

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 453 170

SP 039 969

AUTHOR Shahid, Julia; Thompson, David
TITLE Teacher Efficacy: A Research Synthesis.
PUB DATE 2001-04-14
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Meta Analysis; *Self Efficacy; Sex Differences; *Teacher Competencies; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Experience; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

This study synthesized research on teacher efficacy. A 14-stage model was implemented to identify and analyze characteristics found in the synthesis population of 89 primary studies which addressed teacher efficacy. The 89 primary studies yielded 789 distinct and 973 total research hypotheses; 25 distinct and 973 total teacher efficacy constructs; and 425 distinct and 973 total predictor constructs. Meta analyses were conducted on research hypotheses occurring five times or more. Seven relationships between a teacher efficacy construct and a predictor construct were addressed through a meta analytical process. Sample sizes for studies included ranged from 5-31. Size and direction of relationships identified in the 89 primary studies for the research hypotheses occurring five or more times was closely aligned with size and direction of relationships identified in the theoretical framework of this investigation. The review identified: an inverse relationship between personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy; a positive relationship between female gender and personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy; a positive relationship between overall teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy with years of experience. Recommendations to guide primary studies focus on: data reporting standards, indicators of explained variance, and uniformity of measures. (Contains 46 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

TEACHER EFFICACY: A RESEARCH SYNTHESIS

BY

Julia Shahid, Austin College

David Thompson, University of Texas, San Antonio

AERA Annual Meeting 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Shahid

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEACHER EFFICACY: A RESEARCH SYNTHESIS

Introduction

The actual study of teacher efficacy is relatively new. In 1989 Susan Rosenholtz described research on teacher efficacy as being in its very earliest stages (Ross, 1994). Since then the research on teacher efficacy has grown substantially. Ross stated that there is evidence that in the earliest years of instruction that teaching experience has an effect: personal teaching efficacy increases and general teaching efficacy decreases with experience in the profession. Teacher efficacy is higher in classes in which teachers feel prepared and where classes consist of students who are both relatively orderly and of higher ability (Gibson and Dembo, 1984). Those teachers who attribute student success and failure to efforts within their control are more likely to score higher on teacher efficacy measures (Guskey, 1987; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998; Vitali, 1994). There is evidence that teacher efficacy is higher in schools characterized as having low stress, joint commitment to learning goals, and faculties of satisfied teachers (Moore and Esselman, 1992; Warren, 1993). High efficacy teachers are more likely to be active members of the school organization and collaborate with fellow teachers (Edwards, Green, & Lyons, 1996; Poole and Okefor, 1989).

Higher teacher efficacy is associated with current notions of good teaching practices (Trentham, Silvern, & Brogdon, 1985). Higher efficacy is associated with the use of more challenging teaching techniques, teachers' willingness to try innovative methods (Ghaith and Yaghi, 1997; Guskey, 1988; Rangel, 1997), and with humanistic classroom management practices. The findings about the impact of teacher efficacy on student achievement have been consistent. Higher teacher efficacy enhances student

mastery of both cognitive and affective goals (Guskey, 1988; Ross, 1992; Ross, 1994; Turgoose, 1996; Watson, 1991).

Educational researchers have devoted much effort to the study of teacher efficacy over the past 10 years. These studies have examined the relationship of the teacher efficacy construct with gender (Haydel, 1997; Wittmann, 1992), experience (Hoy and Woolfolk, 1993; Ghaith and Yaghi, 1997; Walker and Cousins, 1994), teacher certification or degree (Hoy and Woolfolk, 1993; Huguenard, 1992; Serna, 1990), grade taught (Larsen, 1996; Petrie, Hartranft, & Lutz, 1995; Soodak and Podell, 1996; Taylor, 1992), campus leadership (Adams, 1996; Hartnett, 1995), classroom characteristics and student behavior (Emmer and Hickman, 1991; Melby, 1995), work with special needs students (Meijer and Foster, 1988; Ross, Cousins, & Gadalla, 1996; Stanovich and Jordan, 1998), and job satisfaction (Fritz, Miller-Heyl, Kreutzer, MacPhee, 1995; Hyson 1991). Additionally, numerous researchers have studied the relationship of general teaching efficacy to personal teaching efficacy (Fritz et al., 1995; Guyton, 1994; Haydel, 1997; Klein, 1996; Larsen, 1996; Moore and Esselman, 1992; Ohmart, 1992; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998; Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990).

