills” that prepare young people to perform in the “real world” (Burns-Stowers, 1994, p. 60). Soifer (2010) agreed with Burns-Stowers, arguing that “the link between juvenile crime and classroom success suggests that innovative educational strategies are the most effective solution to lowering the district’s juvenile crime rate” (p. 1).

Shay Bilchik, former administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, wrote that “education is one of the services that can help youth return to a law-abiding lifestyle” (cited in Kohler & Reese, 2008, p. 507). Historically, detention center education has been unregulated, has had a lack of consensus regarding its purpose, and has employed untrained staffs who are inappropriate for the job (Reese &

Hall, n.d.). If we can teach these students real-life skills, they have a chance to effectively transition to law-abiding lifestyles after they leave the correctional schools (Kohler & Reese, 2008).

Wolford (2000) suggested that in only two states, Kentucky and New York, were all youth in juvenile justice placements educated under the same administrative management. The variability in the delivery of educational services to youth in juvenile justice placements can be explained in part by the system's fragmentation in many jurisdictions. The states in which juvenile justice education is the primary responsibility of a single state agency appear to have greater consistency in how educational services are provided. It is not unusual for a state to operate only long-term residential facilities, while counties or other local government units provide juvenile detention services. In many states, the youth can be found in various placements to include non-profit and for-profit programs. This situation exists in many jurisdictions and there is an equal or greater diversity of how education services are provided (Wolford, 2000, p. 128). Having one agency to oversee this effort would enhance the students' chance of academic success.

The most comprehensive educational delivery system was reported by Kentucky, where the General Assembly in 1992 created the Kentucky Education Collaborative for State Agency Children Program (KECSAC), which oversees local education agency delivery of education services in more than 125 juvenile justice facilities, child welfare, and mental health placements (Wolford, 2000, p. 128). The local education agency often educates the students in juvenile justice facilities. Quality educational services are an indispensable component of any juvenile justice treatment effort (Wolford, 2000, p. 130).

The local public schools have the main responsibility of educating the majority of youth in the juvenile justice system. The teachers are supplied by the local education agency, which is responsible for verifying that teachers meet certification standards of the state of Kentucky. The teachers who are hired to teach in the facilities are not considered juvenile justice or department of correction employees. “Therefore,” as Wolford (2000, p. i), stated, “it is imperative there is a system in place to be able to offer an appropriate education and the necessary services to our incarcerated youth.” Mazzoti and Higgins (2006) agreed with Wolford’s (2000) argument that collaboration among juvenile justice system, public schools and communities is imperative in reducing recidivism and developing programs for students involved in the juvenile justice system. Foley’s work (as cited in Gagnon, Barber, Van Loan, & Leone, 2009) suggested that “appropriate educational services for incarcerated youth have long been recognized as an important element of transition into society” (p. 673).

In New York, the Bureau of Education Services is responsible for the operation of school programs, which include educational and vocational services, to youth in the Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) facilities. This covers 59 detention programs (secured – nine (9), 48-hour secure holdover; three (3), non-secured), and 47 monitored programs in New York State, which affect youth ages 8 through 18. The staff identifies statewide service priorities and needs; plans education program systems; coordinates the planning and design of career education program systems; develops recreation program models; oversees provision of the Inner Visions Substance Abuse Prevention Education Program; recommends educational policies; and provides technical assistance and monitoring in the education area. The Bureau of Education also

coordinates and assists with the re-entry of OCFS youth to their local education agency, and acts as a liaison with State Education Department to monitor compliance with state regulations and laws (New York State Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS), n.d.).

The provision of a high-quality education is a right of students with or without disabilities in juvenile corrections schools. For students with disabilities, the entitlement to education is further supported by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) (2004). The point of emphasis is that juvenile corrections schools should have access to the general education curriculum and the functional curriculum that include pre-vocational and vocational training; paid work experience; and General Education Development (GED) test preparation (Gagnon & Barber, 2009).

Following the passage of IDEA (2004), a study of juvenile corrections schools was conducted. Upon criteria being established, a total of 483 schools met the criteria for inclusion into the study. The sample size was reduced to 383 due to the following reasons upon the return of the survey: (a) not a Juvenile Correction school; (b) facility closed; (c) no grades 7-12. Data was collected between 2004 and 2005 from participants who were principals. The results indicated that 101 respondents of the survey held a certification as a principal/administrator/ supervisor and came from 41 states and all regions of the U.S. census regions. A sample was represented by contracted and non-contracted facilities and all levels of security (maximum, medium, maximum-medium and minimum).

This investigation provided the first national picture of juvenile corrections school-level approach to curriculum, and extended what is known regarding school, principal, and student characteristics that may impact curriculum decisions in these

settings (Baltodano, Harris, & Rutherford, 2005; Quinn et al., 2005). In the study, two key results were noted concerning accreditation and the basis of curriculum. First, over 80% of juvenile corrections schools were accredited by their state's Department Of Education, and nearly 50% were accredited by the American Corrections Association. Second, approximately 68% of juvenile corrections administrators in the current study identified their school's reliance upon their State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) approved curricula.

The limitations of this study were that the 34.22% response rate to the survey was lower than the 50% commonly accepted for surveys. Second, the percentage of youth with disabilities and the sum of students with specific disability should be interpreted with caution because often the definitions for these categories differ from state to state. Another limitation was the lack of a full psychometric evaluation of the current survey. A final limitation related to the level of detail possible from survey research. The controversy of curriculum individualization versus access to general education curriculum for all students remains a significant debate among policyholders and academics (Gagnon et al., 2009, p. 691). It was clear, however, that a percentage of principals felt unsupported, and that practices were not in place for them to align the curriculum with the state's assessments.

Libby, Coen, Price, Silverman, and Orton (2005) stated that education is an essential part of the services made available to committed youth and the availability of special education services. Education is a tool that provides students the opportunity to transition to a positive life outside of the juvenile correction facilities. Further, the educational needs of students in juvenile correction facilities are greater than what is

being met by the local school districts, and the need to improve educational programs continues to grow (Quinn et al., 2005; Baltodano, Harris, & Rutherford, 2005). The staff's encouragement can help foster environments that are conducive to the students' success. Therefore, having a set delivery method of educational services to students in any alternative placement is critical.

Fostering Learning in Correctional Facilities

Alternative or correctional schools have grown since the 1960s (Franklin, 1992). Alternative schools provide a supportive environment where students can obtain a sense of belonging and support from the staff in order to have an opportunity at academic success. Many schools deal with students who have issues with turancy and multiple contacts with the courts.

Thus, teachers in correctional institutions should incorporate innovative teaching methods to stimulate incarcerated youth to learn. A school's learning and working environment determines its effectiveness. Soifer (2010) added that "the link between juvenile crime and classroom success suggests that innovative educational strategies are the most effective solution to lowering the district's juvenile crime rate" (p. 1). Therefore, a more effective model involves changes in educational philosophy, curriculum, and instructional techniques. A more advanced academic curriculum should feature comprehension and complex problem-solving tasks, allowing students to develop their cognitive skills. The curriculum should also integrate basic skills into more challenging tasks that allow students to apply these skills to real-life situations. Knowledge sharing should be emphasized through cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and team problem-

solving. Teachers should model cognitive processes through a variety of instructional strategies, including externalizing thought processes, encouraging multiple approaches to problem solving, and focusing on dialog and reciprocal learning. A variety of assessment and evaluation measures should be used. Progress should be based on mutually defined student goals that emphasize competence. Instruction should involve multiple strategies appropriate to each learner's interests and needs. Slavin (1993) added that "cooperative learning methods have also had consistently positive effects on such outcomes as self-esteem, race relations, acceptance of mainstreamed academically handicapped students, and ability to work cooperatively" (p. 546).

Feinstein (2002), in corroborating the account of Gemignani (1994), asserted that "the commonly held belief [that incarcerated students cannot learn] resulted in the emphasis of basic skills, while neglecting higher level thinking skills and problem solving activities in the curriculum scope and sequence" (p. 9). Feinstein thus examined the impact of performance assessment on adjudicated youth in a juvenile correctional facility. The paper discussed standardized testing and performance assessments: "Standardize testing places emphasis on facts and note memorization while performance assessment focuses on higher level thinking skills and problem solving" (p. 9). Beginning in April 2001, observations and interviews were conducted over a period of four months. The classrooms at the facility were observed two different times for a period of forty minutes during the implementation of the performance testing. Each teacher and student was interviewed twice, at the midpoint of the assessment and at the conclusion of the testing.

The results from Feinstein's study indicated that students in the correctional facility were able to achieve a passing score on the assessment. The students enjoyed the hands-on nature of the performance assessment and this hands-on element was implemented into the classroom instruction. This allowed the students some creativity, which helped to motivate them. Additionally, breaking down the performance assessments into smaller sections allowed the students to set goals for themselves and this enhanced their academic success.

If education is highly regarded by administrators as an important component of the rehabilitation process, then it should be a priority rather than a competitor with other programs. Mazzotti and Higgins (2006) stated that knowledge concerning the statistics on juvenile offenders is important in designing appropriate programs for educating students in the juvenile correction schools. Also, educators must create an environment that is fair and just for every student (Wald & Losen, 2003). The belief is that schools should act as a place to keep children/youth out of trouble, in addition to teaching academic and social skills (Stephens & Arnett, 2000).

A fundamental assumption underlying the academic curriculum in the past is that basic skills have to be mastered before students are given more advanced tasks, such as problem solving, cognitive reasoning, reading comprehension, and written communication. Current thinking challenges this concept. The new paradigm is based on the assumption that all students can succeed and that educationally disadvantaged students can profit from more challenging tasks. Although there is hardly any agreement on the specific characteristics that may contribute to effective schools, here are a few characteristics that Quaglia (1989) found to be important:

- Strong administrative leadership
- A climate of expectation for satisfactory student achievement
- An orderly but not oppressive school climate
- A focus on pupil acquisition of basic school skills
- A system of continuous monitoring of pupil progress
- Resources that can be focused on fundamental learning objectives

According to Bruce Wolford (2000) of Eastern Kentucky University, our "public schools have the responsibility for educating the majority of youth in the juvenile justice system" (p. i). Therefore, there needs to be a system in place to offer an appropriate education and the necessary services to our incarcerated youth. The provision of high-quality education is a right of youth with or without disabilities in juvenile corrections schools.

Nelson, Jolivette, Leone, and Mathur (2010) argue that the forces which shape policy and practice in public education have a disproportionately negative impact on children who are served in special education programs. Additional authors, such as Kohler and Reese (2008), seem to support this point of view.

Students At-Risk

Students who are at-risk come from many walks of life. They come from different socioeconomic levels, have different family dynamics that include single-parent families, and are most likely to leave high school prior to graduation. Most research indicates that gender has a bearing on the characteristics of students at-risk, with male students typically constituting a larger portion of this population. For the purpose of this paper, the

focus will be on students who have difficulty in a single or multiple area(s) that could impact their academic success.

Finn and Rock (1997) based their definition of at-risk on a medical concept. The authors stated that, “exposure to a particular condition or risk factors increases the likelihood that an individual would experience certain adverse consequences” (p. 221). The authors further explain the risk factors have an association with the student’s behavior: “the personal and academic support provided by parents and teachers may be especially important to students at risk. Research has demonstrated that family support is a key factor in promoting achievement among students at-risk as well as behaviorial and emotional engagment” (p. 231). At-risk students are students who are not seeing a lot of academic success and are likely to become dropouts (Donnelly, 1987). Aalderman (1990) uses the defintion of at-risk as a student who is low achieving.

Khattri, Riley, and Kane (1997) reviewed relevant research on rural education to ascertain what effects poverty and the community have on students being identified as at-risk. “The National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students defines ‘at-risk’ in relation to educational failure or low academic achievement” (p. 81). The research and development are designed to help improve the education of the students who are considered at-risk of educational failure because of variables such as the student’s race, economic status, and particularly geographical location. The authors state that “all of these comparisons illuminate the differences due to the geographical location when taking poverty into account” (p. 80). The events usually include students dropping out of school and failing to take certain courses that would enhance their education; the institute

extended their understanding further to include the “lack of employment beyond high school or success later in life” (p. 81).

Slavin and Madden (1989) identified at-risk as a student “who is in danger of failing to complete their education with an adequate level of skills” (p. 4). The authors discussed the factors that are usually associated with a student being labeled as “at-risk,” such as socioeconomic factors, school attendance, behavior, and being retained in a grade.

Alternative Education

A social function is “the contribution made by any phenomenon to a larger system of which the phenomenon is a part” (Hoult, 1969, p. 139). Teaching is a social function. From a functionalist point of view, enough emphasis has not been made by educators to provide those students at-risk of not graduating high school and who are committed to regional juvenile detention centers and/or youth development centers in Kentucky with the quality education they would be receiving in their regular academic setting. In particular, it is my observation that there has not been much effort made by the educators at regional juvenile detention centers and/or youth development centers to assist these students in successfully completing their education and graduating high school. In the report, “Critical Issues: Providing Effective Schooling for Children At-Risk”, the authors stated that “students who are placed at risk due to poverty, race, ethnicity, language, or other factors are rarely well served by their schools” (as cited by Costello, Hollifield, & Stinnette, 1996, p. 2).

