Journal of Positive School Psychology http://journalppw.com
2023, Vol. 7, No. 09, 115-151

The Relationship Between Character Strengths And Perceived Teacher Self-Efficacy

Victoria Tyrer-Davies

University of East London

Abstract

This study built on existing limited research examining the relationship between teacher Character Strengths and teacher self-efficacy for teachers within the UK. The research question was "is there a significant relationship between Character Strengths and teacher self efficacy for teachers within the UK?"

A correlational, within-subject design was used. A self-selecting sample completed the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Short Form), Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Short Form) and Values in Action, 72 item survey (VIA-72) using Qualtrics. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability was completed as a control measure. The predictor variables were Character Strengths, and the outcome variable was teacher self-efficacy.

The results demonstrated a non-significant relationship between Character Strengths and teacher self-efficacy measured by the Teacher Efficacy Scale. Significant positive and negative correlations were found between Character Strengths and teacher self-efficacy measured by the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale. Character Strengths accounted for variance in the model when socially desirable responding was controlled for. Results are discussed in terms of different aspects of teaching measured by each scale and how significant correlations can be explained by the qualities Character Strengths encompass. The alternative hypothesis, that there is a significant relationship between Character Strengths and teacher self-efficacy was accepted.

This study provides support for the previous limited research that demonstrated a relationship between Character Strengths and teacher self-efficacy in Korea and Turkey and considers differences in the relationship depending on how self-efficacy is measured and how different Character Strengths relate to different aspects of teacher self-efficacy.

Keywords: Teacher Character Strengths; Teacher Self-Efficacy; Positive Education; Personal Teacher Efficacy; General Teacher Efficacy.

Introduction

Self-efficacy is believed to be a feature of positive human functioning (Hoy & Tarter, 2011) and is therefore relevant to Positive Psychology (PP). Research highlights the positive impact of high teacher self-efficacy on teacher wellbeing (Maddux, 1995, 2009; Bandura, 1997) and student success (Sezgin & Erdogan, 2015). Self-efficacy is therefore important for teachers with the potential not only to enhance wellbeing and success but also to reduce teacher turnover.

Strengths-based approaches are derived from PP and social cognitive psychology theories (He, 2009). The strengths-based approach focuses on positive experiences and strengths rather than problems and short-comings (He, 2009). It stands to reason, that if particular strengths are related to higher self-efficacy, strength-based approaches such as developing an awareness of strengths, using strengths in new ways, and utilising lesser strengths, could be methods for enhancing teacher self-efficacy. The question this research seeks to answer is: Is there a relationship between Character Strengths (CS) and teacher self-efficacy in the UK?

Whilst many factors have been found to enhance teacher self-efficacy including academic optimism, zest for work and success (Sezgin & Erdogan,

2015), there is a scarcity of literature about the relationship between CS and self-efficacy, particularly within the UK. Yet the existing research, based in Korea which focused on special education teachers (Lim & Kim, 2014) and Turkey which focused on primary school teachers (Sezguin & Erdogan, 2015), indicates that CS are indeed related to self-efficacy, therefore this warrants further exploration.

The current study aims to explore this further by considering whether CS are related to teacher self-efficacy for teachers within the UK from mainstream, specialist, state and independent primary and secondary sectors.

This research contributes to knowledge by informing the development of: effective interventions to increase teacher self-efficacy and its positive outcomes; whole-school practices incorporating strengths-based approaches to enhance teacher self-efficacy; effective recruitment procedures; initial teacher training programs.

The long-term aim is to contribute to the scientific knowledgebase for increasing teacher wellbeing, student success and teacher retention through strengths-based approaches to enhance teacher self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy

What is it?

Self-efficacy forms part of Social-Cognitive Theory which postulates that self-efficacy has a vital role in determining human behaviour, where people actively shape their lives rather than passively responding (Bandura, 1986; Baron, Maddux & Snyder, 1997). Self-efficacy relates not to actual ability, but to a person's belief in their abilities and chances of success (Sezgin & Erdogan, 2018).

Bandura (1977) proposed the notion of self-efficacy defining it as a person's belief in their ability to effectively manage their behaviours to reach sought after outcomes, believing that self-efficacy directly affects a person's behaviour (Bandura, 2012). Further definitions suggest an element of specificity, asserting that self-efficacy is related to a person's judgement about their ability to deal with different situations and to carry out particular tasks (Senemoglu; 2000, Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

Indeed, Bandura (1977, 1982, 1997) holds that self-efficacy needs to be measured in relation to specific situations, known as the 'situational perspective' (e.g. job performance). Bandura argues against the 'trait perspective' where psychological processes are of thought of as persisting overtime and across different circumstances.

Why is Self-Efficacy Important?

Higher self-efficacy is linked to the ability to manage anxiety and low mood (Maddux, 1995; Bandura, 1997) and better physical health (Maddux, 2009). Situation-specific measures robustly predict that high self-efficacy reduces anxiety and improves academic performance (Bandura, 1997).

Linking to self-efficacy theory, Hope Theory postulates that hope links with the belief that a sought-after outcome will be achieved (Snyder, 1989). Academic Optimism involving self-efficacy, trust, and academic importance, is the expectation of something good coming in the future (He, 2009; Peterson & Park, 2004). Sezgin & Erdogan (2015) and He (2009) describe Hope Theory and Academic Optimism Theory within the context of goals; self-efficacy is an important in your perceived ability to achieve set goals.

Predictors & Mediators

Studies have found that teacher self-efficacy is positively predicted by zest for work, academic optimism, and success (Sezgin & Erdogan, 2015; Karadems, 2006; Karadems et al., 2007). However, Sezgin & Erdogan (2015) found that academic optimism and zest indirectly predicted self-efficacy through perceived success. Indeed, Bandura (1977) believed that success generates self-efficacy, but asserted that the effect is bi-directional, with self-efficacy impacting on success.

Gender roles determine belief in capabilities in different subjects; males have higher self-efficacy in maths and females have higher self-efficacy in

languages (Lopez et al, 2019). Culture is also a factor, in collectivist cultures, people rated themselves as having low self-efficacy even though they performed well on a maths test, the opposite to that for those from individualistic cultures (Lopez et al, 2008) This may be a confounding factor in studies measuring self-efficacy. A factor, not controlled for in these studies, is socially desirable responding; the tendency to respond in a way that gives positive descriptions of the self (Braun et al, 2001).

Self-Efficacy in Teachers

Bandura (1993) asserts that in addition to individual teacher self-efficacy, teacher's beliefs about the capability of the entire school is important, referring to this as Collective Efficacy, a concept supported by Goddard et al. (2000). Consideration of Collective Efficacy is beyond the scope of this paper, where the focus will be on teacher self-efficacy.

Guskey & Passaro (1994) defined teacher self-efficacy as the belief that he/she can influence how well pupils learn, even those considered to be 'difficult' or unmotivated.

A positive relationship has been found between success, self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1993; Zeldin et al., 2008; Mills et al., 2007) and self-esteem (Khan et al., 2015). Self-efficacy also positively influences teacher performance and student achievement (Usher & Pajares, 2006, Bandura et al., 1996; Caprara et al., 2006; Goddard & Goddard, 2001; Judge & Bono, 2001) with teacher's self-efficacy leading to positive changes in learners (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Teachers with high self-efficacy have better relationships with learners (deJong et al., 2014) and are more inclusive of learners with additional needs (Vaz et al., 2015). Moreover, a positive relationship has been found between job satisfaction and teacher self-efficacy (Caprara et al., 2006; Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Lent & Brown, 2006). Conversely, Schwarzer & Hallum (2008) found low self-efficacy was related to work related stress and burnout.

