

A Study on Efficacy and Coping Strategies for Home Economics Teachers

This study investigates the efficacy and coping strategies of Home Economics teachers in secondary schools. Data were collected from 75 Home Economics teachers via a mailed survey and from 282 Home Economics teachers via an online survey. Descriptive statistics including frequency, percentage, average, and standard deviation; in addition, the ANOVA, t-test, multiple linear regression, and correlation results were reported using SPSS statistics 17.0. The results were as follows: First, the average Home Economics teachers efficacy level was 3.82 out of 5-point Likert scale. The efficacy level of learning assistance was the highest. The composite efficacy of Home Economics teachers showed a significant difference depending on the major. Second, the averages of the positive and negative coping strategy level of Home Economics teachers were 3.54 and 2.03, respectively. Third, the efficacy of instructional strategy out of the five components of efficacy was the most influential to the positive coping strategy. There was no significant relationship between teacher efficacy and the negative strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Research

The teachers' sense of efficacy is defined as the teachers' judgments about their abilities to promote students' learning (Hoy & Spero, 2005). Teacher efficacy has been confirmed to be an important

variable in teacher efficiency. It is constantly related to positive teaching behaviors (Allinder, 1994; Riggs & Enochs, 1990) and student outcomes (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000; Henson, Kogan, & Vacha-Haase, 2001). Teachers with higher levels of efficacy are more likely to spend more time teaching in subject areas (Riggs & Enochs, 1990) and exhibit greater levels of planning, organization, and enthusiasm (Allinder, 1994).

Home Economics teacher efficacy has been related to teacher self-esteem and job satisfaction (Lee, 2007), the curriculum perspective (Choi, 2006), educational level, internal locus of control, principal's instructional leadership, parental involvement, and student personalities (Kim, 2004), professional development, and modes of professional teaching practice (Fox, 2001). Hall (1997) found that predictors of Home Economics teacher efficacy were perceptions in the adequacy of teacher preparation programs, attitudes about teaching, and professional development preferences. The researchers examined how teacher efficacy was affected by variables such as school level (Choi, 2006; Kim, 2004), school type (Kim, 2004), school location (Hall, 1997; Kim, 2004), college major (Choi, 2006; Kim, 2004), academic degree and duration of teaching experience (Choi, 2006; Hall, 1997; Kim, 2004; Lee, 2007).

Efficacy determines whether coping behavior will be initiated, how much effort will be exerted, and how long it will persist in threatening conditions (Bandura, 1977). "Those who persist in subjectively threatening activities that are in fact relatively safe will gain corrective experiences that reinforce their

Post-doctoral Research Fellow, Dept. of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems, Florida State University, US
(nansooksb@gmail.com)

Key Words: teacher efficacy, coping strategy, Home Economics teacher

sense of efficacy, thereby eventually eliminating their defensive behavior" (Bandura, 1977, p. 194). Therefore, teacher efficacy determines whether obstacles and challenges will be overcome or avoided. Guskey (1988) found that the teachers with higher levels of efficacy are more capable of the positive attitude toward the implementation of new instructional practice and shows that teacher efficacy can be linked to coping strategies when threatening situations were encountered. In an ultimatum to Home Economics Education, Home Economics teachers are requested to have higher level of teacher efficacy and positive coping strategy to overcome difficult situations.

This study hypothesizes that teacher efficacy affects coping strategies; in addition, it examines the relationship between efficacy and the coping strategies of Home Economics teachers in secondary schools.

Research Questions

1. Does the teacher efficacy differ across school type, school levels, and school location? Does the teacher efficacy differ with relation to the major, academic degree, and duration of teaching experience?
2. Do teacher coping strategies differ across school types, school levels, and school location? Does the teacher coping strategy differ with relation to the major, academic degree, and duration of teaching experience?
3. Does teacher efficacy affect teacher coping strategies?

Operational definition

Teacher efficacy Teacher efficacy is defined as the teachers' judgments about their ability to promote student learning (Hoy & Spero, 2005). It consists of five components such as efficacy of 1) instructional strategy, 2) dealing with student demands, 3) classroom management, 4) environmental assistance, and 5) learning assistance (Choi, 2006).