Statement of the Problem

There has not been an empirical synthesis of the research on teacher efficacy. Research suggests that teacher efficacy has been related to teachers' classroom behaviors, their openness to new ideas, and their attitudes toward teaching. Teacher efficacy appears to influence student achievement, attitude, and affective growth. "Research on teacher efficacy has provided a consistent set of findings that

demonstrate the importance of the construct as a predictor of student and teacher outcomes” (Ross 1994, p. 28).

Purpose of the Inquiry

To maximize knowledge from existing studies, reliable and valid procedures must be used to synthesize findings. The purpose of this study was to synthesize findings on teacher efficacy. The study investigated research that has been conducted on teacher efficacy, synthesized the findings in the primary studies, and considered the implications for educators. Currently no meta-analysis of teacher efficacy has occurred. Extensive primary studies have occurred without a synthesis of the multitude of findings. Since research supports the positive relationship of high teacher efficacy on both the organization of the school as well as student achievement, it appears that a meta-analysis will provide a much better understanding of the construct, its variables, and how it is manifested in a school setting.

Objectives

A model for meta-analysis by Thompson, Hoyle, and McNamara (1997) and meta-analysis procedures by Hunter and Schmidt (1990) were used to guide this quantitative synthesis. This inquiry addressed the following six objectives:

1. Specifying the primary studies that address teacher efficacy and providing sufficient information for quantitative synthesis.
2. Identifying the research hypotheses and tests and the target population, teacher efficacy constructs, and predictor constructs around which these hypotheses are generated.

3. Identifying the statistical hypotheses and inferential rules used to connect empirical evidence to the corresponding research hypotheses.
4. Estimating the population effect sizes corresponding to selected research hypotheses.
5. Elaborating the moderator variables that increase the explanatory power associated with selected research hypotheses.
6. Assessing the stability of the population effect size estimates generated for selected research hypotheses over the period of time represented in the primary studies.

Twenty-three research questions were asked and addressed that were directly aligned to one of the above objectives.

Methodology

The design of this research study was conceptualized as a fourteen-stage model based the work of Thompson et al. (1997). This appears in Table 1.

TABLE 1

<u>Stage</u>	<u>Description</u>
• Stage 1:	Developing the theoretical framework
• Stage 2:	Specifying the population
• Stage 3:	Designing the classification system
• Stage 4:	Designing the coding system
• Stage 5:	Coding the data
• Stage 6:	Archiving the coded data
• Stage 7:	Constructing the research hypotheses inventory

Table 1 (continued)

- Stage 8: Identifying the effect sizes
- Stage 9: Describing the articles
- Stage 10: Describing the effect sizes
- Stage 11: Estimating the parameters
- Stage 12: Elaborating the moderator variables
- Stage 13: Assessing the stability of findings over time
- Stage 14: Specifying the recommendations

The effect size indicator used for statistical analysis was the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. The correlation coefficient expresses the relationship between a distinct predictor variable and a distinct criterion variable and can be cumulated across all studies (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990).

Findings

This inquiry synthesized the available research on teacher efficacy. A 14-stage model was implemented to identify and analyze study characteristics found in the synthesis population of 89 primary studies addressing teacher efficacy and providing sufficient information for quantitative synthesis.

The 89 primary studies yielded: (1) 789 distinct and 973 total research hypotheses; (2) 25 distinct and 973 total teacher efficacy constructs; and, (3) 425 distinct and 973 total predictor constructs. Using the statistical test as the unit of analysis yielded these conclusions: (1) 973 statistical tests were investigated; (2) 973 correlational effect sizes were reported in or derived from the 89 primary studies; (3) 270 (27.7%) effect sizes ranged in absolute value from .00 to .09; (4) 453 (46.5%) effect

sizes ranged in absolute value from .10 to .29; (5) 178 (18.3%) effect sizes ranged in absolute value from .30 to .49; and, (6) 72 (7.4%) effect sizes ranged in absolute value greater than or equal to .50.

A meta-analysis was conducted on the research hypotheses occurring five times or more with the results displayed in Table 2. Seven relationships between a teacher efficacy construct and a predictor construct were addressed through a meta-analytical process. Sample sizes for studies included ranged from 5 to 31. The size and direction of relationships identified in the 89 primary studies for the research hypotheses occurring five or more times is closely aligned with the size and direction of relationships identified in the theoretical framework of this investigation. For instance, both of the frequently occurring research hypotheses that had gender as a predictor construct, found a moderate positive relationship between gender 1=male and 2=female and personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy. This moderate relationship indicates that females tended to have both higher personal and general teaching efficacy than did males. This positive relationship was articulated in the review of the literature.