In an article titled “Alternative Schools: The State of the Art,” Raywid (1994) stated that two enduring consistencies have characterized alternative schools from the start: one, they have been designed to respond to a group that appears not to be optimally served by the regular program; and two, they have consequently represented varying degrees of departure from standard school organization, programs, and environments (p. 26).

As mentioned in the introduction of this study, the Children’s Defense Fund (2010) found that an average of 26,000 children across the country are placed in detention centers facilities on a daily basis (p. 2). Students committed to juvenile detention and youth development centers are educated in an alternative educational environment rather than a traditional school environment. All alternative schools are not the same, but they are similar in many ways. This study will distinguish between the two types in Kentucky. Traditional alternative schools or an “A5” program means an alternative program that is a district-operated and district-controlled facility with no definable attendance boundaries that is designed to provide services to at-risk populations with unique needs. The type of alternative schools to be referenced in this document is the “A6” program, meaning a district-operated instructional program in a nondistrict-operated institution or school (Kentucky Department of Education, 2013). “Alternative schools can provide a supportive environment that often includes social support and academic support, along with a sense of belonging, and a supportive connection that extends beyond the interpersonal relationships in most traditional schools” (Policy Studies Associates, 1995, p. 1). However, research shows that incarcerated students do

not receive the same quality of education in these alternative schools as do their peers who attend traditional schools (Costello, Hollifield, & Stinnette, 1996).

Often, when students are released from juvenile detention centers and youth development centers and re-enter traditional schools, they face multiple challenges. Some of these challenges are the lack of collaboration between schools, justice system and the family. The student is transitioning from a highly structured environment to an environment of independent lifestyle. Additionally, the unfamiliarity with the academic material can cause a challenge to the student completing academic work and ultimately high school. These challenges explain why they continued to be considered at risk of not graduating high school (Matvya, Lever, & Boyle, 2006).

Feinstein (2002) stated that "adjudicated youth are a particular challenge to teach" (p. 9). Several of my colleagues expressed sentiments that align with Feinstein's observation, indicating that there were barriers to understanding the students, such as gender, race and general life experiences. Because of these difficulties, it is imperative that the local education agency hire qualified personnel who can surmount such barriers and reach out to students. "For these students the education provided by the correctional facility is their last bastion, it is their final opportunity to gain the academic knowledge and skills" for a productive life (Feinstein, 2002, p. 9). An education strategy promoted by World Bank Group (2011, p. 3), "Learning For All: Investing in People's Knowledge and Skills to Promote Development," stated that, "At the individual level, while a diploma may open doors to employment, it is a worker's skills that determine his or her productivity and ability to adapt to new technologies and opportunities. Knowledge and

skills also contribute that to an individual's ability to have a healthy and educated family and engage in civic life."

Buck (2011) stated that it is important to consider the impact the lack of a quality education can have on students incarcerated at juvenile detention centers and youth development centers. Students that receive a quality education receive the tools necessary to help them become productive members of society. They raise healthier children who most often graduate high school (p. 2). It decreases their dependence on government sponsored programs like housing assistance and food assistance. Additionally, high school graduates are less likely to commit crimes and they become involved in civics as well as volunteer more in their community (p. 3). This helps students consider and respect the views of others and be able to address their own situation in a positive way. An education helps students think critically; and through the process of getting educated, students may develop respect for the the views of others even when they may disagree. They are able to address a situation through behavior that conforms to the rules of society, which helps them to become productive citizens in the community.

Bruce Wolford (2000) of Eastern Kentucky University indicates our "public schools have the responsibility for educating the majority of youth in the juvenile justice system" (p. 4) Drakeford (2002) indicated that educational services in juvenile corrections must provide incarcerated youth with a chance to increase their academic skills, develop confidence in order to achieve personal goals, and become productive citizens of society. In order for the juvenile corrections education system to be effective and to achieve these goals, they must address other issues that influence juvenile

corrections education, such as “inadequately prepared personnel to work with students with disabilities” (Platt, Casey, & Faessel, 2006, p. 32).

Gemignani (1994, p. 1) argued that juvenile schools are often seen as inferior to public schools. The lack of resources to address issues that students face trying to achieve a quality education appears to be one of the problems. In this study, the criteria used to identify a quality juvenile justice school is based on students returning to school upon release from an institution; the facility’s effort to provide transition services; conducting program evaluations of the juvenile justice schools; and using specific student learning and community reintegration outcome measures.

Blomberg, Blomberg, Waldo, Pesta, and Bellows (2006, p. 145) supported Gemignani’s view when they argued that “the quality of juvenile justice schools throughout the United States historically has been uneven and inferior to that of public schools.” Platt, Casey, and Faessel (2006, p. 32) suggested that inferiority of the juvenile justice schools and the difficult task to offer a quality education are often exacerbated by an unwillingness of local administrative agencies to expend the needed resources on a population that has so little political capital. Many of these issues in education are coming to the forefront and forcing our society to deal with them. Educators and legislators believe that the implementation of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act will help minimize the effects of this problem, but not eliminate it (Blomberg et al., 2006).

Pierce et al. (2009, p. 8) wrote that:

> …according to IDEA 2004, transition services are defined as a coordinated set of activities designed to result in the improvement of both the academic and functional achievements of the student. Transition services are expected to

> support the students' movement from education programs to post-school activities, including post-secondary, continuing and adult education opportunities, adult services, employment and community participation, and independent living. Education programs must provide evaluation of, and instruction in, these activities that are based on the individual students' strengths, needs, interests and preferences (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004).

The experience of students from youth development centers do not vary from those in juvenile detention centers. Academic programs are comprehensive in the juvenile detention centers and in youth development centers. They offer a regular six-hour school day with an academic track for both high school graduation and the General Educational Development (GED) test. Some students also have vocation opportunities as well as the opportunity to take college courses through a virtual university program (Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice, 2008). In the Department of Juvenile Justice programs, the school day is the same as in tradtional schools. There is a minimum of 6 instructional school hours per KRS 158.060 (3) and has an extended school calendar of 33 days beyond the traditional school calendar that totals 210 days.

Earning a high school diploma is essential to the future success of those who have spent time in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers. According to The Social Studies Help Center (2012), obtaining a high school diploma provides better job opportunities, gives the recipients a sense of pride, and gives them the opportunity to continue their education and earn a college degree which ultimately leads to higher wages. The Alliance for Excellent Education (2011) stated that "the annual average income for a high school dropout in 2009 was $19,540 compared to $27,380 for a high

school graduate, a difference of $7,840 annually (p. 1)" and that "a high school dropout can expect to receive additional lifetime income if they graduate with their high school class" (p. 1). Further, the Alliance for Excellent Education (2011) stated that Kentucky had an estimated graduation rate 72.8% in school year 07-08 and projects the number of nongraduates in the state to total 15,482 non-graduates in the class of 2011. Kentucky dropouts from that period could expect to earn additional income totaling $2,117,000,000 inclusive of all that did not graduate (p. 5). These figures were calculated using an economic input-output model created by Economic Modeling Specialists, Inc. (p. 6).

Mitra (2011) stated that because "graduating high school has historically been an important indicator for employers that a person is ready to hold a job" it has "dramatic economic benefits for individuals" (p. 10). Additionally, public education provides one of the best opportunities to reduce crime and its cost to society by helping children to gain knowledge, skills, and character that help them avoid criminal activity. The following data demonstrates the strong correlation between the lack of educational achievement and crime:

A. Roughly 41 percent of all federal, state, and local prisoners in 1997 and 31 percent of probationers had not completed high school or received a GED, while that was true of only 18% of the general population age 18 or older.
B. Black and white males in prison at 20 to 39 years of age (Two-thirds of all state inmates in 1997) were half as likely to have a high school degree as the same group in the general population.
C. In 1999, Caucasian men aged 30-34 who had not completed high school were four times more likely to have a prison record than Caucasian men of the same age

> who had completed high school, and African American male dropouts aged 30-34 were two times as likely as those with a high school degree to have a prison record (Mitra, 2011, p. 13).

Those who have a high school education are less likely to commit a crime and they feel better about the opportunities that are available to them. Additionally, those with a high school education live healthier lives and are not likely to depend on the social systems to support their lifestyles. Learning equates to attaining an education of which promotes a sense of self-control in our life-style choices and equates living a better life (Mitra, 2011).

KECSAC

Sweeping changes in funding and delivery of elementary and secondary education called for by the 1990 Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) did not specifically address the needs of state agency children in receiving a quality education that would include academic, pre-vocational, vocational, special education, social skills, and post-secondary content (KECSAC, 2007). In response to this deficiency, the Kentucky General Assembly passed Senate Bill 260 in 1992, which called for the establishment of the Kentucky Educational Collaborative for State Agency Children (KECSAC) to oversee the administration of regulations governing the education of state agency children (Wirth et al., n.d.). The definition of state agency children followed an evolutionary process with the creation of the Department of Juvenile Justice Centers and KECSAC and is most recently defined by KRS 158.135(1)(a) as

> Those children of school age committed to or in custody of the Cabinet for Health and Family Services operated or contracted institution, treatment center, facility, including those for therapeutic foster care…as well as those children committed to or in custody of the Department of Juvenile Justice and placed in a department operated or contracted facility or program (Wirth et al. n.d.)

KECSAC's legislative mission includes the distribution of funds to school districts that serve state agency children. These state funds are for teacher training, data collection, interagency collaboration, and program improvement in education programs operated by, funded by, or contracting with the Kentucky Departments of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), Community Based Services (DCBS), and Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities and Addiction Services (DMHDDAS) (Pierce et al., 2009, p. 6). Schools and programs are categorized A1 – A6. While the majority of schools are "A1" schools—that is, under administrative control of a principal and eligible to establish a school-based decision-making council—some alternative or special programs exist as follows:

- An "A2" program means a district-operated, totally vocational-technical program.
- An "A3" program means a district-operated, totally special education program.
- An "A4" program means a district-operated, totally preschool program.
- An "A5" program means an alternative program that is a district-operated and district-controlled facility with no definable attendance boundaries that is designed to provide services to at-risk populations with unique needs.
- An "A6" program means a district-operated instructional program in a nondistrict-operated institution or school (Kentucky Department of Education, 2013).

The “A6 education programs,” as identified by the Kentucky Department of Education, are alternative education settings that serve youth from across the state, and thus serve those students most at risk of making unsuccessful transitions to adult life. Kentucky is one of the few, if not the only state in the nation with such an innovative and viable education collaborative designed specifically to educate its at-risk youth within state agency programs. KECSAC is a true partnership of linkages between school districts, children and family services, community mental health, juvenile justice, private providers, and an institution of higher learning.

KECSAC poplulation varies by the level of risk of the student being served, with 48% being served by the Department of Juvenile Justice (Pierce et al., 2009, p. 8). In Kentucky, KECSAC works with local education agencies as well as alternative and state programs to provide quality educational experiences to meet the varying needs of the youth designated as state agency children. These educational experiences can include academic, pre-vocational, vocational, special education, social skills, and post-secondary offerings, which are in compliance with state and federal educational laws and regulations (KECSAC, 2007, p. 3).

The programs conduct a regular school calender of 177 days and has an extended calender of 33 days that totals 210 days of instruction each year. The programs also must meet the requirement set forth in section 505 KAR 1:080 (4)(a), that indicates, “The teacher pupil ratio for on-site state agency school programs serving state agency children shall average, based on annual average daily attendance, no more than ten (10) students to one (1) teacher without a classroom aide and fifteen (15) students to one (1) teacher with a classroom aide. A classroom that exclusively serves students with the educational

disabilities shall comply with teacher pupil ratios as specified in 707 KAR 1:230, Section 5" (Kentucky Legislature, n.d.).

Teacher Efficacy

There are many forces which shape policy and practice in public education that have a disproportionately negative impact on children who are served in special education programs (Skiba et al., 2008). Many times these forces lie outside of the students' control, encompassing issues such as race, culture and socioeconomic status. Consequently, teachers and educational leaders must "demonstrate a willingness to understand the cultures and background realities of their students and school community" (Walker & Dimmock, 2005, p. 295). Those factors affect the behavior and values that students bring into school from their communities, but how staff members react to those factors ultimately impacts the learning climate. Without proper diversity training, educators may not be able to effectively address cultural issues in their classrooms, which may incline them to reduce their expectations of their students' academic abilities.