Coping strategies Coping strategies consist of positive and negative strategies when a crisis is encountered. Positive coping strategies include

immediate action and soliciting advice from co-workers to solve problems. Negative coping strategies include avoidance, delay, and attribution to others (Kim, 1999).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The focus of the literature review section is placed on previous studies that examined Home Economics teacher efficacy and some relevant variables to teacher efficacy in Korea and the US.

Kim (2004) identified Home Economics teacher efficacy and investigated the relationship between types of teacher efficacy and related variables. Of the five subscales of teacher efficacy, the efficacy of classroom management was the highest, followed by the efficacy of learning assistance, the efficacy of instructional strategies, the efficacy of environmental assistance, and the efficacy of dealing with student demands in order of the level of teacher efficacy. Three types of teachers were identified according to the mean scores of five subscales from the factor analysis; in addition, the individual and environmental variables were categorized. Individual variables included educational level, locus of control, receiving training courses, and job stress. The environmental variables contain the principals' instructional leadership, parental involvement, student personalities, peer-teacher personalities, and physical conditions. All the variables were different depending on three types of teachers. The student personalities were the most influential on teacher efficacy, followed by peer-teacher characteristics, receiving any of training courses, and principals' instructional leadership.

Choi (2006) investigated the relationship between perspectives on curriculum and the efficacy of Home Economics teachers. The teacher efficacy tool contains five subscales. The level of the efficacy for learning assistance was the highest followed by the efficacy of classroom management, the efficacy of environmental assistance, the efficacy of instructional strategy, and the efficacy of dealing with student demands in order of the mean score. The interpretative perspective on curriculum has a

moderate correlation with teacher efficacy.

Lee (2007) examined how general characteristics, self-esteem, professional development, the educational context of the school, and job satisfaction were related to teacher efficacy. The teacher efficacy has a significant difference in regards to age, academic degree, duration of teaching experience, and salary. There was a significant correlation between teacher efficacy and job satisfaction. The professional development and teacher self-esteem were predictors of teacher efficacy.

Hall (1997) examined how the variables of teachers' age, years teaching, level of education, college attended, type of school district employed in, teaching attitude, perceptions of the adequacy of teacher preparation program, professional development preference, and student achievement scores, were related to personal teaching efficacy and locus of control. The best predictors of efficacy for all teachers were perceptions of adequacy of teacher preparation programs, teaching attitudes, rural school type (a negative relationship), and professional development preference; however, no relationships between student achievement scores and teacher efficacy existed.

Fox (2001) investigated how professional development and modes of professional teaching practice were related to teaching efficacy. She categorized teacher efficacy measures into two subscales of personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy. The results showed that teachers see themselves as having a high teacher efficacy. There was a significant difference between two groups (receiving professional development courses or not) for their mean scores on personal teaching efficacy. Teaching efficacy was a predictor of professional teaching practice modes.

Researchers examined how teacher efficacy was affected by variables such as school level (Choi, 2006; Kim, 2004), school type (Kim, 2004), School location (Hall, 1997; Kim, 2004), college major (Choi, 2006; Kim, 2004), academic degree, and duration of teaching experience (Choi, 2006; Hall, 1997; Kim, 2004; Lee, 2007). However, there was no consensus that teacher efficacy has a significant difference with the variables. Home Economics teacher efficacy did

not show a significant difference according to school level, major, academic degree, and the years of teaching experience (Choi, 2006; Kim, 2004). However, Lee (2007) found that teacher efficacy varies depending on the academic degree and the years of teaching experience.

METHOD

Data Collection Procedure

Data for this study were obtained by a convenience sampling and were collected from 75 Home Economics teachers via a mailed survey during June 20 to July 11 and from 282 Home Economics teachers via an online survey during November 1 to December 31 in 2010. This survey received 357 responses.

A mailed survey was sent to 300 Home Economics teachers and an additional postal card mailing was initiated to encourage the completion and return of the questionnaire. The potential subject was a randomly selected sample from Home Economics teachers of secondary schools located in Incheon metropolitan city and Chungcheonbuk-do. The lists of secondary schools were downloaded from the websites of two educational offices. Seventy-five questionnaires were received in a month with a response rate of 25%.