TABLE 2

Research Hypothesis	Number of Effect Sizes	Overall Effect Size	Standard Deviation of Population Correlation
Personal Teaching Efficacy related to General Teaching Efficacy	31	-0.15063	0.29194
Personal Teaching Efficacy related to Years of Teaching Experience	21	-0.03121	0.1972
General Teaching Efficacy (Rand 1) related to Personal Teaching Efficacy (Rand2)	8	0.278	0.1382
Personal Teaching Efficacy related to Gender	8	0.16286	0.02168
General Teaching Efficacy related to Years of Teaching Experience	8	-0.09346	0.18099
Overall Teaching Efficacy related to Years of Teaching Experience	5	-0.0995	0.18099
General Teaching Efficacy related to Gender	5	0.159	0.2566

The inverse relationship between personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy was identified in the literature review. This relationship was reported to be inverse in that as one construct increased the other decreased. General teaching efficacy was specifically addressed as being related to gender. The review of the literature of this relationship indicated a positive relationship between female gender and general teaching efficacy as well as personal teaching efficacy. Female teachers tended to be more efficacious than did male teachers. Several authors' works were cited (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Ross, 1994; Benz et al., 1992) regarding the relationship

of overall teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy with years of experience, with a consensus, that as teaching years increase the overall teaching efficacy decreases.

This study limited an in-depth meta-analysis to the most often-occurring research hypotheses. Due to this limitation, only those hypotheses occurring five or more times were identified for a meta-analysis. In these most often-occurring research hypotheses, demographic factors predominated including gender and years of teaching. These demographic characteristics were generally weak predictors of teacher efficacy. However, there were 54 strong positive predictors of teacher efficacy constructs. Several trends can be noted in these large positive effect sizes. Predictor constructs of student engagement and student achievement are both strongly correlated to teacher efficacy. Additionally, teacher success and organization factors such as shared decision making and being part of a coaching network are strong predictors of high teacher efficacy. Finally, instruction strategies such as the use of centers, cooperative learning and implementation of instructional changes as well as integration of the curriculum are also strongly correlated to high teacher efficacy.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for guidelines for primary studies and data reporting are offered with the intent that these recommendations would assist in maximizing knowledge of teacher efficacy in all primary studies.

Data reporting standards. To encourage and enable researchers to calculate effect sizes and to perform meta-analytic synthesis on existing research data reporting standards in primary studies should become more rigorous. Hunter and Schmidt (1990) have recommended that for correlational and multiple regression studies that means,

standard deviations, sample sizes, measurement reliability and validity, and zero-order correlation matrices for each variable be published. They also suggest that all descriptive statistics be published regardless of statistical significance.

Indicators of explained variance. The practical significance of findings in primary studies should receive more emphasis. The proportion of explained variance may be used as an indicator of practical significance (McNamara, 1978). Since most test statistics or effect sizes are convertible to indicators of explained variance, it is suggested that this explained variance be part of the reported research findings.

Uniformity of measures. The measures employed to measure teacher efficacy constructs should be more uniform in primary studies. Thirty-four different measures for 25 teacher efficacy constructs were reported in this investigation. The measure used to assess the teacher efficacy construct could easily be a moderating variable in the reporting of a correlation with a specific predictor construct. It is suggested that measures of teacher efficacy become more uniform across studies leading to more reliable and valid meta-analytical findings.

Future Research

This quantitative synthesis of teacher efficacy research was exhaustive to the extent that it utilized all available primary studies relating to teacher efficacy that were identified in the search of nine databases. This inquiry synthesized and extended knowledge of teacher efficacy research published in primary studies through December 1998. Analysis of the content provided understanding and insights into the construct of teacher efficacy along with the operationalization of this concept and measurements used. Although the model for this synthesis is relatively new, the model can be

replicated and offers researchers a means of synthesizing research findings in theoretical constructs in a variety of primary studies.

Comparison to models. A comparison of this model to other more traditional models could be the topic of a future inquiry resulting in possible modification and refinement of the Thompson, Hoyle, and McNamara model. This would make it more useful for future quantitative syntheses of primary studies.