Raising teachers' expectations begins with understanding and improving teacher efficacy, which Protheroe (2008) defines as the teacher's belief in his or her own influence over student behavior and academic learning. Jackson (2002) supports this conceptualization, noting that these beliefs help shape the classroom environment, student engagement and academic achievement. Psychologist Albert Bandura (as cited by Jackson, 2002, p. 244) "suggested that self efficacy beliefs may be enhanced in four ways: (a) perfomance accomplishments (successfully achieving the outcome), (b) vicarious experiences (observing others achieve the outcome), (c) verbal persuasion

(encouragement, reassurance, motivational speech), and (d) emotional arousal (reducing physiological signs of anxiety)."

Teachers with a high sense of efficacy tend to be patient in the classroom; avoid criticizing students too harshly over errors; are reluctant to refer students for special education; are willing to try and implement new ideas to enhance a student's instruction; and demonstrate strong skills in planning for academic success through diversified instructional strategies. I have observed that teachers in schools with low-performing students are not likely to accept responsibility for the low performance if their efficacy is low.

Conversely, high collective efficacy is associated with high student academic achievement (Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004). Collective efficacy refers to the environment of the school and the teachers' collective efforts. This effort affects the behavior of the teachers in regards to their belief in their ability to meet the needs of the students and to ultimately impact the student achievement in a positive manner. When a school has a high sense of efficacy the faculty generally takes responsibility for the academic outcomes of their students. One can infer from the literature on teacher efficacy that collective efficacy and student achievement may share a reciprocal relationship (Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004).

According to Guskey (1987), teacher efficacy is a critical variable when examining instructional effectiveness. The author identified three context variables hypothesized to affect teacher efficacy: 1) teachers taking responsibility for their own actions and for student acheivement; 2) the ability of the students involved; and 3) the scope of teacher influence. In the study, Guskey collected data from 120 teachers across

three school districts and found that the teachers in the lower grade levels appeared to have a greater personal efficacy on all dimensions of the examined variables. In this study, the responsibility the teachers assumed for the success of a student was different compared to the responsibility the teacher assumed for failure or lack of success. The results of this study are reasonable, but they counter that is hypothesized.

Another study by Coladarci (1992) corroborated and expanded these findings. The study sampled 170 teachers from the state of Maine and examined the association between a teacher's efficacy and commitment to the field of education. Coladarci's study based itself upon Bandura's theory regarding classes of expectations that impact human behavior: namely, outcome expectations and efficacy expectations. Outcome expectations are defined as "a person's estimate that a given behavior will lead to certain outcomes" while efficacy expectations are defined as "the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcome" (Coladarci, 1992, p. 324). The study found that efficacious teachers tend to adhere to these expectations in positive ways, thus providing "some evidence that teacher efficacy is related to academic achievement" (Coladarci, 1992, p. 326). Like Guskey (1987), Coladarci found that teacher efficacy was higher for elementary school teachers compared to high school teachers.

Ware and Kitsantas (2007) conducted a study that "sought to examine whether teacher and collective efficacy beliefs predicted a commitment to the teaching profession" (p. 303). The authors used the definition of teacher efficacy supplied by Tscahnnen-Moran and Hoy (2001): the teacher's belief in his or her ability to affect students' classroom engagement and academic achievement. The study found that

teachers who exhibit low efficacy will place the responsibility for their failures on other people or situations. However, high efficacy can equate to strong support for the organization and a commitment to the school and the profession. The study uncovered a correlation between the commitment to teaching and "the three scales of teacher efficacy to enlist administrative direction, collective efficacy – teacher influence on decsion-making, teacher efficacy for classroom management" (Ware & Kitsantas, 2007, p. 305).

In essence, one expects that teachers who are more committed to their jobs care more about their students. Collier (2005) asserts that "caring is the fuel for teacher efficacy" (p. 358), adding that this value, which we typically expect from the best teachers, "is critical to guiding instruction and student discipline, the development of school policy and the organization of daily school schedule" (p. 363). The overlap between efficacy and caring is not terribly surprising, as efficacious teachers tend to view their roles as teachers as important; set high expectations for student perfomance; take personal responsibility for student learning; make adjustments to instructional practices when necessary to meet the students' needs; engage in goal-setting for all those involved in the success of the student; and consider their students to be partners in the learning process. These same attributes are usually found in teachers who are considered caring.

While the degree of caring varies from person to person, and is certainly important for an effective classroom, efficacy is not necessarily something that teachers must possess innately; rather it involves what teachers believe about themselves in relation to student academic performance. Undoubtedly, then, teacher efficacy will be affected by the classroom environment and the teachers' own experiences. A cross-sectional study by Stipek (2012) illustrates this point. In the study, a survey was

conducted among 473 third- and fifth-grade teachers, with the population composed primarily of females (79.6%) who were predominantly white (81.6%) from 196 schools (p. 595). The schools served, on average, a relatively high proportion of students living in poverty and students of color. The study makes apparent that student characteristics can affect teacher efficacy: Teachers who work with minority students from low socioeconomic backgrounds tend to hold a lower academic expectation of their students and eventually develop a lower sense of efficacy. These results were more obvious in situations where the student's family dynamic was mentioned and the administrators were passive. In situations where teachers were supported by administrators and the student's family, the teachers' expectations and self-efficacy tended to be higher. The researcher could not confirm a causative relationship, but there appears to be a correlation between parental and administrative support and high teacher efficacy, at least in situations involving disadvantaged students.

These findings are also relevant to environments with disabled students—a population that is being increasingly accommodated in regular and juvenile classrooms. According to Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012), many industrialized countries, such as the United States, United Kingdom, Canada and Australia, have enacted some type of law that regulates inclusive classrooms, which has spurred a need for greater teacher efficacy in these environments. In these classrooms, teachers must contend with both physical and mental disabilities, which often entails the application of diversified instruction in order to meet the needs of all students. Obviously, this is no easy task. Consequently, Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012) set out to develop an instrument capable of measuring teacher efficacy in an inclusive classroom. The authors found that this effort is affected

by variables such as parents, adminsitration, peers, and other resources; the support and participation of all the aforementioned variables is imperative to the success of the inclusive effort. That said, teacher efficacy is significantly associated with success in the inclusive classroom: The researchers discovered “that teachers with a low sense of self-efficacy demonstrated anxiety and rejected the idea of including students with special needs in their classrooms” (Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2012, p. 13).

Protheroe (2008) argues that a school with a strong sense of collective efficacy is likely to encourage strong and positive teacher-parent relationships, which could ultimately have a positive impact on retaining teachers in the profession. This argument follows soundly from an earlier study by Newmann, Rutter, and Smith (1989), which focused on reducing the alienation felt by high school teachers. The authors defined alineation as the “relationships of detachment, estrangement, fragmentation, isolation, and separation” (p. 222). The study suggested that teachers who become highly skilled in their academic area and invest time into supporting their students are more likely to be considered efficacious. However, support from parents and the school organization are important for maintaining the teacher’s feeling of attachment. Ultimately, the results from this study “indicate reasonably strong relationships between efficacy and community and between efficacy and expectations, but a weak relationship between expectations and community” (p. 232).

A later study by Pas, Bradshaw, and Hershfeldt (2012) helps to validate the above conclusions. Their research revolves around the relationship between teacher efficacy and teacher burnout. Survey data was collected three times from a group of 600 teachers over a period of two academic years. The authors made several discoveries: First, teachers

who feel more prepared when they graduate and enter the profession experience a higher sense of efficacy and less burnout. Second, teachers who receive more parental involvement and principal support experience less burnout. However, teacher efficacy and teacher burnout both increased at various times, with teacher burnout increasing more rapidly than teacher efficacy. The authors propose that future researcher should examine the variables that lead to teacher efficacy and teacher burnout in order to better address the problem of teacher retention.

Rushton (2000) provides a useful example of a program designed to enhance teacher efficacy and reduce alienation. Using interviews, written reflections and classroom discussions, the paper records the experiences of five student teachers who spent eight months in inner-city middle school classrooms. In this study, efficacy is defined "as the positive change in attitude toward self, teaching, and working with others" (p. 371). The study charted the growth of these teaching interns toward efficacy through conflicts they dealt with during a 20-week academic period. The teaching program was designed to help the student interns understand more about the socioeconomic, cultural, and political issues that affected the classroom. As the interns' perspectives changed and their confidence increased, they were willing to take more risks in order to help students gain self-efficacy. The study indicated that teachers often encounter a conflict between establishing good rapport with their students and trying to create a disciplined learning environment. However, it seems possible for some teachers, with the right types of support, to overcome their alienation and become more invested in their students' success.

Tucker et al. (2005), in a study designed to develop and test a training program for promoting teacher efficacy, indicated that teacher efficacy significantly affects the teacher-student relationship. Teachers with a strong belief in their ability to affect a student's academic achievement and motivation for learning spent less time lecturing the whole classroom and more effort in placing their students in small groups to facilitate activity. Teachers with a high sense of efficacy are generally patient, willing to teach difficult learners and less likely to make a special education referral. These teachers also look for solutions within the classroom environment as opposed to associating academic failure to external variables. The study indicated that teacher efficacy is related to the teacher's ability and willingness to work with students from diverse background or backgrounds unlike their own. Also, teacher efficacy can be increased though various types of training including diversity training for teachers.

Naturally, students who are difficult to teach present a struggle for educators regardless of efficacy level. Thus, it is important to understand the factors which tend to produce difficult students, as well as develop methods for helping them. Soodak and Podell (1994) conducted a study with 240 teachers to examine the association between their sense of efficacy and their decisions regarding difficult students. Of course, factors such as class size, curriculum rigidity, available time and the student's needs (whether physical, emotional or behavioral) introduce a strain on the teacher, however efficacious. Often there is a lack of available services and resources to address those issues, which may lead the teacher to seek outside support. Less efficacious teachers may be more inclined to refer the student to special education and place the blame on external factors such as family life. According to the authors, higher teacher efficacy "based on one of the

dimensions the social learning theory by Bandura's (1997, 1982) state, [is] the teacher's conviction that one can successfully bring about the desired outcomes in their students" (Podell & Soodak, 1993). Efficacious teachers generally use whole group instruction, exhibit good planning, enact effective classroom management practices, and employ multiple strategies to enhance student learning. The results of this study suggest that teachers make intervention decisions based on their personal efficacy level and their understanding of the student's problems, which can introduce issues of bias where cultural training is insufficient.

An earlier study by Podell and Soodak (1993) contends with this very issue, examining teachers' sense of efficacy and the biases in their decisions to refer students to special education. The concerns about the bias in the referral process "necessitated that a careful examination take place concerning the referral process" (p. 247). Even years later, Hoover (2012) agrees that teachers' misperceptions based on students' cultural and linguistic diversity are often the basis for student referrals to special education. Podell & Soodak (1993) operationalized teacher efficacy through two dimensions of social learning: "their beliefs in their own ability to bring about change in their students and beliefs concerning the extent to which teaching can overcome external influences on the student" (p. 247). The researchers indicated that more efficacious teachers are less likely to make referrals to special education and will exhibit more patience with difficult students. However, the study also highlighted a common bias toward the student's socioeconomic status and a disbelief regarding the causes of the student's problem(s). The results of the study suggest that teachers' decisions can be based on non-academic causes (e.g., race, status, etc.) that are unrelated to the specific academic difficulty

experienced by the student. Consequently, students will not be treated fairly and may find themselves unnecessarily referred to special education.

On this point, Goodman and Webb (2006) conducted a study to examine the referrals to special education of primary students in the third and fourth grades at a school located in a low socioeconomic neighborhood in the Southwest. In question was the teachers' competence in dealing with students with inappropriate behaviors; their ability to handle diversity in their student population, and their preparation and subjectivity toward the process which prompted them to refer students for special education.

Wolters and Daugherty (2007) examined the association between teacher efficacy and classroom goal structure in regard to teaching experience and academic level. The authors defined goals structures as "prevailing instructional policies and procedures within an academic setting, such as a classroom or school" (p. 181). Goal structures are important because of their impact on student achievement and motivation; they have also been linked to indicators of students' engagement, learning, and performance (Wolters & Daugherty, 2007). The participants for this study were teachers from a large suburban district in Texas who were responsible for teaching instruction in all of the subject areas. The data was collected via an Internet-based self-report survey. Teachers supplied demographic information and completed the long form of the Teachers' sense of Efficacy school developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001).

This study provided insight on how some teachers view their own sense of efficacy with regard to classroom goal structures, the likes of which ultimately affect student achievement. The findings indicated that the motivational climate of the classroom varies across academic levels and that teachers cite job experiences and

training as reasons for higher efficacy. Of course, the study's correlational nature does not allow one to draw causal conclusions between its many variables, but the "study [nonetheless] adds to the research on motivation by connecting frameworks develped to better understand the classroom influences on students' motivation and subsequent learning and achievement" (Wolters & Daugherty, 2007, p. 191).