An email list of 790 Home Economics teachers was collected through personal contacts, school webpages, and online Home Economics teacher communities. An online survey was published via the emails of Home Economics teachers with an explanation of the importance of the research and possible benefits to them and with an apology statement for any unwanted email contact. Two additional email contacts were made to encourage completing and returning email questionnaires. After a two-month surveying processes, 282 questionnaires were obtained with a response rate of 35.7%.

Participants

Participants were between the ages of 25 and 62 ($M=44.34$, $SD=8.39$). The teachers had from 0.5 to 40

Table 1. General Characteristics of the Participants

Variables	Level	N (%)
School level	Middle	240 (67.2)
	High	117 (32.8)
School type	Public	297 (83.2)
	Private	60 (16.8)
School location	Metropolitan	132 (37.1)
	Town	157 (44.1)
	County	67 (18.8)
Major	Home Economics Education	250 (70.2)
	Child science	3 (0.8)
	Home Management	21 (5.9)
	Food and Nutrition	17 (4.8)
	Clothing and Textile	9 (2.5)
	Housing	7 (2.0)
	Other	49 (13.8)

years of teaching experience with a mean of 19.7 ($SD=9.09$). The levels, frequencies, and percentages of the general characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1. Of those who indicated the grade level at which they taught, 67.2% taught middle school and 32.8% taught high school. The sample included 297 (83.2%) public school teachers and 60 (16.8%) private school teachers. The school locations of the participants were metropolitan (37.1%), town (44.1%), and county (18.8%). The majority of the participants majored in Home Economics education (70.2%). This teacher sample was made up of teachers of various ages with different durations of teaching experience.

Measures

Efficacy was assessed using the instrument that Choi (2006) used. From this study, 10 items were selected from the original 15 items to reflect five efficacies of (a) instructional strategy, (b) dealing with student demands, (c) classroom management, (d) environmental assistance, and (e) learning assistance. Coping strategies were assessed using the instrument that Kim (1999) used. From this study, five relevant items were selected from the original 13 items to reflect a positive or negative coping strategy. For both instruments, teachers were asked to rate the extent to which they agree with each item on a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (do not agree) to 5 (agree a lot).

The relevant item responses of the teachers were first computed into five subscales of teacher efficacy

Table 2. Measures of Teacher Efficacy and Coping Strategy

Measure	Number of items	M (SD)	Reliability
Teacher efficacy			
IE	2	3.70 (.75)	.68
DE	2	3.65 (.75)	.68
CE	2	3.80 (.71)	.69
EE	2	3.87 (.69)	.71
LE	2	4.07 (.62)	.69
Overall	10	3.82 (.61)	.92
Coping strategy			
Positive	2	3.54 (.80)	.56
Negative	3	2.03 (.81)	.59

Note. Reliability was estimated by coefficient alpha.

M=mean; SD=standard deviation; Teacher efficacy: IE=Efficacy of instructional strategy; DE=Efficacy of dealing with student demands; CE=Efficacy of classroom management; EE=Efficacy of environmental assistance; LE=Efficacy of learning assistance.

and two subscales of coping strategy. Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations, and the internal consistency reliabilities of these subscales. The internal consistency reliability coefficients of five subscales of teacher efficacy ranged from .68 to .71. The internal consistency reliability coefficients of two subscales of coping strategy were .56 and .59.

Data analyses

Data were analyzed through descriptive analysis, ANOVA, *t*-test, multiple linear regression, and correlation by using SPSS statistics 17.0.

