Physical Education Teacher Self-Efficacy for Standards Based Curriculum: A Test of Social Cognitive Theory

By Matthew Buns, Ph.D. and Katherine T. Thomas, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

There is a need for sound self-efficacy measures in education that are based on Social Cognitive Theory. Physical education benefits public health by addressing physical inactivity and obesity. The purpose of this study was to develop and test a standards-based training program and virtual blog on self-efficacy. Participants were 60 physical education teachers recruited from 16 school districts. Three self-efficacy scales were administered at the beginning of a workshop and after a six-week collaborative blog. The major finding is that the intervention enhanced self-efficacy to a much greater extent than the control group. The average experimental group effect size for ESBI was .97 compared to .19 for the control group. This work could help guide future professional development opportunities.

Table 1. Descriptive data for the self-efficacy measures by group and time. Overall effect of Standards-based training intervention on physical educator self-efficacy.

	Control Group $(n = 25)$			Exp	Experimental Group $(n = 35)$		
Scale	Baseline $M(SD)$	$\operatorname{End} M\left(SD\right)$	ES	Baseline M (SD)	$\operatorname{End} M(SD)$	ES	
	(95% CI)	(95% CI)		(95% CI)	(95% CI)		
ESBI	76.92 (10.88)	78.97 (9.95)	.19	70.83 (15.22)	84.31 (8.96)	.97	
	(72.97-83.09)	(74.84-83.10)		(67.77-76.69)	(80.67-87.95)		
Assessment	18.12 (4.30)	18.66 (4.21)	.13	17.11 (4.05)	20.93 (2.54)	1.13	
	(17.60, 20.09)	(17.18, 20.14)		(15.61, 18.69)	(19.62, 22.23)		
Planning	19.94 (3.28)	19.75 (2.86)	.06	17.48 (4.36)	21.13 (2.65)	1.01	
	(18.65, 21.79)	(18.55, 20.95)		(16.27, 19.04)	(20.07, 22.19)		
Instruction	20.01 (1.96)	20.41 (1.38)	.23	18.74 (4.31)	21.65 (1.59)	.89	
	(19.11, 21.68)	(19.75, 21.07)		(18.05, 20.33)	(21.07, 22.23)		
Knowledge	18.85 (3.27)	20.11 (3.61)	.38	17.5 (4.34)	20.60 (2.88)	.87	
	(17.60, 20.56)	(18.82, 21.51)		(16.94, 19.55)	(19.42, 21.79)		
TESPE	96.3 (10.7)	95.5 (7.5)	09	92.4 (5.3)	94.5 (6.6)	35	
	(93.6, 100.9)	(92.7, 98.3)		(91.3, 97.8)	(89.9, 94.9)		

Table 1. (Continued)

	Control Gro		Experimental Group $(n = 35)$				
Scale	Baseline M (SD)	$\operatorname{End} M\left(SD\right)$	ES	Baseline M (SD)	End $M(SD)$	ES	
	(95% CI)	(95% CI)		(95% CI)	(95% CI)		
Skill	24.8 (2.6)	24.8 (1.9)	.00	23.9 (2.2)	22.9 (1.5)	53	
	(24.3, 26.1)	(24.1, 25.5)		(22.9, 24.6)	(22.2, 23.5)		
Preparation	23.7 (3.5)	23.9 (3.2)06 22.9 (2.5		22.9 (2.5)	22.1 (2.8)	30	
	(22.4, 25.2)	(22.6, 25.2)		(21.9, 24.3)	(20.9, 23.3)		
Comm.	24.3 (3.2)	23.5 (1.8)	.27	24.1 (2.2)	24.6 (1.1)	29	
	(23.6, 25.8)	(22.8, 24.1)		(23.2, 25.1)	(23.9, 25.1)		
Motivation	23.5 (2.9)	23.3 (2.6)	11	23.6 (1.9)	23.2 (2.2)	20	
	(22.5, 24.6)	(22.3, 24.3)		(22.6, 24.5)	(22.3, 24.1)		
TSES	83.3 (9.2)	83.3 (9.1)	.00	82.5 (10.2)	83.0 (4.0)	.06	
	(80.7, 88.9)	(80.4, 86.2)		(78.8, 86.0)	(80.4, 85.6)		
Instruction	28.2 (4.6)	27.9 (3.5)	.07	27.8 (3.3)	28.9 (2.2)	39	
	(27.3, 30.7)	(26.7, 29.2)		(26.4, 29.3)	(27.8, 29.0)		
Engagement	23.6 (5.0)	23.6 (5.3)	.00	24.9 (4.7)	24.4 (1.7)	.14	