In sum, "teacher efficacy is a simple idea with significant implications" (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001, p. 783). It encompasses important beliefs about teachers' ability to impact student performance and bring about desired results. The teacher's sense of self-efficacy is associated with the students' self-efficacy, behavior in the classroom, effective classroom management and student outcomes with regards to student achievement. Higher efficacy prompts teachers to be more tolerable of student behavior and performance in the classroom, while also creating an environment that is conducive for student learning.

Student Achievement

Margolis and McCabe (2006) propose that many students who are at-risk often resist academics because of the feeling that succeeding is not a reality. In a qualitative study, Knesting and Waldron (2006) set out to determine those factors which can enhance feelings of success, namely by describing the process of student persistence as well as the social support systems enacted by teachers and school administrators. "Three interactive factors that appeared critical to the students' persistence were: (a) goal orientation – students believed they benefited from graduating, (b) willingness to play the game – student's willingness to follow school rules, and (c) meaningful connections –

relationships with teachers who believed students could graduate and provided support and caring" (Knesting & Waldron, 2006, p. 603). The study indicated that teachers can also help students graduate by emphasizing the students over the programs, focusing on the positive, maintaining high expectations, talking with students, and paying attention to small details such as students' demeanor and attitudes. The students were more willing to accept assistance from the teachers as their comfort levels increased.

However, the participants in the study clearly indicated that other factors motivate them to stay in school: relationships with 'caring' teachers, negative views about dropping out, and clear communication with teachers about academic issues and personal issues. The participants in this study would argue otherwise due to their relationships with teachers they identified as caring, their views negatives views about dropping out of school, teachers that had a high sense of efficacy in regards to their success, teachers that communicated with the students and knew what issues the students were dealing with in their lives and the small things such as the interpersonal behavior between the teacher and student that was identified as important by the student. In short, efficacious teachers can influence some students to remain in school and work toward completing their education.

Of course, the research makes clear that the aforementioned issues are associated variables that can impact student academic success. The CRESPAR (2001) report indicated that children who come from impoverished communities are placed at academic risk. Often, schools are not able to provide the support necessary to combat academic failure that results from the lack of human and academic resources needed to address a struggling student's various issues. In response, disadvantaged students sometimes

develop an oppositional culture that equates to one appearing to acting white or selling out. If a student does not feel a "fit" in the school or academic environment, that isolation will also impact his or her academic success. The CRESPAR (2001) study thus purports a need to address factors that help students beat the odds. These efforts create resilience in students that contribute to the student having a strong will and a positive disposition. "Out of this research has emerged a tendency to label whole groups of students as 'at risk' when, in fact, many of them succeed. Rather than identifying achievement gaps, resilience research offers the possibility of discovering why individuals succeed despite adversity" (CRESPAR, 2001, p. 4). This attitude is important because the focus on success will outweigh the focus on failure.

Proctor's (1984) work identified that the attitudes, norms and the values of an educational faculty and staff can make a difference in achievement test scores. In turn, the student's characteristics are influenced by teacher attitudes and teacher efficacy. It is important to know that in more recent studies, Proctor found that students' self-image and behavior are affected by teacher efficacy. Other components that are encompassed by the theory are the quality of instruction and teacher classroom behavior.

Proctor's model places emphasis on teachers' expectations and the effect on student academic effort and, as a result, the academic outcome. Proctor's ideas were derived from parts of other teacher and classroom-based models and were redesigned to place emphasis on teacher expectation. His model begins with the school social climate that includes attitudes, norms, beliefs, and prejudices. The climate is influenced by student characteristics that are identified as race, gender, economic level, and past academic performance, all of which he argued influenced teacher attitudes and teacher

efficacy (McIlrath & Huitt, 1995). Additionally, Proctor suggested that the variable of interaction was important and encompassed the school's overall policy. He also included the quality of instruction a student received and the teacher's classroom behaviors. The final variable was the student's achievement level which was an outcome of all the aforementioned variables.

Bandura (1997) offers ideas that align with these principles, such as perceived self-efficacy, which is defined as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, p. 207). A higher self-efficacy level in a teacher should equate to a higher level of effort to serve the students' different learning styles and environments. The lower the teacher's self-efficacy, the less the teacher will feel that help for the student is possible. Teachers with high self-efficacy have more positive behavior and attitudes toward students and their efforts are more effective in creating and providing an inclusive academic environment. Teachers that are competent in using effective teaching strategies, collaborating with others and managing disruptive behaviors would likely be more efficacious when teaching in an inclusive classroom.

To help validate these ideas, Tyler and Boelter (2008) conducted a study to examine whether teachers' expectations are predictive of student academic efficacy and engagement. The authors randomly selected a middle school from a list of middle schools in the Southeastern region of the United States and collected data from students in a Language Arts class. During this class the participants were given coded packets and were informed that their responses should reflect their total school experience and not just the Language Arts class. In this study, the perception that teachers had high

expectations for the students predicted academic engagement. However, the study discovered no clear association between the teachers' expectations and cognitive antecedents of academic performance. Granted, the study is limited in its external validity due to the random selection of a single middle school with predominately low-income, black students. Additionally, the findings of the sample were generalized and the framework described an association with teacher expectations and academic outcomes; but there was no data collected to support this association.

Nixon (2010) indicated that the relationship between a student and teacher plays a critical role in a student's academic achievement and overall success in school. After conducting a comprehensive review of literature on school programs for African-American males, Ascher (1995) assessed that many African-American students would choose to be absent from class rather than attend class with a disliked teacher, while Corbett and Wilson (2002) contended that developing and maintaining meaningful teacher relationships with African-American students can improve their academic achievement and persistence.

Yeo, Ang, Chong, Huan, and Quek (2008) conducted a study with the purpose of examining the efficacy of teachers who work with at-risk students. Specifically, the study sought to assess the efficacy of Asian teachers (from Asian countries) using the Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1998) scales, which had not been previously applied to this population. The participants were provided questionnaires and completed them on their own time. The three elements critical to this study, based on the aforementioned scales, were classroom management, instructional strategies and student engagement, which are defined below:

- Classroom Engagement: Efficacious teachers create environments that are conducive to academic success. The teachers are well-organized and plan appropriately to meet the needs of their students. The planning and organization allows for the flexibility to meet a diverse student population's needs in the classroom environment.
- Instructional Strategies: Efficacious teachers develop strategies to meet the needs of their students. These teachers spend more time monitoring the students' work and providing feedback than on discipline. Teachers uncover ways to help students with learning difficulties, setting attainable goals while establishing realistic academic expectations.
- Student Engagement: Efficacious teachers find or develop ways to engage students in the classroom. These teachers believe in their ability to teach students regardless of their academic background and demonstrate a willingness to reach out to and encourage their students. This engagement increases the student's chance of receiving a general education.

"The findings suggested that an inverse predictive relationship between teacher-student conflict and teacher competence in managing the classroom and providing appropriate instructional strategies for low achieving students" (Yeo et al., 2008, p. 200). The teachers in Singapore reported a higher sense of efficacy as their experienced increased. The researchers communicate a need for novice and experienced teachers to continue receiving training or professional development as they work to strengthen teacher efficacy. The study is limited by its small sample size, which may reduce its power and render the results less applicable to teachers who are serving low-achieving

students in other countries. Additionally, participants' demographic information was not obtained and data was collected only through questionnaires.

The literature suggests that as we look at the student's aspirations, we should also take a close look at the teacher's expectations. There appears to be correlations between the students' aspiration and teachers' expectations, which has a direct impact on the school's learning environment. Often teachers and administrators, who make up a large portion of the school environment and impact the school culture, accept that familial variables impact student learning, but miss the possible effects introduced by teacher expectations and beliefs (Theoharis, 2007).

The question now is how all of the above factors—teacher efficacy and expectations, student status and culture, and available resources—translate to the juvenile education domain. This paper holds that education must be the cornerstone of the juvenile rehabilitation process and must be offered to youth both at schools and juvenile detention facilities. Problems arise when services are not rendered properly, or at all, and children are not prepared for life after incarceration (Wald & Losen, 2003). Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012) indicate that inclusiveness has to do with creating an environment to address the needs of all students. The effort includes the adaption of the teaching methods to address each student's needs individually. Much of the inclusive effort is dependent on the teacher's effort and belief in helping the student. This is where the teacher education programs should prepare the graduates to serve all students.

Conclusion

The literature review points to some research areas that could be improved upon and that, in doing so, could enhance the effort of educators in juvenile corrections education systems across the United States. Various research studies conclude that juveniles in the corrections education system receive inferior education compared to those students who attend regular public schools. There was no research available that opposed those findings.

Even though Kentucky has the most comprehensive educational delivery system in the United States, there was minimal research data available concerning the impact of teacher efficacy on student achievement in juvenile detention and youth development centers in Kentucky. Academic research institutions should consider reviewing and revising polices so that data can be more easily collected and program evaluations can be obtained in order to conduct meaningful research.

Providing a comprehensive education effort for the students of the juvenile correction education system should aid in increasing teacher efficacy and impact student achievement in a positive way through additional educational services offered to the students and professional development for educators in areas of understanding and embracing diversity, individual education plans, career education for students, and problem-solving activities. Bereiter (1985), Scarr (1988), and Wang (1990) all concluded that educators in juvenile corrections education systems must optimize learning environments and maximize potential of at-risk learners; they must also understand which factors contribute to their success. For these reasons, the researcher reiterates the importance of addressing the research question: Namely, what is the perceived level of

teacher efficacy in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky?

If every student can have access to a quality education regardless of class standing or academic setting, then society may begin to accept that incarcerated students should have the same opportunities as their peers to improve their lives. Moreover, when educators begin to understand the seriousness of efficacy and its influences on students in the juvenile corrections education system, we may begin to see higher teacher efficacy and improved student achievement.

Next, chapter three will describe the methodology and research design utilized in the present study.

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY & RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this study is to examine the self-efficacy of teachers who work in the juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky. More specifically, the study aims to assess how the level of self-efficacy influences student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management—all of which contribute to students' efforts to complete high school. "Teacher self-efficacy beliefs are important in terms of the decisions of how a teacher handles classroom management, organizing courses to accommodate the needs of the student, teaching, motivating the students for learning, and communicating with the students effectively" (Erdem & Demirel, 2007, p. 574). The study hopes to provide information that will help improve the education offered to students incarcerated in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky. A quality education for these students can help ensure that they receive the same opportunities as their peers who attend public schools.

This study focuses on teachers (N=61) who are employed by local public schools systems to teach in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky. These teachers are certified in special education and the core subject academic areas and are able to handle situations that could arise from working in this academic environment and the experience of working with the population of at-risk students. The teachers in this study were surveyed using a questionnaire containing questions pertaining to their roles as teachers working in this academic environment. The researcher obtained permission to use the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale, developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), as the survey instrument. "The survey instrument was designed to gain a better understanding of the situations that create difficulties for

teachers in their school activities" (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001, p. 1). The goal is to examine the level of teacher efficacy in the classrooms at juvenile detention centers and youth development centers and determine the impact this element has on students' efforts to succeed academically. Academic success is operationally defined in this study as students being able to work toward high school graduation while incarcerated at the juvenile detention centers or youth development centers.

The data collected from the survey should provide answers to the research question, which is: Do teachers perceive the level of teacher efficacy in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky to be high with regards to the students they teach in the domains of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management?

I believe that the findings from this data analysis will add to the academic area of alternative education and enhance efforts to improve the education offered to students committed to the juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky.

Definition of Key Terms

Juvenile Detention Center, also known as juvenile holding facility, means "a physically secure facility, approved by the Department of Juvenile Justice, which is an entirely separate portion or wing of a building containing an adult jail, which provides total sight and sound separation between juvenile and adult facility spatial areas and which is staffed by sufficient certified juvenile facility staff to provide twenty-four (24) hours per day supervision" (Kentucky Legislature, 2012, para. 35).

Youth Development Center, also known as "Youth alternative center," means a non-secure facility, approved by the Department of Juvenile Justice, for the detention of juveniles, both prior to adjudication and after adjudication, which meets the criteria specified in Kentucky Legislature 15A.320 (Kentucky Legislature, 2012, para. 66).

KECSAC is an acronym for Kentucky Educational Collaborative for State Agency Children. The Kentucky General Assembly passed Senate Bill 260 (SB 260) in 1992, which called for the establishment of the Kentucky Educational Collaborative for State Agency Children (KECSAC) (Kentucky Legislature, 2012). The purpose of KECSAC is to specifically address the needs of State Agency Children, which include youth in therapeutic foster care placements and those confined in state-operated juvenile detention facilities, state-operated and contracted day treatment, group homes, and residential placements (KECSAC, 2009).

Alternative Education Programs and Intervention Services constitute "any preventive, developmental, corrective, supportive services, or treatment provided to a student who is at risk of school failure, is at risk of participation in violent behavior or juvenile crime, or has been expelled from the school district" (Kentucky Legislature, 2012).