Bandura (1993) suggests that self-efficacy inspires teachers to develop effective learning environments and learning processes. Indeed, Goddard & Goddard (2001) postulate that teacher self-efficacy impacts on several teaching behaviours that facilitate pupil achievement, such as persisting in helping struggling pupils rather than supplying answers, using strategies that reduce negative affect and facilitating warm classroom relationships. It is also possible that teacher self-efficacy positively impacts on learner's academic self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977).

Different types of teacher self-efficacy have been identified (Gibson & Dembo, 1984): 'personal teacher efficacy' (PTE), the belief a teacher has in his/her ability to be an agent of change in pupils, and 'general teaching efficacy' (GTE), the belief a teacher has that he/she can teach a pupil regardless of external influences such as their home context.

The notion of GTE has attracted much debate (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). GTE refers to influences that are not under direct control of the teacher, therefore Guskey and Passaro (1994) argue that GTE is a measure of external attributions for failures of learners. This lends support to Bandura's view that measures of self-efficacy need to be situation specific, indeed Hoy & Woolfolk (1993) demonstrated that PTE and GTE are separate. Further, there are no GTE items related to the impact of positive external factors on student success (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). It is also argued that GTE measures only part of the teaching task (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998), however the same can be said for PTE measures.

Teachers with high PTE are more likely to set high academic standards, demonstrate positive attitudes towards pupils who do not achieve highly, establish good rapport and relationships (Ross & Bruce, 2007). Levels of PTE are felt to be particularly relevant to teaching staff in specialist education, who need to meet the complex needs of pupils (Layser, 2002) In support of this, teachers with low PTE are more likely to refer challenging pupils to special education than teachers with high PTE (Soodak & Podell, 1996). Teachers with high PTE working in specialist provisions are more likely to

put extra effort and time into planning, demonstrate better organisation, give clearer instruction, and have greater enthusiasm (Allinder, 1994).

Importantly, PTE has been found to be influenced by several factors including a strong academic emphasis and influential leaders (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993), gender, age and the number of years teaching practice (Ross et al., 1996; Schonfeld, 2001; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

CS

Character forms part of personality and identity, described by Park & Peterson (2009) as parts of the personality that are valued morally. Facets within each of the Big Five Personality Theory have been identified, and some can be linked to CS. For example, a facet of Openness to Experience is creativity (John & Srivastava, 1999), which is also measured by the Values in Action (VIA) CS Survey (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). This, combined with research that has found personality factors influence PTE, with conscientiousness predicting instructional strategies (Navidnia, 2009), suggests that CS will offer insight into further factors contributing to PTE.

What are CS?

CS are defined as positive assets that reflect individual's identities and values (Niemiec, 2017). They differ from skills, talents, expertise (Hart, 2021).

Peterson & Seligman (2004) identified 6 virtues and 24 related CS that enable success, known as the VIA CS and Virtues. Peterson and Seligman (2004) assert that CS are the mechanism via which virtues are revealed. However, the VIA classification is not considered exhaustive (Hart, 2021). CS have been receiving a lot of interest in the field of Positive Education which is defined as "education for both traditional skills and for happiness" (Seligman, 2009 p.293).

Predictors & Mediators

There is a positive correlation between life satisfaction and CS of gratitude, love, hope, zest, and curiosity, even when gender, age and US residency were controlled for (Park et al, 2004; Ruch et al., 2010). However, Peterson et al. (2007) found different strengths predicted life satisfaction in different countries; in the US gratitude was the one of the strongest predictors whilst in Switzerland it was perseverance.

Some effect of gender has been reported but it is asserted that there are more similarities than differences between genders (Linley et al., 2007). Linley et al. (2007) found a positive relationship between strengths and age particularly for curiosity, love of learning, fairness, forgiveness, and self-regulation, it is suggested that CS could develop with increasing maturity.

Why are CS important?

Identifying and utilising strengths can improve wellbeing, relationships, and performance (Niemiec, 2017). Yet, many are unaware of their strengths and therefore cannot utilise them (Hart, 2021).

CS strengths have been found to be related to many areas of human functioning including coping efficiently with problems and difficulty (Denovan & Macaskill, 2013) and greater subjective well-being (Park et al., 2004).

Use of strengths varies between contexts, individuals may use a certain strength at home and a different one in work (Hart, 2021). Within the work context, CS use links to higher productivity, achievement, engagement, and positive work relationships (Niemiec, 2017). Further, CS use is linked to higher self-esteem, lower stress, creativity, problem-solving and meaning at work, as well as viewing work as a vocation and job satisfaction (Niemiec, 2017; Littman-Ovadia & Stegar, 2010).

If CS use leads to positive outcomes such as achievement, productivity and problem-solving, it is reasonable to suggest that CS may be linked to self-efficacy. In support of this, Toback et al. (2016) found that a CS intervention resulted in sustained improvement in self-efficacy in psychiatric youths.

CS in Teachers

It is suggested that the CS related to work may differ according to occupation; a strength of humanity could predict work satisfaction amongst careers that involve work with others, such as teaching (Peterson & Park, 2006). In support of this, Chan (2009) found that teachers in China scored higher in the virtues of humanity and transcendence compared to the rest of the population, they also showed greater levels of certain strengths including hope, love, gratitude, teamwork, and spirituality. Meanwhile, Gradisek (2012) found fairness, kindness, integrity, and love were the highest reported CS for pre-service and in-service teachers in Slovakia. This indicates that culture may also impact on CS demonstrated by teachers.

CS & PTE in Teachers

Lim & Kim (2014) investigated the relationship between PTE and CS in Korean teachers working in special education. Using the CS Test – Short Form (CST-SF), which reflects the 24 CS in the VIA classification and a modified version of the Teacher-Efficacy Scale – Personal (TES-P; Gibson & Dembo, 1984) they found PTE was significantly correlated with intellectual, spiritual, interpersonal and restraint strengths. Using Pearson r and Regression Analysis, they concluded that interpersonal and restraint strengths predicted PTE after controlling for gender, age, and years of teaching experience. However, the modified version of the TES-P has no reliability or validity data, and the effects of socially desirable responding was not controlled for.

Sezgin & Erdogan (2018) used a correlational method with structural equation modelling (SEM) and found CS of humility and forgiveness positively predicted personal teacher self-efficacy measured by the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) in Turkish primary and secondary school teachers.

Whilst both studies claimed that CS predict self-efficacy, these are correlational studies, as such the direction of causation cannot be inferred. It is argued that even SEM is not predictive (Bollen, 1989).

The Current Research

The current research will further the existing, limited, research into how CS relate to teacher self-efficacy. Existing literature is limited; there are two studies, both from outside the UK and research indicates that the CS strengths demonstrated by teachers are different across cultures (e.g. Chan, 2009; Gradisek, 2012; Lim & Kim, 2014; Sezgin & Erdogan, 2018). Further, one existing study restricted its scope to teachers working within special education and used a measure of self-efficacy that did not have any reliability or validity data and socially desirable responding was not controlled for.