Time-ordering of findings. This inquiry attempted to analyze effect sizes of frequently occurring research hypotheses over time. Analyzing correlations over time can provide useful information in terms of identifying trends and changes over time. Time-order analyses were limited to frequently occurring research hypotheses along with the author(s), date, and target population along with population characteristics. Other study findings including teacher efficacy constructs, predictor constructs, and measures employed could be time-ordered. This analysis could provide insights into each of these components and the respective role in research over time thus contributing a deeper understanding of the teacher efficacy construct and its multiplexities.

Examination of the effects of non-demographic variables. The behavioral and organizational variables of student achievement, use of promising research based instructional strategies, and organizational variables related to school climate, role in shared decision making and collegiality are all issues that have been shown to be strongly correlated to teacher efficacy and are variables well worth future study. This could be accomplished by an in-depth analysis of the existing data utilizing subsets of variables.

Teacher efficacy has shown to be strongly correlated to student achievement. High efficacy teachers' students demonstrate high student achievement (Ross, 1992; Ross, 1996; Tracz & Gibson, 1986). Student success is paramount in the educational system; therefore, understanding this construct and the variables strongly associated with it holds great promise for education. Finally, the framework for teacher efficacy provided by Bandura (1977) established that high self-efficacy contributes to pursuing challenging goals, increased goal commitment, and the expectation that the goal will be achieved in spite of setbacks. By developing a better understanding of the teacher efficacy construct and strongly related variables, variables that make a positive difference in teacher efficacy can be deliberately addressed, thereby constituting a research base that has the potential to make a positive difference in the teacher profession.

References

- Adams, C. M. (1996). A study of the effects of principal and teacher efficacy on suspension rates in the junior high schools of an urban school district (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Toledo, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57-5A, 1919, AAG9630034.
- Anderson, R., Greene, M., & Loewen, P. (1988). Relationships among teachers' and students' thinking skills, sense of efficacy, and student achievement. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 34 (2), 148-165.
- Edwards, J. L., Green, K. E., & Lyons, C.A. (1996). Factor and rasch analysis of the school culture survey. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
- Emmer, E. T., & Hickman, J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51, 755-765.
- Fritz, J, Miller-Heyl, J., Kreutzer, J., & MacPhee, D. (1995). Fostering personal teaching efficacy through staff development and classroom activities. Journal of Educational Research, 88(4), 200-208.

- Guyton, E. (1994). Relationships among economic diversity and context of student teaching placements and educational attitudes and performance of pre-service teachers. A paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Ghaith, G., & Yaghi H. (1997). Relationships among experience, teacher efficacy, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. Teaching and Teacher Education, 13(4), 451-458.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76(4), 569-582.
- Guskey, T. (1987). Context variables that affect measures of teacher efficacy. Journal of Educational Research, 81(1), 41-47.
- Guskey, T. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. Teaching and Teacher Education 4(1), 63-69.
- Hartnett, M. J. (1995). The relationship between principal and teacher efficacy in middle level schools in Missouri (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Nebraska, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56-12A, 4622.
- Haydel, J. B. (1997). The relationships between evaluative culture, teacher efficacy, and student efficacy (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58-8A, 2926.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. The Elementary School Journal, 93, 356-372.
- Huguenard, T. (1992). The relationship between teacher efficacy, certification, and student achievement (Doctoral dissertation, Baylor University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54-1A, 147.
- Hunter, J. E. & Schmidt, F. (1990). Methods of meta-analysis. Newbury Park, CA Sage Publications.
- Hyson, W. S. (1991). Teacher efficacy of regular and special education teachers (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52-12A, 4293.
- Klein, R. A. (1996). Teacher efficacy and developmental math instructors at an urban university: An exploratory analysis of the relationships among personal factors, teacher behaviors, and perceptions of the environment (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Akron, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57-8A, 3419.

Larsen, P. E. (1996). Relationship between selected measures of teacher and positive teacher behaviors (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57-7A, 2773.

Meijer, C.J. & Foster, S.F. (1988). The effect of teacher self-efficacy on referral chance. The Journal of Special Education, 22(3), 378-385.

Melby, L. C. (1995). Teacher efficacy and classroom management: A study of teacher cognition, emotion, and strategy usage associated with externalizing student behavior (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56-10A, 3890.