RESULTS

Efficacy of Home Economics Teachers

The level of efficacy for Home Economics teachers was determined by computing a total response score for ten 5-point Likert scale items. As seen in Table 2, the average of efficacy levels for Home Economics teachers were slightly high, 3.82; however, it is similar to the results of previous studies (Choi, 2006; Kim, 2004; Lee, 2007). The efficacy level of learning assistance was the highest. Then, the efficacy of environmental assistance, the efficacy of classroom management, the efficacy of instructional strategy, and the efficacy of dealing with the student demands followed respectively. This order of subscale score of teacher efficacy was somewhat different from

Table 3. Mean Comparisons of Overall Efficacy depending on Variables

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>t</i> or (<i>F</i>)
School level			
Middle	238	3.79 (.61)	-1.06
High	116	3.87 (.62)	
School type			
Public	294	3.84 (.60)	1.29
Private	60	3.73 (.65)	
School location			
Metro	130	3.85 (.59)	(1.54)
Town	156	3.84 (.63)	
County	67	3.70 (.62)	
Major			
HEE	247	3.91 (.54)	3.93***
Other	106	3.61 (.71)	
Academic degree			
BA	203	3.80 (.65)	-.60
Other	150	3.84 (.56)	

Note. *** $p < .001$

Major: HEE=Home Economics Education; Academic degree: BA=Bachelor's degree.

previous studies (Choi, 2006; Kim, 2004); however, the first order was consistent with a study of Choi (2006) and the last order was consistent with the studies of Choi (2006) and Kim (2004).

Mean Comparisons of Overall Efficacy depending on Variables The overall efficacy of Home Economics teachers was initially analyzed according to several variables and shown in Table 3. The overall efficacy of Home Economics teachers did not show a significant difference across school levels, school types, school location, and academic degrees. It can be implied that composite efficacy is of a similar quality and independent from the analyzed variables. However, statistical significance exists with respect to the major and indicates that the participants who studied Home Economics Education as a major have a higher overall efficacy than others with a significance level .001. There was no relationship between teacher efficacy and the duration of teaching experience ($r=.08$, $p=.15$) and the result is the same as other studies (Choi, 2006;

Hall, 1997; Kim, 2004). Hoy and Spero (2005) found that there were significant increases in efficacy during student teaching; however, there were significant declines during the first year of teaching. Once established, the efficacy of experienced teachers is hard to change (Hoy & Spero, 2005).

The analyses of further subdivision of overall efficacy into five sub-categories are shown in Table 4. The components of the efficacy of Home Economics teachers show significant differences according to the major. The difference was in favor of the teachers with a major in Home Economics Education. The difference can be inferred according to the result of the analysis of the overall efficacy of Home Economics teachers. However, Choi (2006) and Kim (2004) showed that teacher efficacy is not significantly different depending on college major.

The further analysis showed two different results regarding 'IE' and 'LE'. With respect to the efficacy 'IE', the public school teacher received more points than the private school teacher did ($p < .05$). With respect to the efficacy 'LE', the difference was seen according to the variable, 'school location'. A Scheffe test was conducted to understand which groups belong to the differences in locations of the school. The result of the analysis indicated only a difference between 'Town' and 'County' that indicated that teachers working at urban schools had a higher efficacy level than those working at suburban schools ($p < .05$). The findings can be compared to that of Hall (1997). There was a small negative relationship between teacher efficacy and teachers working in rural districts. There was a small positive relationship between teacher efficacy and teachers working in urban districts. Hall (1997) inferred that the results were associated with school climate and resources available in districts.

Coping strategy of Home Economics Teachers

Home Economics teachers' level of coping strategies were determined by computing the total score for their responses to 5-point Likert scale items. As presented in Table 2, the averages of the positive and negative coping strategy level of Home Economics teachers were 3.54 and 2.03, respectively. The level of the positive coping strategy was fairly high, while