The current research will be conducted within the UK, will draw on data from teachers from mainstream, specialist, independent and state primary, and secondary education using reliable and valid measures. Social desirability will be controlled for.

Further, existing studies have focused on PTE, but the current study will include measures of GTE to explore whether PTE and GTE are related to different CS. It is argued that GTE covers only part of the teaching task (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998) and the current author believes the same can be argued in relation to PTE.

The research question is: Is there is a relationship between CS and teacher self-efficacy for teachers within the UK?

The null hypothesis is: There is no significant relationship between CS and teacher self-efficacy.

The alternative hypothesis is: There is a significant relationship between CS and teacher self-efficacy.

The alternative hypothesis is drawn from previous studies that demonstrated a relationship between CS and teacher self-efficacy (Lim & Kim, 2014; Sezgin & Erdogan, 2018). This hypothesis will be tested using a correlational, within subjects design where participants complete two valid and reliable measures of self-efficacy and a measure of CS.

Method

Participants

Teachers (N = 60) recruited using a convenience sampling model, completed a Qualtrics survey. 78.3% of participants were in-service, 21.7% were retired. 90% were from mainstream and 10% taught within specialist provisions. 83.3% of were from state schools and 16.7% taught in independent settings. Participants' teaching experience ranged from 1-5 years to 30+ years, the mode was 11-20 years. Key Stages taught ranged from Early Years Foundation Phase to Key Stage 4, the majority taught more than one Key Stage. 85% identified as female and 15% as male. Ages ranged from 21-30 years to 70+ years, the mode was 31-40 years. See Tables 1 - 4 at the end of this paper for detailed demographic information.

Study Design

This quantitative study used a within-subject correlational design. Teachers completed a CS survey, two measures of self-efficacy and a social desirability measure. A social desirability measure was taken to assess the level of socially desirable responding that may have taken place when completing surveys, to ensure that any significant results were due to the predictor variables and socially desirable responding. All measures were taken once.

The predictor variable was CS, and the outcome variable was teacher self-efficacy.

A quantitative design was the most appropriate approach as there are valid and reliable measures for self-efficacy and CS available allowing for any relationship to be measured as objectively as possible. Further, the quantitative approach allows for a larger sample size and greater generalisability of findings. It is also completely anonymous which facilitates honesty and helps to reduce socially desirable responding. A correlational approach was chosen as at this stage in the research in this area, it needs to be established if the two areas are associated with one another and initial detail about the nature of the association needs to be gathered. Information can also be gathered about the direction and strength of any existing relationships. This then creates opportunities and directions for future research.

Measures

Demographic Information

Demographic information was gathered to: ensure the study filled gaps in previous studies; provide a description of the sample; to support future replications of the study; to support judgements to be made about the generalisability of the findings. Respondents were asked to provide information about their age (21-31; 31-40; 41-50; 51-60; 61-70; 71+ years), their gender (male; female; non-binary/third gender; prefer not to say), whether they were currently in-service or retired, how many years they have been teaching/have taught for (less than one year; 1-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-20 years; 20-30 years; 30+ years), whether they teach/did teach in a mainstream or specialist setting, whether they teach/did teach in a state school or an independent school and which Key Stage they teach/did teach in their latest role.

Self-Efficacy

Gibson & Dembo's (1984) measure 'Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale' (TES) was found to measure both PTE and GTE (e.g. Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). However, there are issues with this measure related to items on the scale loading onto both PTE and GTE factors. This instability of the factor structure led Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) to attempt to overcome this by compiling a briefer version of the questionnaire containing just 10 items, 5 related to GTE and 5 related to PTE (Teacher Efficacy Scale – Short Form, Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). Reliabilities for both subtests were found to be in the range found for the longer versions. This revised version was used in this study. However, this may still mean that the scale lacks clarity between what is exactly being measured.

Other issues related to the Gibson & Dembo (1984) scale concern the focus on student difficulty and disruptions and overcoming limitations imposed by an external environment. It lacks in teaching support of pupil thinking, effectiveness with able students, creativity in teaching and flexible

application of alternative assessments and teaching strategies (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). This scale also lacks balance between specificity and generality of the teaching self-efficacy components measured (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, (2001) argue that 'to be useful and generalisable, measures of teacher efficacy need to tap teacher's assessments of their competence across the wider range of activities and tasks they are asked to perform' (p.795). They argue that a measure of self-efficacy needs to assess personal competence and analyse particular tasks. This led to the development of the 'Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale' (TSES; also known as the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale - OSTES). Expanding on Bandura's unpublished Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale measuring different teaching tasks and subjects, the TSES captures a wide range of teaching tasks. Three factors were identified: efficacy for instructional strategies; efficacy for classroom management and efficacy for student engagement.

These three dimensions represent the richness and teachers' work and the requirements of good teaching. This factor structure was most distinct for in-service teachers and was less distinct for pre-service teachers (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Some elements of this scale tap GTE whilst others tap PTE. This was the second scale selected for this study.

CS

The VIA 72 Survey has been selected to measure CS. This is the briefest available survey available from the VIA institute. Whilst internal consistency reliability and validity co-efficients are slightly lower than those for the VIA-120 survey (https://www.viacharacter.org/researchers/assessments/via-72), it was felt the need for a brief measure overrode this due to the reasons discussed above.

Social Desirability

As discussed, a possible confounding factor in the limited previous studies, is socially desirable responding, where participants give the answer that they believe will show them in the best light rather than answering honestly. The Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale - Short Form was selected to measure the tendency of respondents to provide socially-desirable answers, allowing for this behaviour to be statistically controlled.

Reynolds (1982) reported the internal consistency reliability of the measure is typically in the low .70 to low .80 range, due to the nature of the construct being measured.

Procedure

An application was submitted to the Ethics Committee at the University of East London. Upon approval, participants were recruited via email to head teachers requesting permission to ask their teachers to participate. Once consent was received, staff teams were emailed with information about the study and the link to the Qualtrics survey. Recruitment also took place via a Social Media advert and word of mouth. Participants were able to access the Qualtrics survey at a time convenient to them.

Upon accessing the Qualtrics platform, participants were shown information about the study, provided anonymous consent and demographic information. They then completed one measure of CS, two measures of teacher self-efficacy and a social desirability measure as described above. Upon completion, participants were shown debrief information via Qualtrics.

The data collected via Qualtrics was transferred to SPSS, where the responses given to the questionnaires (e.g. 'A Great Deal', 'Like Me'), were re-coded into numerical responses. Items 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9 on the Teacher Efficacy Scale were reverse coded. And items 5, 7, 9, 10 and 13 of the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale were recoded. No reverse coding was required on the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale or on the VIA 72 survey.

Using the recoded data, the total score for each participant was calculated for the TES and the TSES. For the latter, the total score for each participant for the 'Efficacy in Student Engagement', 'Efficacy in Instructional Strategies'

and the 'Efficacy in Classroom Management' subscales were calculated. Next, the total score for each participant on each of the 24 CS measured by the VIA 72 survey was determined, three survey items contributed to each character strength (see Appendix for details). Finally, the total score for each participant on the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale was calculated.