Teacher self-efficacy is "the teacher's belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context" (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, p. 233).

At-Risk describes "when students experience a significant mismatch between their circumstances and needs, and the capacity or willingness of the school to accept, accommodate, and respond to them in a manner that supports and enables their maximum

social, emotional, and intellectual growth and development" (Costello, Hollifield, & Stinnette, 1996, p. 2).

Academic achievement encompasses "the level of actual accomplishment or proficiency one has achieved in an academic area, as opposed to one's potential" (Packer, 2002, p. 1). An example would be if a student has a tested potential to do academic work on one level, but actually may be working on a level lower.

Academic success is defined as being able to retain the information one learns in class and apply it to a situation outside of class (Finn & Rock, 1997).

Research Perspective

The research is guided by the phenomenological inquiry approach. The discipline of phenomenology may be defined as "a qualitative strategy in which the researcher identifies the essence of human experiences about a phenomenon as described by participants in the study" (Creswell, 2009, p. 231).

Research Method

This study will be conducted through a descriptive research method. According to Key (1997), "descriptive research is used to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena to describe 'what exists' with respect to variables or conditions in a situation" (Introduction section, para.1). The reason for choosing the descriptive research method design is so that data on teacher efficacy can be collected from teachers in their natural working environment. The survey will utilize a cross-sectional format, which is designed to gather information on a population at a single point in time (Kelley,

Clark, Brown, & Sitzia, 2003). The survey will replicate the *Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale* (2001), which utilizes a cross-sectional format and questions arranged in a Likert scale format, with the only difference being that the survey will be administered online and the scale rating will be reduced from the original 1-9 to 1-5.

The remainder of the paper is divided into several subsections: selection of participants; primary data collection; data collection; data analysis and interpretation; ethical considerations; limitations; delimitations, and chapter summary.

Selection of Participants

Contact was made with Dr. Ronnie Nolan, the Director of KECSAC, and data was requested on the total number of teachers who are currently teaching in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in the state of Kentucky. Parker (2010) states "that the department of juvenile justice operates seven regional juvenile detention centers and 10 youth development centers in the state of Kentucky" (p. 17). The researcher then made contact, via either phone or e-mail, with the facilities' school administrators in order to confirm the accuracy of the data submitted by Dr. Nolan. The population targeted for this research was male and female teachers (N=61) who are working at juvenile detention centers and youth development centers located in rural and urban geographical regions throughout the state of Kentucky. The population comprises teachers of different races, ethnic backgrounds and education levels.

The school administrators provided the teachers' names as well as granted permission to invite the teachers to participate in the survey. Afterwards, each teacher was sent an electronic invitation with the disclaimer that their responses would be

anonymous and their privacy would be protected. The researcher sent a follow-up email to participating teachers to verify their interest, as well as provided the time and date the survey would be available and the deadline for responding to the survey. Attention was given to fulfilling all the requirements of Eastern Kentucky University's Institutional Review Board.

These teachers have met the minimal requirements to work in the facilities, which involve attending a KECSAC new educators training and being certified to teach in a subject taught at their facility and/or having a special education certification. Participants were chosen based specifically on their employment as teachers assigned to teach at juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky; on their teaching experience in the juvenile corrections education system; and their skills in dealing with at-risk students. It is important to note that the teachers are employed by their local school districts and not by the Department of Juvenile Justice or the Department of Corrections.

Purposive sampling was used in this study. It is a non-probability sampling method often used during preliminary research efforts to obtain a gross estimate of the results without incurring the cost or time required to select a random sample (Survey Sampling Methods, 2010). The basis for this choice is the minimal data available on teacher efficacy in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers. Therefore, the researcher aims to fill this gap in teacher efficacy studies by forming a baseline understanding of teachers' influence on student efforts to complete high school while incarcerated at juvenile detention and youth developments centers.

Primary Data Collection

The questionnaire was administered to all teachers and featured close-ended questions directly related to the juvenile correction education environment. The focus was specifically aimed at the teachers' perceptions of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management in their classrooms. The questions, taken directly from the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale, are designed to gather data in regards to student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management concerning the effect of teacher efficacy on students' efforts at completing high school while incarcerated

Using a Likert scale with closed-ended questions generates statistical measurements of people's attitudes and opinions (Hasson & Arnetz, 2005). The close-ended questions are suited for computer analysis, often receiving a higher response rate and a minimal loss of data during coding (Grbich, 2012). Because the survey was deployed through Survey Monkey, an online survey tool, the researcher was able to collect and download raw data in a format that supports comparative analysis of the variables. This data may provide a fuller understanding of teacher efficacy in the juvenile correction education setting.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data analysis and interpretation was conducted through a phenomenology/heuristic analysis approach. Ratliff (2011) indicates phenomenology places emphasis on how individuals experience the world. Heuristic research starts with a question that has a social significance and its discovery of information is often through

self-inquiry methods. The lives of the researcher and research participants was not to be interpreted but rather their responses to the survey questions that provided a clear picture of the effects of teacher efficacy in this academic setting. The researcher will look at original ideas gathered from the data collected and develop questions that addressed the research question concerning teacher efficacy in regard to student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management.

The questionnaire is in a Likert-type scale format with the data collected being ordinal and interpreted for results. The statistical program utilized was the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). This program allows for the conversion of some qualitative data into quantitative data. A Cronbach's alpha was conducted on the categories and groups to test reliability between each question in a particular group to measure internal consistency, that is, how closely related a set of items are as a group. Most social scientists consider a "reliability coefficient of .70 or higher as 'acceptable' in most social science research situations" (Fazlani, Ansari, Nasar, Hashmi, & Mustafa, 2012, p. 1299). This was the standard used in this study.

The researcher of this study is a teacher in a juvenile detention center and participated by completing the survey. Coded data was transferred into the SPSS statistical analysis program once the questionnaire was completed. A descriptive analysis (i.e., mean, standard deviation, and frequency) was conducted to analyze the responses of the teachers' perception of their efficacy in the areas of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. The results are reported in chapter 4.

Ethical Considerations

Full attention was given to the protocols of the Eastern Kentucky University Institutional Review Board. Permission was requested and obtained from the IRB prior to beginning any data-collection processes. As suggested by Locke, Spriduso, and Silverman (2000), steps were taken to protect the privacy of each study participant. All teachers used their assigned participant e-mail address to offer their participation consent and indicate their completion of the survey.

Prior to making the survey available to the participants, the researcher electronically notified all participants of the study's goal, as well as its methods of data collection, storage and analysis. The names of the participants will not be published: participants answered the survey anonymously with an electronic address allowing them to answer the survey only once. The use of Survey Monkey allowed each participant to complete the online survey and be assured that their identities will never be revealed.

All materials will be transferred to the office of the researcher's academic advisor at Eastern Kentucky University at the conclusion of the research and stored for a period of at least three years. All participants were informed that they have the right to withdraw anytime.

Limitations

There are some limitations in this study. First, data had to be collected from teachers from various sites throughout the state. That required a significant amount of time to commit to communicating with teachers participating in the study. The communication with some teachers in the population was affected by individual school

schedules and the two time zones that affect the state of Kentucky. The adverse weather that impacted the state of Kentucky when the survey began (March 14, 2012) affected many teachers' ability to access the online survey tool: The weather destroyed power lines and many of the teachers had to move from their homes and schools to neighboring counties and schools.

Delimitations

The researcher will not be studying the incarcerated students at the juvenile detention centers and youth development centers directly. The public data that KECSAC compiles will be used to study student data concerning graduation rates. The collection of data included electronic means. The researcher did not personally visit each site due to the amount travel and time that would have been required, as well as because of school schedules and time zone differences.

The researcher chose to use only teachers assigned to work in the juvenile detention centers and youth development centers due to the purpose of this study. Therefore, administrators, principals, counselors, clerical staff, juvenile detention officers and youth workers, and those professionals providing wraparound services are not included in this study.

Chapter Summary

The collecting and analyzing of the survey data offered by the teachers, including this researcher, who teach at juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky will impact the future of student education in said centers. The analysis of the

data should aid in the understanding of whether or not teachers who are educating incarcerated students at juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky perceive teacher efficacy to be high and how it affects a student's effort to complete high school.

The researcher is confident that positive changes will take place regarding how teachers are educating students at these juvenile detention centers and youth development centers. Should the study conclude that the teachers perceive efficacy to be high in the juvenile corrections education system, and believe that efficacy positively affects students' academic efforts, then this study can help establish best practices for juvenile corrections educators and a model of "what should be done" not only in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, but nationwide.

The following chapter will detail the findings of this study.

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

Summary

This dissertation explores how the variables of instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management impact teacher efficacy in the juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky. The collection and analysis of the survey data may prove beneficial to the future of student education at juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky. The data will assist facility leaders in determining the academic needs of their students and the training needs of the teachers assigned to teach at the facilities. Furthermore, the data will enhance the quality of education provided to the students and help administrators in their hiring practices to seek not only highly qualified applicants, but the best people to fill educator positions.

The analysis of the data will help determine whether teachers perceive teacher efficacy to be high or low in their facilities' academic environments, which affects students' efforts to successfully work toward completing high school. The researcher hopes that this study will act as a catalyst for positive changes with regard to how teachers are educating students at the justice facilities.

In this way, this study contributes to the improvement of education for students incarcerated in these justice facilities in Kentucky. Teachers may be able to apply information from the data collection to their classrooms in order to enhance the quality and diversity of their students' learning environment. Additionally, specialized training in the core content, special education and vocational education areas will enhance teachers' efforts in providing a quality education to residents within juvenile detention centers and youth development centers (Nichols, 2011). Finally, the findings of this study may

inform policy makers with regards to decisions that impact the education provided at these facilities, if only indirectly via considerations of teacher efficacy.

According to Nichols (2011), students in these facilities spend 50% of their time during the day in the classroom environment, with most of the students facing academic challenges. Thus, teacher efficacy is an important component of enhancing the environment and bolstering student confidence. By enhancing their efficacy and strengthening their relationships with students, teachers may become more willing to incorporate alternative strategies in the classroom (Nichols, 2011).

Table 1 shows the characteristics assessed in the survey along with their corresponding item numbers and alpha coefficients.

Table 1
Breakdown of Teacher Efficacy Scale Subsections and Alpha Coefficients

Research-based Characteristic	Corresponding Survey Item Numbers	Alpha Coefficient
Teachers Efficacy Scale (Overall)	1-12	Alpha = .774
Efficacy in Student Engagement	2, 3, 4, 11	Alpha = .616
Efficacy in Instructional Practices	5, 9, 10, 12	Alpha = .748
Efficacy in Classroom Management	1, 6, 7, 8	Alpha = .458

The Teacher's Efficacy Scale showed a measure of internal consistency (.774). The measure of .70 is usually acceptable for research purposes, although a measure of .90 is typically desired when the results impact people's lives (Streiner, 2003). Collectively, the scale was used to answer the research question: Do teachers perceive the level of teacher efficacy in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky to be effective with the students they teach? In this study, effectiveness is understood as the ability to apply instructional practices in the classroom environment. The survey thus

assessed instructional practices in relation to these factors: teaching experience, age, gender, race, and context of school.

The only subscale to demonstrate reliability was the one concerned with efficacy in instructional strategies, with an acceptable alpha of .748. The other two subscales did not demonstrate a sufficient reliability measure. The following sections will detail the results for each subcategory of the survey.

Student Engagement

Research Question 1: Do teachers perceive the level of teacher efficacy in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers to be effective with the students they teach with regard to student engagement?

- Null hypothesis 1(a): There will not be a significant relationship between student engagement and the number of years of teaching experience.
- Null hypothesis 1(b): There will not be a significant relationship between student engagement and the age of the teacher.
- Null hypothesis 1(c): There will not be a significant relationship between student engagement and the gender of the teacher.
- Null hypothesis 1(d): There will not be a significant relationship between student engagement and the race of the teacher.
- Null hypothesis 1(e): There will not be a significant relationship between student engagement and the context of the school.

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and the number of years of teaching experience ($r_s[31] = .048$, $p <$

.05). The p-value is less than the alpha of .05. The test supports the rejection of null hypothesis 1(a).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically insignificant relationship between student engagement and the age of the teacher ($r_s[31] = .070$, $p > .05$). The p-value is greater than the alpha of .05. The test supports the acceptance of null hypothesis 1(b).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically insignificant relationship between student engagement and the gender of the teacher ($r_s[31] = .077$, $p > .05$). The p-value is greater than the alpha of .05. The test supports the acceptance of null hypothesis 1(c).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and the race of the teacher ($r_s[31] = -.184$, $p < .05$). The p-value is less than the alpha of .05. The test supports the rejection of null hypothesis 1(d).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and the context of the school ($r_s[31] = -.203$, $p < .05$). The p-value is less than the alpha of .05. The test supports the rejection of the null hypothesis 1(e).