Moore, W. P. & Esselman, M. E. (1992). Teacher efficacy, empowerment, and a focused instructional climate: Does student achievement benefit? Paper presented for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Ohmart, H. E. (1992). The effects of an efficacy intervention on teachers' efficacy feelings (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54-01A, 76.

Petrie, T. A., Hartranft, F., & Lutz, K. (1995). The relationship between teacher efficacy and administrative perceptions of effectiveness. The High School Journal, 78(2), 73-77.

Poole, M. B., & Okeafor, K. (1989). The effects of teacher efficacy and interactions among educators on curriculum implementation. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 4(2), 146-161.

Rangel, A. T. (1997). Venezuelan college teachers' perceptions of efficacy and their attitudes toward interdisciplinary teacher education curriculum (Doctoral dissertation, University of Montana, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58-2A, 427.

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effects of coaching on student achievement. Canadian Journal of Education, 17(1), 51-65.

Ross, J. A. (1994, June). Beliefs that make a difference: The origins and impacts of teacher efficacy. Paper presented at the meeting of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, Calgary, Canada.

Ross, J., Cousins, J. B., & Gadalla, T. (1996). Within-teacher predictors of teacher efficacy. Teaching and Teacher Education, 12(4), 385-400.

Serna, A. G. (1990). Personal teacher training, teacher experience, and system

- factors associated with sense of efficacy or teachers of limited English proficient students (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51-10A, 3297.
- Soodak, L. C. & Podell, D. M. (1996). Teacher efficacy: Toward the understanding of a multi-faceted construct. Teaching and Teacher Education, 12(4), 401-411.
- Stanovich, P. J. & Jordan, A. (1998). Canadian teachers' and principals' beliefs about inclusive education as predictors of effective teaching in heterogeneous classrooms. The Elementary School Journal, 98(3), 221-238.
- Taylor, C. E. (1992). Teacher and principal perceptions of personal efficacy. The High School Journal, 76(1), 60-66.
- Thompson, D., McNamara, J., & Hoyle, J. (1997). Job satisfaction in educational organizations: A synthesis of research findings. Educational Administration Quarterly, 33 (1), 7-37.
- Tracz, S. M. & Gibson, S., (1986). Effects of efficacy on academic achievement. Paper presented at the meeting of the California Educational Research Association, Marina del Rey, CA.
- Trentham, L., Silvern, S., & Brogdon, R. (1985). Teacher efficacy and teacher competency ratings. Psychology in the Schools, 22, 343-352.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. Review of Educational Research, 68(2), 202-248.
- Turgoose, L. E. (1996). The relationship of teacher efficacy, mathematics anxiety, achievement, preparation, and years of experience to student IOWA test of basic skills mathematics test scores (Doctoral dissertation, University of Idaho, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57-5A, 1986.
- Vitali, G. J. (1994). Factors influencing teachers' practices in an assessment driven reform. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 373 053).
- Watson, S. D. (1991). A study of the effects of teacher efficacy on the academic achievement of third-grade students in selected elementary schools in South Carolina (Doctoral dissertation, South Carolina State University, 1991). Dissertations Abstracts International, 53-06A, 1794.
- Walker, C. A. & Cousins, J. B. (1994). Influences on teachers' attitudes toward applied educational research. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Boston, MA.

Warren, L. L. (1993). Middle grades organizational patterns and their relationship to students' self-concepts and perceptions of their school climate and teachers' efficacy and perceptions of their working environment (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54-6A, 2112.

Wittmann, C. L. (1992). Comparison of teacher efficacy of graduates from an alternative teacher education program and traditional programs (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland College Park, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54-01A, 151.

Woolfolk, A., & Hoy, W. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control, Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(1), 81-91.



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>Teacher Efficacy: A Research Synthesis</i>	
Author(s): <i>Julia Shahid, David Thompson</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: <i>April 14, 2001</i>

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY. HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 1

Level 2A

Level 2B

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: <i>J. Shahid</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Julia Shahid, Asst. Professor</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>Austin College</i>	Telephone: <i>903/813-2457</i>	FAX: <i>903/813-2326</i>
<i>900 N. Grand 6E</i>	E-Mail Address: <i>jshahid@</i>	Date: <i>April 11, 2001</i>
<i>Sherman, TX 75090</i>	<i>austinc.edu</i>	



(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

**University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Laboratory
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions**

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598**

Telephone: 301-497-4080

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-953-0263

e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)