Hierarchical Multiple Regressions were carried out, to evaluate the ability of the model to predict perceived teacher self-efficacy after controlling for social desirability, scores on the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale were entered into Block 1 to statistically control this variable. The total scores for each of the 24 CS were entered as the Predictor Variables into Block 2 and the total scores for the TES were entered as the Outcome Variable. Next, a further Hierarchical Multiple Regression was carried out, again the scores for the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale were entered into Block 1, then the total scores for each of the 24 CS were entered into Block 2 as the Predictor Variable and the total scores for the TSES were entered as the Outcome variable. This procedure was repeated using the total scores for each subscale of the TSES measure, namely Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies and Classroom Measurement as Outcome Variables.

Assumptions were tested using Multicollinearity diagnostics to ensure that this was not an issue and that the predictor variables were not highly correlated with each other. Mahalanobis Distance was used to identify outliers in the data. Predicted Probability (P-P) plots were also generated to ensure the data was normally distributed.

Results

Hierarchical Multiple Regression was used to examine the ability of the predictor variables (CS) to predict levels of teacher self-efficacy after controlling for socially desirable responding.

Multiple Regression was selected as an alternative to Pearson R Correlations as the latter are intended for exploring the relationship between two variables and would require individual correlations for each CS and each measure of self-efficacy, therefore 48 correlations in total. Multiple Regression is intended for use when exploring the correlation between a set of predictor variables (CS) and a dependant measure (self-efficacy) and allows for a more succinct analysis.

Hierarchial Multiple Regression was selected rather than other Regression Analysis options as the study wanted to control for any possible impact of socially desirable responding which Hierarchial Multiple Regression allows.

Preliminary analyses were carried out to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and multicollinearity.

The Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES)

Social desirability was entered at step 1, explaining 13% of the variance in teacher self-efficacy.

After entry of CS in step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 43%, however this was non-significant, $F(25,32) = .999$, $p = .495$. The outcome of the regression analyses are illustrated in Table 5 at the end of this paper.

The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

Social desirability was entered at step 1, explaining 6 % of the variance in teacher self-efficacy.

After entry of CS in step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 79%, $F(25,32) = 4.893$, $p < .001$). CS explained an additional 78% of the variance in teacher self-efficacy after controlling for socially desirable responding, R squared change = .787, F change $(24, 32) = 5.057$, $p < .001$.

The individual predictors were examined further and indicated that the CS of Bravery, Kindness, Forgiveness, Fairness, Creativity, Humour and Love were significant predictors in the model. All effects remained when socially desirable responding was statistically controlled for. Meanwhile, the CS of Perseverance, honesty, hope, spirituality, social intelligence, leadership, self-regulation, curiosity, appreciation of beauty and excellence, humility, love of learning, perspective, gratitude, zest, prudence, judgement, and

teamwork were not significant predictors in the model. The outcome of the regression analyses for this model as a whole are illustrated in Table 6 at the end of this paper.

The order of contribution to the percentage variance explained by significant predictor variables in the model is show in Table 7 below:

Table 7 The Order of Contribution of Each Significant Predictor Variable to the Percentage Variance Explained for the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale

Rank Order	Character Strength	sr Value	p
1	Love	.281	.001
2	Bravery	.261	.003
3	Kindness	-.239	.006
4	Creativity	-.227	.008
5	Forgiveness	-.214	.012
6	Humour	.213	.013
7	Fairness	.178	.034

It is noteworthy that the predictor variables of love, bravery, humour, and fairness were positively correlated with scores on the TSES, while the predictor variables of kindness, creativity and forgiveness were negatively correlated with scores on the TSES.

Student Engagement Subscale

Social desirability was entered at step 1, explaining 12 % of the variance in teacher self-efficacy.

After entry of CS in step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 70%, F (25,32) = 3.070, p .002). CS explained an additional 69% of the variance in teacher self-efficacy after controlling for socially desirable responding, R squared change = .694, F change (24, 32) = 3.144, p .001.

The individual predictors were examined further and indicated that the CS of Bravery, Kindness, Forgiveness, Creativity and Love were significant predictors in the model. All effects remained when socially desirable responding was statistically controlled for. Meanwhile, the CS of perseverance, honesty, hope, spirituality, social intelligence, leadership, self-regulation, curiosity, appreciation of beauty and excellence, fairness, humility, love of learning, perspective, gratitude, humour, zest, prudence, judgement, and teamwork were not significant predictors in the model. The outcome of the regression analyses for this model as a whole are illustrated in Table 8 at the end of this paper.

The order of contribution to the percentage variance explained by significant predictor variable in the model is show in Table 9 below:

Table 9 The Order of Contribution of Each Significant Predictor Variable to the Percentage Variance Explained for the Student Engagement Subscale

Rank Order	Character Strength	sr Value	p
1	Bravery	.426	.012
2	Love	.320	.002
3	Kindness	-.248	.014
4	Forgiveness	-.237	.019
5	Creativity	-.230	.023

It is noteworthy that the predictor variables of bravery and love were positively correlated with scores on the

Student Engagement Subscale of the TSES, while the predictor variables of kindness, forgiveness and creativity were negatively correlated with scores on this subscale.

Instructional Strategies Subscale

Social desirability was entered at step 1, explaining 0% of the variance in teacher self-efficacy.

After entry of CS in step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 76%, F (25,32) = 4.008, p < .001). CS explained an additional 76% of the variance in teacher self-efficacy after controlling for socially desirable responding, R squared change = .762, F change (24, 32) = 4.258, p < .001.

The individual predictors were examined further and indicated that the CS of Bravery, Kindness, Forgiveness, Fairness, Creativity, Humour, Love and Judgement were significant predictors in the model. All effects remained when socially desirable responding was statistically controlled for. Meanwhile, the CS of perseverance, honesty, hope, spirituality, social intelligence, leadership, self-regulation, curiosity, appreciation of beauty and excellence, humility, love of learning, perspective, gratitude, zest, prudence, and teamwork were not significant predictors in the model. The outcome of the regression analyses for this model as a whole are illustrated in Table 10 at the end of this paper.

The order of contribution to the percentage variance explained by significant predictor variable in the model is show in Table 11 below:

Table 11 The Order of Contribution of Each Significant Predictor Variable to the Percentage Variance Explained for the Instructional Strategies Subscale

Rank Order	Character Strength	sr Value	p
1	Love	.260	.005
2	Bravery	.277	.003
3	Humour	.235	.010
4	Creativity	.230	.012
5	Fairness	.215	.018
6	Forgiveness	-.214	.019
7	Kindness	-.201	.027
8	Judgement	.185	.040

It is noteworthy that the predictor variables of love, bravery, humour, creativity, fairness, and judgement were positively correlated with scores on the Instructional Strategies Subscale of the TSES, while the predictor variables of kindness, forgiveness and creativity were negatively correlated with scores on this subscale.

Classroom Management Subscale

Social desirability was entered at step 1, explaining 10 % of the variance in teacher self-efficacy.

After entry of CS in step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 76%, F (25,32) = 4.129, p < .001). CS explained an additional 75% of the variance in teacher self-efficacy after controlling for socially desirable responding, R squared change = .754, F change (24, 32) = 4.247, p < .001.

The individual predictors were examined further and indicated that the CS of Bravery, Kindness, Creativity, Humour, Love and Teamwork were significant predictors in the model. All effects remained even when the impact of socially desirable responding was statistically controlled for. Meanwhile, the CS of perseverance, honesty, hope, spirituality, social intelligence, leadership, self-regulation, forgiveness, curiosity, appreciation of beauty and excellence, fairness, humility, love

of learning, perspective, gratitude, zest, prudence, and judgement were not significant predictors in the model. The outcome of the regression analyses for this model as a whole are illustrated in Table 12 at the end of this paper.