Table 1. (Continued)

Control Group $(n = 25)$			Experimental Group $(n = 35)$			
Baseline M (SD)	$\operatorname{End} M\left(SD\right)$	ES	Baseline M (SD)	$\operatorname{End} M(SD)$	ES	
(95% CI)	(95% CI)		(95% CI)	(95% CI)		
(21.7, 25.8)	(21.9, 25.2)		(22.8, 26.4)	(23.0, 25.9)		
31.5 (3.3)	31.8 (2.8)	.09	29.8 (4.4)	29.4 (3.2)	10	
(30.4, 33.8)	(30.5, 33.1)		(28.5, 31.5)	(28.2, 30.6)		
	Baseline <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) (95% CI) (21.7, 25.8) 31.5 (3.3)	Baseline M (SD) End M (SD) (95% CI) (95% CI) (21.7, 25.8) (21.9, 25.2) 31.5 (3.3) 31.8 (2.8)	Baseline M (SD) End M (SD) ES (95% CI) (95% CI) (21.7, 25.8) (21.9, 25.2) 31.5 (3.3) 31.8 (2.8) .09	Baseline M (SD) End M (SD) ES Baseline M (SD) (95% CI) (95% CI) (95% CI) (21.7, 25.8) (21.9, 25.2) (22.8, 26.4) 31.5 (3.3) 31.8 (2.8) .09 29.8 (4.4)	Baseline M (SD) End M (SD) ES Baseline M (SD) End M (SD) (95% CI) (95% CI) (95% CI) (95% CI) (21.7, 25.8) (21.9, 25.2) (22.8, 26.4) (23.0, 25.9) 31.5 (3.3) 31.8 (2.8) .09 29.8 (4.4) 29.4 (3.2)	

SD, Standard Deviation; CI, Confidence Interval; ES, Effect Size

Table 2. Pearson-product correlations among blog use, education level and self-efficacy assessments.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Individual BC	-									
2. District BV	02	-								
3. Rating	29	.17	-							
4. Pre-ESBI	14	41*	03	-						
5. Pre-TESPE	.31	34*	07	.56**	-					
6. Pre-TSES	13	23	18	.49**	.53**	· _				
7. Post-ESBI	.57*	.03	.32	13	11	.07	-			
8. Post-TESPE	17	10	00	11	07	22	.16	-		
9. Post-TSES	.49*	08	.08	12	.20	.09	25	08	-	
10. Educ. Level	02	.03	06	20	.16	01	18	.20	.03	-

Note: *p<.05, two-tailed. **p<.01, two-tailed

 $BV = Blog\ Views,\ BC = Blog\ Comments,\ Educ.\ Level = Education$

Efficacy for Standards-based Instruction (ESBI)

Directions: The attached form lists different teaching activities. In the column **Confidence**, rate how confident you are that you can do them **as of now**. Rate your degree of confidence by recording a number from 0 to 100 using the scale given below. Please be honest in your evaluation. Your answers are confidential.

Ceratin cannot do	Moderately certain can do	Ceratin can do		
		Confidence (0-100)		
<u>Understanding the Curriculum in</u>	the District	, ,		
Understand the standards and ber Am able to determine how feasib education teachers to impleme	aknesses of written curricula ontent of my district's physical education curriculum achmarks used in my district's physical education curriculum le and affordable it is for the school district and physical ent the curriculum successfully occus on the physical education curriculum in my district	n		
Planning Based on the Curriculur	n Model			
Collaborate with colleagues to de Plan lessons that help students ma	at address each benchmark so students have many	(s)		
* *	ulum with current local, state, and/or national standards			
Teaching the Curriculum Model				
Clearly communicate instructiona	e developmentally appropriate and properly sequenced cation content			
Assessment				
Continually assess student performance Base assessment on mastery of lestandards and benchmarks	mance to guide instruction arning expectations which are outlined in district			
Can document student learning in Use multiple assessment strategie				
1	in response to information from assessment			