Table 4. Mean Comparisons of Components of Efficacy depending on Variables

	N	IE		DE		CE		EE		LE	
		M (SD)	t or (F)	M (SD)	t or (F)	M (SD)	t or (F)	M (SD)	t or (F)	M (SD)	t or (F)
School level											
Middle	240	3.69 (.71)	-.17	3.64 (.74)	-.52	3.75 (.70)	-1.77	3.83 (.69)	-1.41	4.05 (.63)	-90
High	117	3.71 (.83)		3.68 (.75)		3.90 (.71)		3.94 (.69)		4.11 (.59)	
School type											
Public	297	3.74 (.72)	2.08*	3.68 (.74)	1.47	3.81 (.71)	.41	3.88 (.68)	.72	4.08 (.62)	.48
Private	60	3.49 (.85)		3.53 (.77)		3.77 (.69)		3.81 (.74)		4.03 (.62)	
School location											
Metro	132	3.78 (.71)	(1.42)	3.66 (.73)	(.25)	3.82 (.69)	2.58	3.89 (.65)	(1.15)	4.09ab (.60)	(3.10)*
Town	157	3.65 (.77)		3.67 (.77)		3.86 (.72)		3.90 (.73)		4.12b (.63)	
County	67	3.63 (.77)		3.60 (.73)		3.63 (.71)		3.75 (.68)		3.90a (.63)	
Major											
HEE	250	3.79 (.70)	3.42**	3.75 (.70)	3.77***	3.90 (.64)	3.81***	3.95 (.63)	3.03**	4.15 (.54)	3.45**
Other	106	3.48 (.82)		3.43 (.81)		3.57 (.80)		3.68 (.80)		3.88 (.74)	
Academic degree											
BA	204	3.68 (.75)	-.35	3.66 (.77)	.19	3.77 (.75)	-1.06	3.85 (.72)	-.74	4.05 (.66)	-.85
Other	151	3.71 (.75)		3.65 (.71)		3.85 (.64)		3.90 (.65)		4.10 (.57)	

Note. a < b: Scheffe Multiple Comparison Test, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$,

M=mean; SD=standard deviation; Teacher efficacy: IE=Efficacy of instructional strategy; DE=Efficacy of dealing with student demands; CE=Efficacy of classroom management; EE=Efficacy of environmental assistance; LE=Efficacy of learning assistance; Major: HEE=Home Economics Education; Academic degree: BA=Bachelor's degree.

that of the negative coping strategy was fairly low.

Mean Comparisons of Coping strategies depending on Variables The positive and negative coping strategies of Home Economics teachers were analyzed according to several variables shown in Table 5. Positive coping strategies of Home Economics teachers showed a significant difference depending on the type of school ($p < .05$). The positive coping strategies of public school teachers was higher ($M=3.58$) than that of private school teachers ($M=3.32$). There was no relationship between the positive coping strategies and the duration of

teaching experience ($r = -.02$, $p = .76$). However, the negative coping strategy of Home Economics teachers had no significant difference across the variables and indicated that a negative coping strategy was independent from the examined variables. There was no relationship between negative coping strategies and the duration of teaching experience ($r = .08$, $p = .12$).

Relationship between Efficacy and Coping strategies of Home Economics teachers

An Analysis of Effect of Efficacy on Positive Coping Strategy A multiple regression analysis was

Table 5. Mean Comparisons of Coping Strategies Depending on Variables

	N	Positive coping strategy		Negative coping strategy	
		M(SD)	t (F)	M(SD)	t (F)
School level					
Middle	240	3.54 (.76)	.16	2.03 (.78)	.24
High	117	3.53 (.87)		2.01 (.86)	
School type					
Public	297	3.58 (.78)	2.35*	2.04 (.82)	.80
Private	60	3.32 (.86)		1.95 (.72)	
School location					
Metro	132	3.62 (.75)	(1.12)	2.00 (.81)	(.33)
Town	157	3.48 (.84)		2.07 (.81)	
County	67	3.51 (.78)		1.99 (.82)	
Major					
HEE	250	3.58 (.77)	1.59	1.98 (.80)	-1.60
Other	106	3.43 (.84)		2.13 (.83)	
Academic degree					
BA	204	3.55 (.78)	.41	2.05 (.85)	.69
Other	151	3.52 (.82)		1.99 (.75)	

Note. * p<.05

Major: HEE=Home Economics Education; Academic degree: BA=Bachelor's degree.