The order of contribution to the percentage variance explained by significant predictor variable in the model is show in Table 13 below:

Table 13 The Order of Contribution of Each Significant Predictor Variable to the Percentage Variance Explained for the Classroom Management Subscale

Rank Order	Character Strength	sr Value	p
1	Teamwork	.251	.006
2	Kindness	-.220	.016
3	Love	.214	.018
4	Bravery	.022	.022
5	Humour	.205	.023
6	Creativity	-.182	.042

It is noteworthy that the predictor variables of Teamwork, Love, Bravery and Humour were positively correlated with scores on the Classroom Management Subscale of the TSES, while the predictor variables of Kindness and Creativity were negatively correlated with scores on this subscale.

Differences in Contributory Predictor Variables

It is important to note that whilst some CS universally contributed to the variance found in all four measures of teacher self-efficacy (i.e. total score on the scale, Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies and Classroom Management), some CS contributed to the variance for some of the measures and not others. This is shown in Table 14 below:

Table 14 CS that Significantly Contribute to the Variance in Self-Efficacy for Each Measure of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale

Character Strength	Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale Measure			
	Overall	Student Engagement	Instructional Strategies	Classroom Management
Bravery	*	*	*	*
Kindness	*	*	*	*
Forgiveness	*	*	*	
Fairness	*		*	
Creativity	*	*	*	*
Humour	*		*	*
Love	*	*	*	*
Judgement			*	
Teamwork				*

*Indicates that specified Character Strength accounts for some variance in the measure

Discussion

The current study found that there was no significant relationship between CS and teacher self-efficacy as measured by the Teacher Self Efficacy Scale (TES).

However, when teacher self-efficacy was measured by the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), a

significant relationship with certain CS was found, this effect remained when the socially desirable responding was statistically controlled for. The subscales of the TSES, namely Instructional Strategies, Student Engagement and Classroom Management also demonstrated a significant relationship with certain CS. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis, that there is a significant relationship between CS and teacher-self efficacy is accepted.

Importance of the type of Teacher Self-Efficacy

It is reasonable to suggest that CS would have little impact on aspects of teaching that are beyond the control of the individual and that it would be difficult to link CS to indistinct aspects of teaching, thus explaining the non-significant correlation found using the TES, which focuses on the external environment and lacks specificity around the aspects of teaching measured (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Using the TSES, which measures personal competence and particular teaching tasks, several significant correlations were found, suggesting that CS are primarily linked to factors that are under the control of the individual teacher. Therefore, these findings suggest that CS impact on aspects of teacher self-efficacy that are under control of the individual teacher and that CS do not impact on aspects teacher self-efficacy that are not under control of the individual teacher such as the pupil's home environment.

Relationship to Previous Research

The significant results yielded from the TSES measure in the current study, support those of Sezgin & Erdogan (2015) and Lim & Kim (2014) who found CS to be related to teacher self-efficacy. These previous studies focused on Korean Special Education Teachers and Turkish Primary School teachers respectively, therefore the current study builds on these previous studies, finding that CS are also related to teacher self-efficacy for teachers within the UK, from a range of settings and Key Stages.

Interestingly, Sezgin & Erdogan (2015) found the CS of humility and forgiveness positively predicted PTE as measured by the TSES. Yet, in the current study teacher self-efficacy, as measured by the TSES, correlated with forgiveness but not humility. Furthermore, for some measures, a negative correlation was found between forgiveness and teacher self-efficacy as measured by the TSES. Lim & Kim (2014) used a different measure and found that PTE was significantly correlated with intellectual, spiritual, interpersonal and restraint strengths. The current study included the CS of 'Spirituality' and 'Social Intelligence' which may map onto the 'Spiritual' and 'Interpersonal' strengths in Lim and Kim's (2014) work, yet the current study did not yield significant correlations for these CS. These differences may demonstrate an effect of culture. In support of this, Chan (2009) found teachers in China showed greater levels of CS in hope, love, gratitude, teamwork, and spirituality and Gradisek (2012) found fairness, kindness, integrity, and love were the highest reported CS for pre-service and in-service Slovakian teachers.

The Relationship Between Certain CS & Different Aspects of Teaching

On all measures, Bravery and Love significantly positively correlated with teacher self-efficacy measured by the TSES, meanwhile Kindness yielded a significant negative correlation. Those who scored high on Bravery and Love also scored high on self-efficacy using the TSES. Niemiec (2018) describes the strength of Bravery partly as not shying away from threat or challenge, both feature within the teaching profession in terms of both classroom management and delivery of the curriculum, thereby facilitating an understanding of the relationship between high scores on Bravery and high scores on self-efficacy. Niemiec (2018) describes the strength of Love partly as valuing relationships with others and expressing warmth, this would suggest that teachers with this CS value their relationship with pupils and would interact warmly with them. These characteristics may support teachers to develop strong relationships with pupils which in turn facilitates classroom management and higher self-efficacy as measured by the TSES. Meanwhile, those teachers who scored high on kindness experienced lower levels of teacher self efficacy as measured by the TSES.

It is suggested this is because, those who have a strength in kindness perhaps find it difficult to impose discipline, as a result they may experience difficulties with classroom management which reduces their sense of efficacy as a teacher. This may link to strengths overuse, where the use of a strength has a negative outcome rather than a positive one (Niemiec, 2018).

Creativity also significantly correlated on all measures; however it was negatively correlated with teacher self-efficacy on the TSES measure as a whole, the Student Engagement and Classroom Management subscales but creativity was positively correlated with the Instructional Strategies subscale. Niemiec (2018) describes creativity partly as being original and adaptable and doing things differently, this can explain the positive correlation with the Instructional Strategies subscale, where these abilities would support the use of different teaching approaches for different pupils. However, these abilities may not be effective in facilitating classroom management and student engagement as these elements of the teaching task may be more influenced by external factors such as home background and whole school approaches that are enforced on the individual teacher, leading to low self-efficacy.

Other CS contributed to the variance in just some of the measures; Forgiveness negatively correlated with all measures on the TSES, except Classroom Management, so those scoring high on Forgiveness score low on self-efficacy as measured by the TSES. Neimiec (2017) describes Forgiveness partly as accepting the shortcomings of others and giving second chances. These traits in a teacher may make it difficult for the person to stick to rules and boundaries which could negatively impact on student engagement. The negative correlation with self-efficacy, as measured by the TSES, in Instructional Strategies is difficult to understand, but it is suggested it could be linked to a lack of student engagement due to the overuse of forgiving behaviours.

Fairness positively correlated with overall self-efficacy on the TSES and Instructional Strategies. Niemiec (2018) described Fairness as linking to justice, equal opportunities, and unbiased decisions. This are clearly valuable strengths in a teacher who deals with pupils from different background and difficult incidents and behaviours, therefore these abilities would link to higher self-efficacy. However, it is difficult to explain why the relationship exists with the Instructional Strategies subscale rather than the Student Engagement and Classroom Management subscales which are perhaps more reliant on this strength.