In summary, results across the data of five variables were inconsistent. Based on the p-values of these items, there is no consistent relationship between student engagement and the variables of the teacher's age and gender. However, the data indicate that years of experience, race and the context of the school are relevant to student engagement and teacher efficacy in these academic environments.

The analysis indicates that 77.4% (24) of teachers felt they could do "quite a bit" to a "great deal" to motivate students who showed a low interest in school. Additionally, 80.7% (25) of the teachers felt they could do "quite a bit" to a "great deal" to calm noisy or disruptive students in the classroom. Furthermore, 61.3% (19) of the teachers believed

they could help their students to value their learning. However, only 6.4% (2) indicated they could do much to assist families in helping their children to do well in school. In general, though, it seems that higher teacher efficacy translates into a stronger feeling that teachers can minimize negative student behavior and help students achieve academic success in the classroom.

Instructional Strategies

Research Question 2: Do teachers perceive the level of teacher efficacy in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers to be effective with the students they teach with regard to instructional strategies?

- Null hypothesis 2(a): There will not be a significant relationship between instructional strategies and the number of years of teaching experience.
- Null hypothesis 2(b): There will not be a significant relationship between instructional strategies and the age of the teacher.
- Null hypothesis 2(c): There will not be a significant relationship between instructional strategies and the gender of the teacher.
- Null hypothesis 2(d): There will not be a significant relationship between instructional strategies and the race of the teacher.
- Null hypothesis 2(e): There will not be a significant relationship between instructional strategies and the context of the school.

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically insignificant relationship between instructional strategies and the number of years of teaching experience ($r_s[31] = .298$, $p >$

.05). The p-value is greater than the alpha of .05. The test thus supports the acceptance of null hypothesis 2(a).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically insignificant relationship between instructional strategies and the age of the teacher ($r_s[31] = .225$, $p > .05$). The p-value is greater than the alpha of .05. The test supports the acceptance of the null hypothesis 2(b).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically insignificant relationship between instructional strategies and the gender of the teacher ($r_s[31] = .214$, $p > .05$). The p-value is greater than the alpha of .05. The test supports the acceptance of the null hypothesis 2(c).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between instructional strategies and the race of the teacher ($r_s[31] = -.080$, $p < .05$). The p-value is less than the alpha of .05. The test supports the rejection of the null hypothesis 2(d).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between instructional strategies and the context of the school ($r_s[31] = -.122$, $p < .05$). The p-value is less than the alpha of .05. The test thereby supports the rejection of the null hypothesis 2(e).

In summary, results differed across the five variables. There was no consistent relationship between instructional strategies and the variables of teacher's experience, age, and gender, and thus the null hypotheses for those variables can be accepted. Meanwhile, the data indicate that the race of the teacher and the context of the school are relevant to teacher efficacy and the instructional strategies used in the classroom.

Analysis of the data indicates that 93.5% (29) of the teachers felt they could do "quite a bit" to a "great deal" to craft good questions for students during instruction time

in class. Additionally, 73.3% (22) of the teachers felt they use a variety of assessment strategies for students during instruction time in class. Moreover, 96.8% (30) of the teachers answered that they could provide an alternative explanation or example when students were confused during their classroom instructional time. Finally, 76.7% (23) indicated they could effectively and efficiently implement alternative teaching strategies in their classrooms in order to help their students. These traits are critical to providing a quality education to this alternative student population with their diverse needs and learning styles.

Classroom Management

Research Question 3: Do teachers perceive a level of teacher efficacy in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers to be effective with the students they teach with regard to classroom management?

- Null hypothesis 3(a): There will not be a significant relationship between classroom management and the number of years of teaching experience.
- Null hypothesis 3(b): There will not be a significant relationship between classroom management and the age of the teacher.
- Null hypothesis 3(c): There will not be a significant relationship between classroom management and the gender of the teacher.
- Null hypothesis 3(d): There will not be a significant relationship between classroom management and the race of the teacher.
- Null hypothesis 3(e): There will not be a significant relationship between classroom management and the context of the school.

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically insignificant relationship between classroom management and the number of years of teaching experience ($r_s[31] = .163$, $p > .05$). The p-value is greater than the alpha of .05. The tests supports the acceptance of null hypothesis 3(a).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically insignificant relationship between classroom management and the age of the teacher ($r_s[31] = .100$, $p > .05$). The p-value is greater than the alpha of .05. The test supports the acceptance of the null hypothesis 3(b).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between classroom management and the gender of the teacher ($r_s[31] = -.107$, $p < .05$). The p-value is less than the alpha of .05. The test supports the rejection of the null hypothesis 3(c).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically insignificant relationship between classroom management and the race of the teacher ($r_s[31] = .110$, $p > .05$). The p-value is greater than the alpha of .05. The test supports the acceptance of the null hypothesis 3(d).

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between classroom management and the context of the school ($r_s[31] = -1.30$, $p < .05$). The p-value is less than the alpha of .05. The test supports the rejection of the null hypothesis 3(e).

In summary, results for the five variables differed across the data. The data suggest that only certain factors are related to teacher efficacy and classroom management, such as the gender of the teacher and the context of the school.

The data revealed that 83.9% (26) of the teachers felt they could do “quite a bit” to a “great deal” to control disruptive behavior during instruction time in class.

Meanwhile, 96.7% (29) of the teachers felt they could do a “great deal” to encourage their students to follow classroom rules during instruction time in class. Additionally, 90.4% (28) of the teachers claimed they could help their students through encouragement to believe they could do well in school. Finally, 87.1% (27) indicated they could effectively and efficiently implement a classroom management system for each group of students in their classroom.

Limitations

There are some limitations in this study. First, data had to be collected from teachers working at various sites throughout the state. Due to the significant time commitment involved with communicating with these teachers, the study was limited to those teaching at juvenile detention and youth development centers in the state of Kentucky in A6 alternative programs. As stated in the literature review, an “A6” program is a district-operated instructional program in a non-district-operated institution or school (Kentucky Department of Education, 2013).

Furthermore, the communication with some teachers was affected by individual school schedules and the two time zones separating the state of Kentucky. For instance, many of the programs in the Western part of the state begin their day an hour later than I did. Also, their school schedules often overlapped because of the time zone difference and the length of the classes. Additionally, there were meetings with other agencies that provide services to the youth in the facilities as well as mandatory professional development throughout the year for teachers. For these reasons, communicating with the participants was limited at times. Moreover, the adverse weather that occurred state-wide

when the survey opened to the participants affected their ability to access the online survey tool: The weather destroyed power lines and many of the teachers had to move from their homes and schools to ones in neighboring counties. Finally, the study is unable to rely on a solid groundwork of scholarly material due to the limited research available on teacher self-efficacy in Department of Juvenile Justice programs in the state of Kentucky. Restricting the study to juvenile detention centers and youth development centers limited the scope of comparison for teacher efficacy in juvenile justice programs. There are other juvenile programs to which a comparison could have been made if the resources had been available.

Based on these findings, the next chapter will underscore the implications of the study and offer recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER V. IMPLICATIONS

This chapter will provide relate the findings to prior research, discuss the theoretical and practical implications and finally suggest possible venues for future studies.

Theoretical Implications

This study was impacted by Bandura's theoretical framework, as mentioned in chapter four. Teachers' efficacy expectation should be critical to engaging students in the classroom, developing and implementing positive classroom instructional strategies and establishing an effective classroom management system. Additionally, the outcome expectation is important to this study because if the three variables being studied—efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management—are able to be achieved, then one could expect a high level of teacher efficacy, which could in turn result in student academic success.

Relation to Prior Research

The research conducted through ProQuest Dissertation and Full Theses Text, ProQuest Criminal Justice and the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) supports the statement made in chapter one: There is a relatively small amount of research in the area of teacher efficacy in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky. There are many studies that focus on other, related areas, but none specifically on teacher efficacy in the juvenile detention centers and youth developments centers in Kentucky. A study by Aalderman (1990) indicated that teachers

with a high sense of self-efficacy are beneficial to low-achieving students because these teachers believe that students can be reached and deserve their very best effort at a second chance academically. A more recent study by Nichols (2011) seemed to corroborate Aalderman's (1990) claim. The present study connects with these earlier studies on the basis of teacher self-efficacy and its impact on student performance and motivation.

Practical Implications

Being able to use instructional strategies developed by other authors and educators is important. Critical development of instructional strategies is not as important as is the implementation of those strategies with equal application among all the students in the classroom. This is where the full benefit of the researcher's effort is realized. The strategies take into account that the population being considered is not always optimally served. Understanding that the entire student population may not benefit but if the majority does there could be a measure of success that can be duplicated. That would benefit not just current students but those that come in the future. Therefore I learned that to implement effective instructional strategies meant I had to know my students and to believe strongly in my ability to reach each of them so that I could teach each of them.

It is important to successfully engage a student in the classroom. The more engaged a student becomes, the more the student's attendance should increase and, hopefully from here, the more his or her grades should improve. When a student is engaged, the principles of peer tutoring and direct instruction should become a stronger part of the classroom instructional strategies. Understanding the importance of

engagement encouraged me to seek alternative methods to involve students in the daily classroom activities from peer tutoring, using technology, and teaching note taking techniques for lectures. Additionally, by providing discussions that seek responses from students and implementing student thoughts, ideas and responses into instruction, students gain a sense of ownership over the lesson.

The management of the classroom is critical to any classroom environment. If classroom management is not strong and in force, then the application and implementation of instructional strategies are negatively impacted. Also, the lack of classroom management can affect the engagement of the student because students with learning disabilities can be distracted and critical lessons cannot be learned. When this happens it can affect the teacher's efficacy and the students' self-efficacy, thus effecting the overall learning environment. It is critical to manage any and all possible distractions that could negatively impact the students' learning environment.

There is a concern because the results suggest that only certain factors are related to teacher efficacy and instructional strategies, such as the teacher's race and the context of the school. Additionally, the results from the data suggest that only certain factors are related to teacher efficacy and student engagement, such as years of experience, race and context of the school. Finally, results from the data suggest that only certain factors are related to teacher efficacy and classroom management, such as the gender of the teacher and the context of the school.

A common thread of these three variables is the context of the school followed by race. The context of the school showed a relationship with student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management. The variable of age showed some

statistical significance with student engagement and instructional strategies. I was not satisfied with my findings because many of these students transfer between the facilities in our state and the context of the school should not be affecting instructional strategy, student engagement, and classroom management as they relate to teacher efficacy.

The teachers working in these facilities are educated and trained in the state of Kentucky and many from the same schools and programs. All programs in the state abide by the same academic standards. Additionally each school may have differences in the resources and personnel that may affect how confident teachers feel in their ability to help students. Therefore the bigger issue may be one of resource distribution and school leadership. This could indicate the quality of the education may not be consistent throughout our juvenile detention centers and youth development centers academic environments in Kentucky.

The findings indicated statistical significance between the race of the teacher and instructional strategies and student engagement. This concerns me because race should be neutral especially since many of the teachers elect to teach in these programs and understand the population they will be dealing with daily. Because of the impact of race on these two variables it is clear that instructional strategies that could possible enhance the quality of the student's learning experience will be negatively impacted if the teacher is not comfortable and properly trained to deal with students of a different ethnicity, race or considered to be students at risk..

In addition, the students' engagement level will be affected in the classroom and the communication between the student and teacher both verbal and non-verbal will be

negatively impacted and the necessary reinforcements from the teachers cannot be provided if the student engagement is impacted in any way.

There was no statistical relationship with age as it relates to student engagement, instructional strategies, or classroom management. This was interesting because as I began this study, I figured there would be some impact. The gender of the teacher showed only a statistical relationship as it dealt with classroom management, but not in the areas of student engagement or instructional strategies. The experience of the teacher showed a statistical significance in the area of student engagement, but not in the areas of instructional strategies or classroom management.

I was hoping for different results than I found. It is clear to me there is much work to be done in the areas of educating our juveniles in the juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in the state of Kentucky. I am concerned because many of our students transition back into the regular (public) school and a lack of services and a lower quality of instruction will impact them as they re-enter public schools and try to improve their lives.

Since there is relatively little research available on instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management as they relate to teacher efficacy in juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in the state of Kentucky, this study will provide necessary information to help those teaching students considered at-risk of not graduating from high school. It should also help those teachers, veteran and novice alike, to acquire a better understanding of what it takes to teach in this environment and how to provide the necessary elements for creating a classroom environment that is conducive for learning.

The results from this study can be applicable in the academic setting of juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in the state. For example, as teachers seek to provide a quality education to students at risk of not graduating high school, it may be beneficial for them to consider their efficacy in the domains of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. The same advice may apply to those who enter the profession in the future. Students who can connect with a teacher's vision for them may be less likely to demonstrate behavioral issues and instead believe more in their capacity to succeed academically. It is the researcher's hope, then, that the results will motivate teachers in the pertinent facilities to improve their instructional practices and, in doing so, better engage their students and bolster their motivation to graduate.