Table 6. Effect of Teacher Efficacy on Positive Coping Strategy

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Correlations		Collinearity
	B (SE)	Beta		Zero-order	Part	VIF
Constant	1.122 (.242)		4.64***			
IE	.356 (.073)	.336	4.85***	.52***	.22***	2.35
DE	.206 (.079)	.194	2.60**	.48*	.12*	2.72
CE	.071 (.087)	-.063	-.82	.38	-.04	2.91
EE	.072 (.094)	.063	.77	.42	.04	3.29
LE	.084 (.105)	.065	.80	.40	.04	3.28

R²= .294, F (5, 346)=28.84***, Adjusted R²= .284

Note. * p<.05, *** p<.001

Dependant variable: Positive coping strategy

Teacher efficacy: IE=Efficacy of instructional strategy; DE=Efficacy of dealing with student demands; CE=Efficacy of classroom management; EE=Efficacy of environmental assistance; LE=Efficacy of learning assistance.

conducted to explore the influence of teacher efficacy on positive coping strategies. A positive coping strategy was set to a dependent variable and five components of teacher efficacy were set to predictors in this multiple regression model. The coefficient is the estimated slope for the predictors, where the slope is the predicted change in the

dependent variable for a one-unit increase in the predictor and controlled for other predictors in the model.

Collinearity statistics were obtained to identify the potential existence of multicollinearity problems among the variables as seen in Table 6. The Variance Influence Factor (VIF) ranged from 2.35 to 3.29 and

Table 7. Effects of Teacher Efficacy on Negative Coping Strategy

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	<i>t</i>	Correlations		Collinearity
	B (SE)	Beta		Zero-order	Part	VIF
Constant	2.209 (.290)		7.61			
IE	-.046 (.088)	-.042	-.52	-.04	-.03	2.346
DE	.065 (.095)	.060	.69	-.01	.04	2.726
CE	.091 (.104)	.080	.88	-.01	.05	2.909
EE	-.196 (.113)	-.168	-1.74	-.07	-.09	3.270
LE	.039 (.125)	.030	.31	-.03	.02	3.272

$R^2=.012$, $F(5, 347)=.84$, Adjusted $R^2=-.002$

Note. Dependant variable: Negative coping strategy

Teacher efficacy: IE=Efficacy of instructional strategy; DE=Efficacy of dealing with student demands; CE=Efficacy of classroom management; EE=Efficacy of environmental assistance; LE=Efficacy of learning assistance.

was lower than 10 and indicated no serious collinearity problem to have to conduct further analyses. Table 6 illustrates that the overall *F* test showed that any of the five predictors affected the positive coping strategy ($F(5, 346)=28.84$, $p<.001$). The importance of the impact of the slopes can be compared using the standardized coefficients (*Beta*). The standardized coefficient of 'IE' (.336, $p<.001$) was the highest, followed by 'DE' (.194, $p<.05$). The other components of teacher efficacy (such as 'CE', 'EE', and 'LE') were not statistically significant.

The results showed that the efficacy of the instructional strategy (IE) of Home Economics teachers significantly affected the positive coping strategy and indicated that a positive coping strategy increases by .356 as one-unit increases in the efficacy of instructional strategy. The efficacy of dealing with student demands (DE) also significantly affected the positive coping strategy. It indicated that the positive coping strategy increases by .206 as one-unit increases in the efficacy of dealing with student demands. It can be inferred that the efficacy of instructional strategy is the most effective on the positive coping strategy since teaching is the most important to the teacher.

Correlations were computed to assess the strength of the relationship between the variables. A multiple regression analysis provided two kinds of correlation statistics such as a zero-order and part correlation as shown in Table 6. A zero-order correlation was named because no other variables were controlled (Roberts, 1999). A part correlation is

useful to determine whether a true correlation exists between variables while holding other variables constant (Roberts, 1999).

There were two significant correlations between efficacy and positive coping strategy, significance between 'IE' and positive coping strategy ($r=.52$, $p<.001$), and significance between 'DE' and positive coping strategy ($r=.48$, $p<.05$) according to the zero-order correlation statistics. Part correlation statistics between 'IE' and positive coping strategy ($r=.22$, $p<.001$) and between 'DE' and positive coping strategy ($r=.12$, $p<.05$) are different from the zero-order correlations, because the impact of other variables were partialled out. A positive coping strategy by Home Economics teachers had no significant correlation with other variables.