Humour positively correlated with all measures on the TSES apart from Student Engagement. Niemiec (2017) described Humour partly as seeing the lighter side, this is clearly advantageous in the teaching role where different challenges arise daily. Being light-hearted is likely to led to the teacher taking a positive view of what can be done in a situation and led to higher self-efficacy. The absence of a correlation with Student Engagement may be attributable to this being linked to factors outside the teacher's control, such as the learner's home life.

Judgement positively correlated with Instructional Strategies on the TSES only. Niemiec (2017) describes Judgement partly as thinking things through, a teacher who is good at this is likely to choose the most effective teaching strategies and therefore experience higher self-efficacy.

Teamwork positively correlated with Classroom Management on the TSES only. Neimiec (2017) describes Teamwork partly as contributing to group effort. Classroom Management utilises whole school approaches to behaviour management, therefore this strength could lead to a positive impact on the teacher's ability to manage a class and higher self-efficacy.

Relevance & Importance of Current Research

An assumption underlying the current study is that a relationship between CS and perceived teacher self-efficacy provides insight into the methods that can be used to enhance self-efficacy amongst teachers and in doing so, increase teacher flourishing and teacher recruitment and retention.

If this assumption of causality is correct, the outcome of this study could further inform recruitment and selection procedures and well as teacher professional development and wellbeing programs. Which may include interventions such as using signature strengths in new ways and utilising lesser strengths. For example, if a teacher was struggling with classroom management, then he/she could be supported by their mentor to develop their use of the particular strength found to predict the some of variance in this measure, namely teamwork. Where strengths such as kindness can have a negative impact on a teacher's sense of efficacy, perhaps strength management training is required which could help where strengths overuse is present. Whole school Strengths Use training programmes could be developed. In support of these proposals, Toback et al (2016) found a CS intervention led to improved self-efficacy in psychiatric youths.

Intervention in the areas outlined above may also be extrapolated to those who are training to enter the teaching profession. Friedman (2000) asserts that an effective mentoring program for pre-service teachers is not only important for effective classroom instruction but also for the development of their self-efficacy.

Limiting Factors

The considerations below are important in terms of the study as a whole but may also go some way to explain some of the results that were difficult to explain.

The sample size of the current study was small; therefore, some caution is required in generalising the results.

The current study used a self-selecting sampling technique used which raises issues related to the generalisability of results to the target population and context (Keiding & Louis, 2016).

It must also be remembered that correlation does not imply causation; we cannot say that certain CS cause higher or lower teacher self-efficacy (as measured by the TSES), only that there is a relationship between them.

Whilst the current study controlled for socially desirable responding, factors such as age, gender and years of teaching experience were not included in the model as previous research (Lim & Kim, 2014) had already established that there is an effect of CS on teacher self-efficacy when these demographic variables were controlled for. However, the outcome of the current study could be further endorsed by including the same demographic variables in Step 1 of the modelling. Additionally, data could be collected about the ethnicity/cultural background of participants as further control measures as some research indicates some variation in CS between teachers in different cultures (e.g. Chan, 2009; Gradisek 2021).

Quantitative studies that use questionnaire measures are limited by the factors that the researcher who compiled the scale believe to be relevant. Therefore, some strengths of character that may be important in a teacher, may not be included in the measures used. Indeed, Hart (2021) asserts that that VIA classification is not exhaustive.

The self-efficacy construct may be considered variable rather than stable, vulnerable to changes in life circumstances at any one time. This is a possible limiting factor in the current study.

An assumption underlying regression research where a variable is found to predict a favoured outcome, is that increasing the level of the predictor variable increases the level of the favoured outcome. However, this has been questioned and it is beginning to be asserted that some individual differences can increase a favoured outcome to a point, but then stop having an impact and in some cases levels of the outcome variable may even drop (Kaiser & Overfield, 2011).

Future Research

The sample size for the current study was small, given some CS showed a near significant relationship with teacher self-efficacy as measured by the TSES, conducting the study on a larger scale may help to firstly, confirm and consolidate the existing results and have the potential to highlight

further CS that are of importance within those entering the teaching profession.

Closer examination of the CS of profile of teachers working within primary settings compared to those within secondary settings would be interesting. Further, examination of any differences within the CS profile of state versus independent sector teachers and mainstream versus specialist settings. Indeed, research suggests that PTE is particularly important for those in Special Education (Layser, 2002).

It would be interesting to examine the character strength profiles of those teachers who remain within the classroom compared to those who move one to management positions within education (e.g. members of the senior leader team).

Future research may wish to examine the profile of CS in those who have left the teaching profession to see how these compare to those who continue to work as teachers and those who spent their whole career as a teacher. Also differences in CS between teachers and other professionals could be considered.

The current study examined general and personal perceived teaching self-efficacy, indeed much of the research has focused on individual self-efficacy but it has been asserted that teacher's beliefs about the capability of the entire school is important (Bandura, 1993; Goddard et al 2000) and there is a growing body of evidence indicating that collective self-efficacy plays a positive role in classrooms (Lopez et al., 2019). Collective self-efficacy refers to a group of people who share the same objective (Bandura, 1997). Maddux (2009a) offers more specificity stating that collective self-efficacy is "the extent to which we believe that we can work together effectively to accomplish our shared goals" (p.340). Given the large organisations that schools are, within which there are a variety of professional roles, examination of the link between CS and teacher's perceptions of collective self-efficacy could be an important investigation that could further inform recruitment and selection procedures and well as teacher professional development and wellbeing programs. In support of this, the current study found the CS of Teamwork was significantly positively correlated with Classroom Management as measured by the TSES.

The current study and its predecessors (Sezgin & Erdogan, 2015; Lim & Kim 2014) have focused on CS which refers to individual virtues that indicate a person's character using the VIA surveys. Whilst clearly, CS are important in considering why some may be better suited to, and more successful, within the teaching profession than others, another potential route for exploration by future research is ability-focused strengths. Such research could employ The Gallup StrengthsFinder (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001) which is designed to measure various talent themes. Outcomes from research exploring this route could be an effective adjunct when considering how a person's strengths can be utilised and enhanced to facilitate individual flourishing and flourishing within whole schools which experience lower staff absence and turn-over rates as levels of wellbeing amongst teachers increase.

Furthermore, future research may examine whether there is an impact of strengths overuse on perceived teacher self-efficacy.

References

Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teach ers and consultants. Teacher Education and Special Educ ation, 17, 86–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/088840649401700203

Bandura, A. (1977). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying the ory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Psychologist, 37, 122–147. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning.

Educational Psychologist, 28(2), 117-148. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. Child Development, 67, 1206-1222. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131888

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: the exercise of control. Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy revisited. Journal of Management, 38 (1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311410606

Baron, D., Maddux, J.E., & Snyder, C.R. (1997). The social cognitive construction of difference and disorder. In D. Baron, J.E. Maddux, & C.R. Snyder (Eds.), Social cognitive psychology: history and current domains (pp. 397-428). Plenum.

Bollen, K.A. (1989). Structural Equations with Latent Variables. John Wiley & Sons.

Braun, H. I., Jackson, D.N., & Wiley. D.E. (2001). Socially desirable responding: The evolution of a construct. In H.I. Braun, D.N. Jackson, & D.E. Wiley (eds.), The role of constructs in psychological and educational measurement (pp.49-72). Routledge.