In summation, there is a noticeable lack of information available concerning the efficacy of teachers who work in the juvenile detention centers and youth development centers in Kentucky. This study has identified several areas for future research regarding teacher efficacy as it relates to student engagement, classroom management and instructional strategy.

Recommendations for Future Studies

While this study emphasizes the relationship between teacher efficacy and the variables of student engagement, instructional strategy, and classroom management, several areas of critical inquiry remain to be explored. Additional areas of research might include the following:

(1) Conduct a review of the local education agency's support for teachers who teach in the alternative settings and evaluate the opportunities for professional development training. Often, teachers who work in the alternative setting do not receive the same quantity and quality of support from the local education agency as their peers who teach in the public school setting.

(2) Compare the population ratio of teachers by gender to students by gender in order to ascertain if there are any gender-based effects on the effort to educate students. The present study features a majority of female teachers, while males form the majority among students.

(3) Compare the population ratio of teachers by ethnicity to students by ethnicity in order to ascertain any correlations between geographical location and educational emphasis within the facility. For instance, how do centers in rural and urban areas differ in their emphasis on employment and educational opportunities for their students?

(4) Determine if the students perceive their self-efficacy to be high. If there is a perception of high self-efficacy among students, try to find a correlation with the self-efficacy of the teachers.

(5) Compare the grades of students upon arrival at the facility with grades upon their exit from the facility. Dissect this data to form a comparison between juvenile detention centers and youth development centers.

(6) Research the behavior of the DJJ staff and FCPS staff to see if a positive relationship exists and how this relationship affects students' efforts in the alternative academic environment as they work toward high school completion.

(7) Review the students' family demographics to determine if students have been predisposed to situations that could impact their self-efficacy and their effort to complete high school. Variables that need to be investigated are the parents' economic circumstances, highest level of education completed, and whether the parents or other family members (brothers and/or sisters) have had interactions with the law.

(8) Evaluate the Department of Juvenile Justice programs at juvenile detention centers and youth development centers to see if they are actually meeting the goal of educating and rehabilitating the students. Since KECSAC was created to oversee the education of students at-risk, there is a need for studies that assess these goals and their actual realization.

REFERENCES

Aalderman, M. K. (1990, September). Motivation for At-Risk Students. *Education leadership, 48*(1), 27-30.

ABA Division for Public Education. (2007). *The History of Juvenile Justice.* Retrieved from http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/publiced/features/DYJpart1.authcheckdam.pdf

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2011, November). *The High Cost of High School Dropouts: What the Nation Pays for Inadequate High Schools.* Retrieved from http://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/HighCost.pdf

Ascher, C. (1995). Gaining control of violence in the schools: A view from the field. *Emergency Librarian, 23*(2), 31.

Austin, J., Johnson, D., & Weitzer, R. (2005, September). *Alternatives to the Secure Detention and Confinement of Juvenile Offenders.* Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/208804.pdf

Baltodano, H. M., Harris, P. J., & Rutherford, R. B. (2005). Academic Achievement in Juvenile Corrections: Examining the Impact of Age, Ethnicity and Disability. *Education and Treatment of Children, 28*(4), 361-379.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37*(2), 122.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Bereiter, C. (1985). The changing face of educational disadvantagement. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 66*(8), 538-541.

Blomberg, T. G., Blomberg, J., Waldo, G. P., Pesta, G., & Bellows, J. (2006, April). Juvenile Justice Education, No Child Left Behind, and the National Collaboration Project. *Juvenile Justice News*, 143-146.

Brockman, M. S., & Russell, S. T. (2012). *Academic Success*. Retrieved from http://classroom.leanderisd.org/users/0955/docs/academic_success.pdf

Buck, J. A. (2011). The looming expansion and transformation of public substance abuse treatment under the Affordable Care Act. *Health Affairs*, *30*(8), 1402-1410.

Burns-Stowers, R. (1994). Education: The Answer Juvenile Crime—A Reflective Look. *Journal of Correctional Education, 45*(2), 60.

Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk (CRESPAR). (2001). *Academic Success Among Poor and Minority Students: An Analysis of Competing Models of School Effects* (report no. 52). Retrieved from http://www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/techReports/Report52.pdf

Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ) (2013). *Juvenile Justice History*. Retrieved from http://www.cjcj.org/Education1/Juvenile-Justice-History.html

Children's Defense Fund. (2010, October). *Rethinking Juvenile Detention in Ohio.* Retrieved April 2013, from http://www.cdfohio.org/research-library/documents/resources/JuvDetention_Issue_Brief.pdf

Coladarci, T. (1992). Teachers' sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching. *The Journal of experimental education*, *60*(4), 323-337.

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2003, May 21). National Conference of State Legislatures Resolution in Support of the Efforts of

Operation Respect Inc. *National Conference of State Legislatures*. Retrieved August 2, 2012 from casel.org/wp-content/uploads/3D_Endorsements.pdf

Costello, M. A., Hollifield, J. H., & Stinnette, L. (1996). *Critical Issue: Providing Effective Schooling for Students at Risk.* Retrieved April 16, 2012, from North Central Regional Educational Laboratory: http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/students/atrisk/at600.htm

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dollar, R. (1983). What is really going on in schools? *Social Policy, 13*, 7-19.

Donnelly, M. (1987). At-Risk Students. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management*, 1-5. doi:ED292172

Drakeford, W. (2002). The Impact of an Intensive Program to increase Literacy Skills of Youth Confined to Juvenile Corrections. *JCE, 53*(4), 139-144.

Durkheim, E. (1956). *Education and Sociology*. The Free Press.

Erdem, E., & Demirel, O. (2007). TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY BELIEF. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 35*(5), 573-586.

Fazlani, T. A., Hashmi, P., Nasar, A., Mustafa, M., & Hirani, G. (2012). The Determinants of Inflation and Its Impact on Economic Growth: A Case Study of Pakistan (2002-2010). *Academic Research International*, *3*(1), 213-222.

Feinstein, S. (2002). Performance Assessment in Juvenile Correction Education Programs. *JCE, 53*(1), 9-12.

Finn, J. D., & Rock, D. A. (1997). Academic success among students at risk for school failure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(2), 221-234.

Forlin, C. (2012). Responding to the need for inclusive teacher education: Rhetoric or reality. *Future directions for inclusive teacher education,* 3-12. New York: Routledge.

Franklin, C. (1992). Alternative School Programs for At-Risk Youths. *Social Work in Education*, *14*(4), 239-251.

Gagnon, J. C., & Barber, B. R. (2009). Incarcerated Youth with Disabilities: Reintegration into the Community, School, and Workforce. In *Juvenile Justice Education Institute and Southern Conference on Corrections* (pp. 1-47).

Gagnon, J. C., Barber, B. R., Van Loan, C., & Leone, P. E. (2009). Juvenile Correctional Schools: Characteristics and Approaches to Curriculum. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *32*, 673-696.

Gemignani, R. J. (1994, October). Juvenile Correctional Education: A Time For Change. *OJJDP Update on Research, 3.*

Goodman, G., & Webb, M. A. (2006). Reading Disability Referrals: Teacher Bias and Other Factors That Impact Response to Intervention. *Learning Disabilities -- A Contemporary Journal*, *4*(2), 59-70.

Grbich, C. (2012). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*. Sage.

Gruber, J., & Trickett, E. (1987). Can we empower others? The paradox of empowerment in the governing of an alternative public school. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *15*(3), 353–371. doi:10.1007/BF00922703

Guskey, T. R. (1987). Rethinking Mastery Learning Reconsidered. *Review of Educational Research, 57*(2), 225-229.

Hasson, D., & Arnetz, B. B. (2005). Validation and Findings Comparing VAS vs. Likert Scales for Psychosocial Measurements. *International Electronic Journal of Health Education, 8*, 178-192.

Hogeveen, B. (2005). Juvenile Detention Centers. In *Encyclopedia of Prisons & Correctional Facilities* (pp. 509-12). Retrieved August 1, 2012 from http://knowledge.sagepub.com/view/prisons/n191.xml

Hoover, J. J. (2012, March/April). Reducing Unnecessary Referrals: Guidelines for Teachers of Diverse Learners. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 44*(4), 38-47.

Hoult, T. F. (1969). *Dictionary of modern sociology.* Littlefield, Adams. doi:101-685-780

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement (IDEA) Act (2004). Retrieved November 11, 2013 from http://idea.ed.gov/

Jackson, J. W. (2002). Enhancing Self-Efficacy and Learning Performance. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 70*(3), 243-254.

Kelley, K., Clark, B., Brown, V., & Sitzia, J. (2003). Good practice in the conduct and reporting of survey research. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, *15*(3), 261-266.

Kentucky Department of Education. (2013, March). *Profile of Kentucky's Alternative Programs*. Frankfort, KY: Division of Student Services, Office of Next Generation Schools and Districts. Retrieved from http://education.ky.gov/school/eap/Documents/Alternative%20Programs%20Report%20March%202013.pdf

Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice. (2008, October 1). Overview. In *Facilities*. Retrieved from http://djj.ky.gov/facilities/

Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice. (2012, July 11). Youth Development Centers. In *Facilities*. Retrieved from http://djj.ky.gov/facilities/

Kentucky Educational Collaborative for State Agency Children (KECSAC). (2009, September 15). *2008-2009 Annual Report.* Retrieved August 2012, from http://www.kecsac.eku.edu/sites/kecsac.eku.edu/files/files/Annual%20Report%2008-09.pdf

Kentucky Educational Collaborative for State Agency Children (KECSAC). (2007). *Directory of School Districts and Programs Serving State Agency Children.* Retrieved from http://www.kecsac.eku.edu/sites/kecsac.eku.edu/files/files/KECSAC%20Brochure.pdf

Kentucky Legislative Research Commission (2000, July 14). *15A.320: Youth Alternative Centers.* Retrieved from http://www.lrc.ky.gov/statutes/statute.aspx?id=1069

Kentucky Legislature. (2012, July 23). *Statute 158.135*. Retrieved August 10, 2012, from http://www.lrc.ky.gov/krs/158-00/135.pdf

Kentucky Legislature. (n.d.). *505 KAR 1:080.* Retrieved August 10, 2012, from http://www.lrc.ky.gov/kar/505/001/080.htm

Key, J. P. (1997). *R-12: Descriptive Research - Oklahoma State University*. Retrieved December 2011, from http://www.okstate.edu/ag/agedcm4h/academic/aged5980a/5980/newpage110.htm

Khattri, N., Riley, K. W., & Kane, M. B. (1997). Students at risk in poor, rural areas: A review of the research. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 13*, 79-100.

Knesting, K., & Waldron, N. (2006). Willing to play the game: How at-risk students persist in school. *Psychology In The Schools, 43*(5), 599-611. doi:10.1002/pits.20174

Kohler, P., & Reese, J. (2008). Jedi: A new pathway to success for our forgotten youth. *Education*, *128*(3), 507-514. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Libby, A. M., Coen, A. S., Price, D. A., Silverman, K., & Orton, H. D. (2005). Inside the Black Box: What constitutes a day in a residential treatment centre? *International Journal of Social Welfare*, *14*, 176-183. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2397.2005.00357.x

Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (2000). *Proposals that work. A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Margolis, H., & McCabe, P. P. (2006, March). Improving Self-Efficacy and Motivation: What to Do, What to Say. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 41*(4), 218-227.

Maryland Department of Juvenile Services. (1999). History of Juvenile Justice in Maryland. In *About DJS*. Retrieved from http://www.djs.state.md.us/history-md.asp

Matvya, J., Lever, N. A., & Boyle, R. (2006, August). School reentry of Juvenile Offenders. *Center for School Mental Health Analysis and Action*, 1-5.

Mazzotti, V. L., & Higgins, K. (2006). Public Schools and the Juvenile Justice System. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *41*(5), 295-301.

McIlrath, D., & Huitt, W. (1995). *The teaching/learning process: A discussion of models*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved from http://www.ed psycinteractive.org/papers/modeltch.html

Mitra, D. (2011). *Pennsylvania's Best Investment: The Social and Economic Benefits of Public Education.*

National Center for Juvenile Justice. (n.d.). *Our History.* Retrieved June 15, 2013, from http://www.ncjj.org/About/History.aspx

Nelson, C., Jolivette, K., Leone, P. E., & Mathur, S. R. (2010). Meeting the Needs of At-Risk and Adjudicated Youth with Behavioral Challenges: The Promise of Juvenile Justice. *Behavioral Disorders*, *36*(1), 70-80.

New York State Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS). (n.d.). Division of Juvenile Justice and Opportunities for Youth. Rensselaer, New York.