An Analysis of Effect of Efficacy on Negative Coping Strategy A regression analysis was performed to explore the influence of teacher efficacy on a negative coping strategy; however, there was no significant relationship between the variables as shown in Table 7. It can be implied that teacher efficacy is independent from negative coping strategy.

CONCLUSIONS

This study investigated the efficacy and coping strategy of Home Economics teachers. Data were collected from 75 Home Economics teachers via a

mailed survey and from 282 Home Economics teachers via an online survey. The results of this study were: First, the average of the overall teacher efficacy level was high (3.82). The efficacy level of learning assistance was the highest. The overall efficacy of Home Economics teachers showed a significant difference depending on the major. Second, the averages of the positive and negative coping strategy level of Home Economics teachers were 3.54 and 2.03, respectively. Third, the efficacy of the instructional strategy out of the five components of efficacy was most influential for the positive coping strategy. The efficacy of dealing with student demands was the second predictor to the positive coping strategy. There was no significant relationship between the teacher efficacy and the negative strategy.

Teacher efficacy needs to be enhanced to increase the level of the positive coping strategy. Especially, the efficacy of instructional strategy and the efficacy of dealing with student demands among the five subscales of teacher efficacy need to be focused on. The content relevant to instructional strategies and understanding students should be reinforced in the teacher education and training programs.

It is important to enhance the positive coping strategy of Home Economics teachers. Home Economics Education faces a crises every several years (such as a decrease in the number of mandatory lesson periods per week and the change of the course status to an elective) whenever curriculum revisions are announced by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology. The crises in Home Economics Education have been caused by educational settings that overly focus on academic knowledge. Since Home Economics Education can provide individuals and families in challenging environment with solutions to the issue of today, Home Economics teachers play key roles to initiate, implement, and continue the innovation for overcoming the crises. In this context, Home Economics teacher efficacy and coping strategies are considered essential factors.

The following suggestions for future research are presented with the results and limitations of this

study. There is likely to be some discrepancies in the findings due to the samples or the methods that the efficacy measured (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). A comparison of teacher efficacy with different measures among the same sample may be a future research topic for the investigation of a multi-faceted picture of teacher efficacy.

The result of this study showed no difference between teacher efficacy and the years of teaching experience. A longitudinal study might provide in-depth information on teacher efficacy. For example, longitudinal studies that follow student teachers through their training years and the first several years teaching Home Economics could provide a more accurate picture of teacher efficacy.

REFERENCES

- Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 17, 86-95.
- Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. New York: Longman.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Choi, Y. (2006). *Correlation of between home economics teacher's viewpoint about curriculum and teacher efficacy*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Korea National University of Education.
- Fox, C. K. (2001). *Teacher efficacy, professional development, professional practices, and critical science-based FCS curriculum implementation*. Unpublished Dissertation, The Ohio State University. Columbus, OH.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 479-507.
- Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.

- 4(1), 63-69.
- Hall, L. D. (1997). *Predictors of personal teaching efficacy and locus of control of Ohio Family and Consumer Sciences teachers*. Unpublished Dissertation, The Ohio State University. Columbus, OH.
- Henson, R., Kogan, L. R., & Vacha-Haase, T. (2001). A reliability generalization study of the teacher efficacy scale and related instruments. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 61*(3), 404-420.
- Hoy, A. W. & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 323-356.
- Kim, H. (1999). A study on the factors influencing middle manager's professional stress in social welfare: Centered on coping strategies, self-esteem, effects of social support influencing on professional stress. Unpublished Master's thesis, Ewha Womans University.
- Kim, Y. (2004). *The types of teacher efficacy among secondary school home economics teachers and the related variables*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Chung-Ang University.
- Lee, J. (2007). Teacher efficacy and job satisfaction of Home Economics teachers, Unpublished Master's thesis, Chung-Ang University.
- Riggs, I., & Enochs, L. (1990). Toward the development of an elementary teacher's science teaching efficacy belief instrument. *Science Education, 74*(6), 625-638.
- Roberts, D. K. (1999). Partial and Part Correlation Coefficients: Formula and Score Regression Perspectives. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (San Antonio, TX, January 21-23, 1999).
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783-805.

Received May 2, 2011

Revised June 13, 2011

Accepted June 17, 2011