Buckingham, M., & Clifton, D. O. (2001). Now, discover your strengths. Free Press.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. Journal of School Psychology, 44, 473-490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.001

Chan, D. W. (2009). The hierarchy of strengths: Their relationships with subjective well-being among Chinese teachers in Hong Kong. Teaching and Teacher Education, 25, 867-875. https://doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.01.010

deLong, R., Mainhard, T., van Tartwijk, J., Veldman, I., Verloop, N., & Wubbels, T. (2014). How pre-service teachers' personality traits, self-efficacy, and discipline strategies contribute to the teacher-student relationship. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 84, 294-310. https://doi:10.1111/bjep.12025

Denovan, A., & Macaskill, A. (2013). An interpretative phenomenological analysis of stress and coping in first year undergraduates. British Educational Research Journal, 39, 1002-1024. https://doi:10.1002/berj.3019

Friedman, I.A. (2000). Burnout in teachers: Shattered dreams of impeccable professional performance. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56(5), 595–606. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4679(200005)56:5<595::AID-JCLP2>3.0.CO;2-Q

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of

Educational Psychology, 76, 569–582. www.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.76.4.569

Goddard, R., Hoy, W., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and effect on student achievement. American Education Research Journal, 37(2), 479–507. https://doi.org/10.2307/1163531

Goddard, R. D., & Goddard, Y. L. (2001). A multilevel analysis of the relationship between teacher and collective efficacy in urban schools. Teaching and Teacher Education, 17, 807-818. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00032-4

Gradisek, P. (2012). CS and life satisfaction of Slovenian in-service and pre-service teachers. CEPS Journal, 2, 167–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clysa.2014.06.002

Guskey, T. R., & Passaro, P. D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions.

American Educational Research Journal, 31, 627-643. https://doi.org/10.2307/1163230

Hart, R. (2021). Positive psychology: The basics. Routledge.

He, Y. (2009). Strength-based mentoring in pre-service teacher education: a literature review. Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in learning, 17 (3), 263-275. https://doi: 10.1080/13611260903050205

Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. The Elementary School Journal, 93(4), 355–372. https://doi.org/10.1086/461729

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2001). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice. McGraw-Hill.

Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2011). Positive psychology and educational administration: An optimistic research agenda. Educational Administration Quarterly, 47(1), 427- 447. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X10396930

John, O.P., & Strivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement and theoretical perspectives. In L.A. Pervin, & O.P. John (Eds.), Handbook of personality: theory and research (Vol. 2, pp 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits - self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability - with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86 (1), 80-92. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80

Kaiser, R.B., & Overfield, D.V. (2011). Strengths, strengths overused and lopsided leadership. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 63 (2), 89-109. https://doi:10.1037/a0024470

Karadems, E. C. (2006). Self-efficacy, social support and well-being the mediating role of optimism. Personality and Individual Differences, 40, 1281-1290. https://doi: 10.1016/J.PAID.2005.10.019

Karadems, E. C., Kafetsios, K., & Sideridis, G. D. (2007). Optimism, self-efficacy and information processing of threat- and well-being-related stimuli. Stress & Health, 23, 285-294. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1147

Khan, A., Fleva, E., Qazi, T. (2015). Role of self-esteem and general self-efficacy in teachers' efficacy in primary schools. Psychology, 6 (1), 117-125. https://10.4236/psych.2015.61010

Keiding, N., & Louis, T.A. (2016). Perils and potentials of self-selected entry to epidemiological studies and surveys. Journal of Social Statistics, 179 (2), 1-128.

https://doi.org/10.1111/rssa.12136

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. Journal of Educational Psychology, 102 (3), 741-756. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019237

Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2006). Integrating person and situation perspectives on work satisfaction: A social-cognitive view. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69, 236-247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.02.006

Leyser, Y. (2002). Choices of instructional practices and efficacy beliefs of Israeli general and

special educators: A cross-
cultural research initiative. Teacher Education and Specia l Education,

25, 154–
167. https://doi.org/10.1177/088840640202500207

Lim, Y-J., & Kim, M-A. (2014). Relation of CS to personal teaching efficacy in Korean special education teachers. International Journal of Special Education, 29 (2), 1- 6.
https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.865.3539&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Linley, P.A., & Harrington.S. (2006). Playing to your strengths. The Psychologist, 19 (2), 86-89.
https://doi: 10.4236/ce.2014.515161 3,367

Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Wood, A. M., Joseph, S., Harrington, S., Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2007). CS in the United Kingdom: The VIA Inventory of Strengths. Personality and Individual Differences, 43, 341–351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.12.004

Littman-
Ovadia, H., & Steger, M. F. (2010). CS and well-

being among volunteers and employees: Toward an integ rative model. The Journal of Positive

Psychology, 5, 419–
430. https://doi:10.1080/17439760.2010.516765

Lopez, S.J., Pedrotti, J.T., & Snyder, C.R. (2019). Positive Psychology: The Scientific and Practical Exploration of Human Strengths (4th Ed.). Sage.

Maddux, J.E. (1995). Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research and application. Plenum.

Maddux, J.E. (2009a). Self-efficacy: The power in believing you can. In S.J. Lopez, & C.R. Snyder (Eds.),

Oxford handbook of positive psychology (pp. 335-343). Oxford University Press.

Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Heron, C. (2007). SES of college intermediate French students: Relation to achievement and motivation. Language Learning, 57(3), 417-442. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00421.x

Navidnia, H. (2009). Psychological characteristics of Eng lish language teachers: On the relationship among Big Fi ve personality traits and teacher efficacy beliefs. Journal of English Language

Studies, 1, 79-
99. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265004352_Psychological_Characteristics_of_English_Language_Teachers_On_the_Relationship_among_Big_Five_Personality_Traits_and_Teacher_Efficacy_Beliefs

Niemiec, R.M. (2017). CS interventions. Hogrefe.

Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Strengths of character and well-being. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 23(5), 603–619. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.23.5.603.50748

Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2000). Character strengths: research and practice. Journal of College and Character, 10(4). https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1042

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). CS and virtue s: A handbook of classi-
fication. Oxford University Press.

Peterson, C., & Park, N. (2004). Optimism. In C. Spielberger (Eds.), Encyclopaedia of applied psychology (pp. 711-714). Elsevier

Peterson, C., & Park, N. (2006). CS in organizations. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 27, 1149–1154. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.398

Peterson, C., Ruch, W., Beermann, U., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2007). Strengths of character, orientations to happiness, and life satisfaction. Journal of Positive Psychology, 2(3), 149–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760701228938

Ross, J., & Bruce, C. (2007). Professional develop ment effects on teacher efficacy: Results of rando mized field trial. The
Journal of Educational Research, 101, 50–60. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.101.1.50-60

Ross, J. A., Cousins, J. B., & Gadalla, T. (1996). Within-teacher predictors of teacher efficacy.

Teaching and Teacher Education, 12, 385–400. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(95)00046-M

Ruch, W., Proyer, R. T., Harzer, C., Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2010). Values in Action Inventory of Strengths (VIA-IS): Adaptation and validation of the German version and the development of a peer-rating form. Journal of Individual Difference, 31(3), 138–149. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000022

Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), Handbook of positive psychology (pp. 3-9). Oxford.