Newman, M., Rutter, R., & Smith, M. S. (1989). Organizational factors that affect school efficacy, community, and expectations. *Sociology of Education, 62*(4), 221-238

Nichols, A. J. (2011). *An Analysis of Teacher Efficacy, Resident Efficacy, and Teacher-Student Relationships with Behaviorially Challenged Youth In Residential Treatment Settings.* Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Nixon, V. (2010) *The relationship between the percentage of African-American teachers on public school secondary campuses and the percentage of African-American students passing the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills Test (TAKS).* Retrieved August 5, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (AAT 3423990)

Packer, L. E. (2002). *Special Education Glossary and Acronyms Guide.* Retrieved October 23, 2011 from http://www.tourettesyndrome.net

Parker, K. (2010, December 1). *KECSAC Census 2010 Final Report.* Retrieved October 2, 2011 from www.kecsac.eku.edu

Pierce, D., Powell, N., Marshall, A., Nolan, R., & Fehringer, E. (2009). *Kentucky Youth At Risk Transitions: A Report to the Commonwealth.* Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/norm_powell/17

Platt, J. S., Casey, R. E., & Faessel, R. T. (2006). The Need for a Paradigmatic Change in Juvenile Correctional Education. *Preventing School Failure, 51*(1), 31-38.

Podell, D. M., & Soodak, L. C. (1993). Teacher Efficacy and Bias in Special Education Referrals. *The Journal of Education Research, 86*(4), 247-253. doi:10.2307/27541871

Policy Studies Associates. (1995, August 10). *Creating Networks of Support for Students.* Retrieved May 20, 2012, from http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/Raising/vol1/pt5.html

Powell, N. (2007). *Kentucky Educational Collaborative for State Agency Children 2006 - 2007 Annual Report.* Eastern Kentucky University. Richmond: KECSAC.

Proctor, C. (1984). Teacher Expectations: A Model for School Improvement. *The Elementary School Journal, 84*(4), 468-481.

Protheroe, N. (2008). Teacher Efficacy: What Is It and Does It Matter? *Prinicpal, 87*(5), 42-45.

Quaglia, R. (1989). Student Aspirations: A Critical Dimension in Effective Schools. *Research in Rural Education, 6*(2), 7-9.

Quinn, M., Rutherford, R. B., Leone, P. E., Osher, D. M., & Poirier, J. M. (2005). Youth With Disabilities in Juvenile Corrections: A National Survey. *Exceptional Children, 71*(3), 339-345.

Ratcliff, D. (1999). *15 Methods of Data Analysis in Qualitative Research.* Retrieved October 19, 2011, from http://qualitativeresearch.ratcliffs.net/15methods.pdf

Raywid, M. (1994). Alternative schools: The state of the art. *Educational Leadership*, *52*(1), 26.

Reese, J., & Hall, A. (n.d.). *Working Across Agencies: Systemic Initiatives for Addressing Academic Needs of Transition Age Youth in the Juvenile Justice System*. Retrieved from www.ideapartnership.org/documents/Session6_Reese&Hall.ppt

Rushton, J. P. (2000). Race, evolution, and behavior: A life history perspective (3rd ed.). Port Huron, MI: Charles Darwin Research Institute.

Scarr, S. (1988, January). Race and gender as psychological variables: Social and ethical issues. *American Psychologist, 43*(1), 56-59.

Sharma, U., Loreman, T. and Forlin, C. (2012), Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 12: 12–21. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x

Skiba, R. J., Simmons, A. D., Ritter, S., Gibb, A., Rausch, M. K., Cuadrado, J., & Chung, C. G. (2008). Achieving equity in special education: History, status, and current challenges. *Exceptional Children*, *74*(3), 264-288.

Slavin, R. E. (1993). Special Issue: Middle Grades Research and Reform. *The Elementary School Journal, 93*(5), 535-552. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1001827

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. E. (1989, February). What Works For Students At-Risk: A Research Synthesis. *Educational Leadership*, 4-13.

Soifer, D. (2010, October). *Education Strategies for Reducing Juvenile Crime in the Nation's Captial.* Retrieved from http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/

resources/documents/Education/EducationStrategiesForReducingJuvenileCrime.pdf

Soodak, L. C., & Podell, D. M. (1994). Teachers' Thinking About Difficult-to-Teach Students. *The Journal of Educational Research, 88*(1), 44-41.

SPSS. (n.d.). *Internation Business Machines.* Retrieved from http://www-01.ibm.com/software/analytics/spss/

Stephens, R. D., & Arnette, J. L. (2000, February). From the Courthouse to Schoolhouse: Making Successful Transitions. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin* , 1-14.

Stipek, D. (2012). Context Matters: Effects of student characteristics and perceived support from administrators and parents on teacher self-efficacy. *The Elementary School Journal, 112*(4), 590-606.

Streiner, D. L. (2003). Starting at the Beginning: An Introduction to Coefficient Alpha and Internal Consistency. *Journal Of Personality Assessment, 80*(1), 99-103.

Taylor, J. M. (1993, January 25). Pell Grants for Prisoners. *The Nation, 25*, 88-91.

The Social Studies Help Center. (2012). *High School Diploma.* Retrieved May 04, 2012, from http://www.socialstudieshelp.com/topics/high_school_diploma.html

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(2), 221-258.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Barr, M. (2004). Fostering student learning: The relationship of collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3*(3), 189-209.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and teacher education, 17*(7), 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk, A. (2002, April). The Influence of Resources and Support on Teachers' Efficacy Beliefs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Session 18.82, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved from http://anitawoolfolkhoy.com/pdfs/aera-2002-megan.pdf

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher Efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Edcuational Research, 68*(2), 202-248.

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

Tyler, K. M., & Boelter, C. M. (2008). Linking Black Middle School Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Expectations to Academic Engagement and Efficacy. *The Negro Educational Review, 59*, 1-2.

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html

Wald, J., & Losen, D. J. (2003). Defining and redirecting a school-to-prison pipeline. *New Directions for Youth Development, 2003*(99), 9-15.

Walker, A., & Dimmock, C. (2005). Leading the Multiethnic School:Research Evidence on Successful Practice. *The Educational Forum, 69*, 291 - 304.

Wang, M. (1990). Programs that promote educational equity. In H. P. Baptiste, H. Waxman, J. Walker De Felix, & J. E. Anderson (Eds.), *Leadership, Equity and School Effectiveness* (pp. 132-154). Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.

Ware, H., & Kitsantas, A. (2007). Teacher and collective efficacy beliefs as predictors of professional commitment. *The Journal of Educational Research*,*100*(5), 303-310.

Wertz, F. J. (1983). From everyday to psychological description: analyzing the moments of a qualitative data analysis. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *14*(2), 197–241.

Wirth, K., Ronca, S., McIntosh, K., Lewis, L. A., Ann, L., Burton, K., & McIntosh, K. (n.d.). KRS 157.3175 KRS 157.226 KRS 158.070 KRS 158.442. *Lea*, *502*, 564-1979.

Wolford, B. I. (2000). *Juvenile Justice Education: "Who is Educating the Youth"*. Eastern Kentucky University, Council for Educators of At-Risk & Delinquent Youth. Richmond: Training Resource Center.

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*(1), 181-193. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.99.1.181

World Bank. (2011). *Learning For All: Investing in People's Knowledge and Skills to Promote Development.* Retrieved August 2, 2012, from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/ESSU/463292-1306181142935/WB_ES_ExectiveSummary_FINAL.pdf

Yeo, L., Ang, R., Chong, W., Huan, V., & Quek, C. (2008). Teacher Efficacy In the Context of Teaching Low Achieving Students. *Current Psychology*, *27*(3), 192-204. doi:10.1007/s12144-008-9034-x

APPENDIX A

Notice of IRB Exemption Status

Graduate Education and Research
Division of Sponsored Programs
Institutional Review Board
Division of Sponsored Programs
Institutional Review Board

Jones 414, Coates CPO 20
521 Lancaster Avenue
Richmond, Kentucky 40475-3102
(859) 622-3636; Fax (859) 622-6610
http://www.sponsoredprograms.eku.edu

NOTICE OF IRB EXEMPTION STATUS
Protocol Number: 12-063
Institutional Review Board IRB00002836, DHHS FWA00003332

Principal Investigator: **Scott T. Ferguson, Sr**. Faculty Advisor**: Dr. Sherwood Thompson**

Project Title: **An Examination of Teacher Efficacy on Student Achievement in Regional Juvenile Detention Centers and Youth Development Centers in Kentucky**

Exemption Date: **January 4, 2012**

Approved by: **Diana Porter, IRB Member**

This document confirms that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has granted exempt status for the above referenced research project as outlined in the application submitted for IRB review with an immediate effective date. Exempt status means that your research is exempt from further review for a period of three years from the original notification date if no changes are made to the original protocol. If you plan to continue the project beyond three years, you are required to reapply for exemption.

Principal Investigator Responsibilities: It is the responsibility of the principal investigator to ensure that all investigators and staff associated with this study meet the training requirements for conducting research involving human subjects and follow the approved protocol.

Adverse Events: Any adverse or unexpected events that occur in conjunction with this study must be reported to the IRB within ten calendar days of the occurrence.

Changes to Approved Research Protocol: If changes to the approved research protocol become necessary, a description of those changes must be submitted for IRB review and approval prior to implementation. If the changes result in a change in your project's exempt status, you will be required to submit an application for expedited or full IRB review. Changes include, but are not limited to, those involving study personnel, subjects, and procedures.

Other Provisions of Approval, if applicable: None

Please contact Sponsored Programs at 859-622-3636 or send email to tiffany.hamblin@eku.edu or lisa.royalty@eku.edu with questions.

APPENDIX B

Approval to Use Teacher Efficacy Scale

Re: Teacher Efficacy Scale

Hide Details

From: Anita Hoy

To: S. Ferguson

You are welcome to use the TSES in your research.

Anita

Anita Woolfolk Hoy, Professor
Educational Psychology & Philosophy
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

phone: 614-488-5064
fax: 614-292-7900
e-mail: anitahoy@mac.com

http://www.coe.ohio-state.edu/ahoy

On Jan 5, 2011, at 2:06 AM, S. Ferguson wrote:

Dr. Hoy,

Good Morning. I am asking permission to use parts or all of the following scale.

Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale Short Form (12 items) as a part of work on my dissertation proposal. While researching I found it and want to have your permission to consider using it as is or changing some parts to fit my research. I found it on the link below this site http://wmpeople.wm.edu/site/page/mxtsch/researchtools.

Respectfully,

Scott Ferguson

APPENDIX C

Approval to Adjust Teacher Efficacy Scale

Re: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale
Hide Details

From: Anita Hoy

To: S. Ferguson

Yes--you can't compare your scores to ours then, but many people do make changes in the scale.

Anita

Anita Woolfolk Hoy, Professor
Educational Psychology & Philosophy
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

phone: 614-488-5064
fax: 614-292-7900
e-mail anitahoy@mac.com

http://ehe.osu.edu/epl/directory/anita-hoy/

On Nov 8, 2011, at 8:02 PM, S. Ferguson wrote:

Dr. Hoy,

Hello. I wanted to ask permission to adjust the ranking scale from 9 to 5 when using your scale.

Thanks,

Scott Ferguson

"To know the will of God is the greatest knowledge, to find the will of God is the greatest discovery, to do will of God is the greatest achievement."
"SPES MEA IN DEO EST"
Brother Scott Ferguson, 32°
1SG, USA - Retired
Phi Beta Sigma

APPENDIX D

Sample of Teacher Efficacy Scale

Teacher Beliefs

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create challenges for teachers. Your answers are confidential.

Directions: Please indicate your opinion about each of the questions below by marking any one of the nine responses in the columns on the right side, ranging from (1) "None at all" to (9) "A Great Deal" as each represents a degree on the continuum.

Please respond to each of the questions by considering the combination of your *current* ability, resources, and opportunity to do each of the following in your present position.

	None at all		Very Little		Some Degree		Quite A Bit		A Great Deal
1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
2. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
3. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
4. How much can you do to help your students value learning?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
6. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
7. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
9. To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
11. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨
12. How well can you implement alternative teaching strategies in your classroom?	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧	⑨

13. What is your gender?
- O Male
- O Female

14. What is your racial identity?
- O African American
- O White, Non-Hispanic
- O Other

15. What subject matter do you teach? (as many as apply)
- O All (Elementary/ Self-contained)
- O Math
- O Science
- O Language Arts
- O Social Studies

16. What level do you teach?
- O Elementary
- O Middle
- O High

17. What is the context of your school?
- O Urban
- O Suburban
- O Rural

18. What is the approximate proportion of students who receive free and reduced lunches at your school?
- O 0-20%
- O 21-40%
- O 41-60%
- O 61-80%
- O 81-100%

19. What grade level(s) do you teach? (K) ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨

20. How many years have you taught? ⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨

For office use only. ⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