Seligman, M. E. P., Ernst, R. M., Gillham, J., Reivich, K., & Linkins, M. (2009). Positive education: Positive psychology and classroom interventions. Oxford Review of Education, 35(3), 293-311. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980902934563

Schonfeld, I. S. (2001). Stress in first
year women teachers: The context of social support and coping. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monogr aphs, 127, 133–168. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2001-07813-001

Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 57, 152-171. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00359.x

Sezgin, F., & Erdogan, O. (2015). Academic optimism, hope and zest for work as predictors of teacher self-efficacy and perceived success. Educational Sciences, Theory & Practice, 15 (1), 7-19. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2015.1.2338.

Sezgin, F., & Erdogan.O. (2018). Humility and forgiveness as predictors of teacher self-efficacy. Educational Research and Reviews, 13 (4), 120-128. https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2017.3449

Snyder, C. R. (1989). Reality negotiation: From excuses to hope and beyond. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 8, 130-157. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1989.8.2.130

Snyder, C.R. (1995). Conceptualizing, measuring, and nurturing hope. Journal of Counseling and Development, 73(3), 355–360. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01764.x

Soodak, L. C., & Podell, D. M. (1996). Teacher efficacy: Toward the understanding of a multifaceted construct. Te aching and Teacher Education, 12, 401–411. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(95)00047-N

Toback, R.L., Graham-Bermann, S.A., & Patel, P.D. (2016). Outcomes of a CS-based intervention on self-esteem and self-efficacy of psychiatrically hospitalized youths. Psychiatric Services, 67, 574-577. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps201500021

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk, H, A., & Hoy, W.K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. Review of Educational Research, 68, 202-248. https://doi.org/10/3102/00346543068002202

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2006). Sources of academic and self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of entering middle school students. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 31(1), 125-141. https://sites.education.uky.edu/motivation/files/2013/08/Usher_Pajares_2006.pdf

Vaz, S., Wilson, N., Falkmar, M., Sim, A., Scott, M., Cordier, R., & Falkmer, T. (2015). Factors associated with primary school teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities. PLOS ONE, 10, e0137002. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0137002

Zeldin, A. L., Britner, S. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). A comparative study of the self-efficacy beliefs of successful men and women in mathematics, science, and technology careers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45(9), 1036-1058. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20195

Appendix

Tables

Table 1 General Demographic Information

Demographic	Percentage of Participants
Female	85%
Male	15%
In-service	78.3%
Retired	21.7%
Mainstream	90%
Specialist	10%
State School	83.3%
Independent School	16.7%

Table 2 Percentage of Participants within Each Age Bracket

Age Bracket (Years)	Percentage of Participants
21-30	8.3
31-40	26.7
41-50	18.3
51-60	25
61-70	6.7
70+	15

Table 3 Percentage of Participants and Years of Experience

Teaching Experience (Years)	Percentage of Participants
1-5	8.3
6-10	10
11-20	36.7
20-30	15
30+	30

Table 4 Percentage of Participants Teaching Each Key Stage

Key Stage	Percentage of Participants
Early Years Foundation Phase	6.7%
Key Stage 1	16.7%
Key Stage 2	28.3%
Key Stage 3	3.3%
Key Stage 4	5%
Key Stage 5	0%
More than One Key Stage	40%

Table 5 Teacher Efficacy Scale

Step & Predictor Variable	B	SE B	Beta	sr	Change in R^2	R^2	p
Step 1					.013	.013	.396
Constant	37.352	8.432					
Social Desirability	.328	.383	.114	.114			.396
Step 2					.426	.438	.482
Constant	16.343	15.194					
Social Desirability	.727	.630	.252	.153			.257
Bravery	.759	.844	.250	.119			.375
Perseverance	.923	.739	.279	.166			.220
Honesty	.009	1.487	.002	.001			.995
Hope	-.835	.911	-.247	-.121			.367
Spirituality	.292	.368	.140	.105			.434
Social Intelligence	-.021	.726	-.007	-.004			.977
Kindness	-.707	1.121	-.142	-.084			.533
Leadership	-794	1.085	-.206	-.097			.470
Self-Regulation	.030	.563	.012	.007			.958
Forgiveness	-.664	1.000	-.194	-.088			.511
Curiosity	1.399	.955	.354	.194			.153
Appreciation of Beauty & Excellence	.899	.742	.266	.161			.234

Fairness	1.471	1.246	.303	.156		.246
Humility	-.822	.700	-.232	-.156		.249
Love of Learning	-.086	.501	-.034	-.023		.865
Creativity	-1.406	.692	-.420	-.269		.059
Perspective	1.112	.699	.321	.211		.121
Gratitude	-1.436	1.039	-.365	-.183		.177
Humour	1.029	.625	.334	.218		.109
Zest	-.223	.712	-.075	-.041		.756
Love	.857	.800	.246	.142		.292
Prudence	.680	1.312	.196	.069		.608
Judgement	-.292	1.264	-.071	-.031		.819
Teamwork	-1.153	.957	-.312	-.160		.237

Table 6 Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale: Overall

Step & Predictor Variable	**B**	**SE B**	**Beta**	**sr**	**Change in R^2**	**R^2**	**p**
Step 1					.006	.006	.559
Constant	84.584	15.669					
Social Desirability	.417	.711	.078	.078			.559
Step 2					.787	.793	<.001
Constant	26.378	17.098					
Social Desirability	.786	.709	.147	.089			.276
Bravery	3.081	.950	.548	.261			.003
Perseverance	1.310	.831	.214	.127			.125
Honesty	-.622	1.673	-.070	-.030			.712
Hope	-1.962	1.026	-.314	-.154			.085
Spirituality	.076	.414	.020	.015			.856
Social Intelligence	-.216	.817	-.037	-.021			.793
Kindness	-3.738	1.262	-.406	-.239			.006
Leadership	-982	1.221	-.138	-.065			.427
Self-Regulation	.278	.633	.060	.035			.863
Forgiveness	-2.989	1.125	-.472	-.214			.012
Curiosity	1.725	1.075	.236	.129			.118
Appreciation of Beauty & Excellence	1.394	.835	.223	.134			.105
Fairness	3.099	1.402	.344	.178			.034
Humility	.390	.788	.060	.040			.624
Love of Learning	-.572	.564	-.121	-.082			.318

Creativity	-2.194	.779	-.354	-.227			.008
Perspective	.815	.786	.127	.083			.308
Gratitude	-2.258	1.169	-.310	-.155			.062
Humour	1.857	.703	.325	.213			.013
Zest	-.110	.801	-.020	-.011			.891
Love	3.147	.900	.488	.281			.001
Prudence	-2.629	1.477	-.409	-.143			.085
Judgement	2.781	1.422	.367	.157			.059
Teamwork	2.147	1.077	.314	.160			.005

Table 8 Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale: Student Engagement Subscale

Step & Predictor Variable	**B**	**SE B**	**Beta**	**sr**	**Change in R^2**	**R^2**	**p**
Step 1					.012	.012	.416
Constant	25.591	5.675					
Social Desirability	.211	.258	.109	.109			.416
Step 2					.692	.706	.001
Constant	7.632	7.398					
Social Desirability	.337	.307	.174	.105			.280
Bravery	1.095	.411	.536	.256			.012
Perseverance	.361	.360	.162	.096			.324
Honesty	.073	.724	.022	.010			.921
Hope	-.714	.444	-.314	-.154			.118
Spirituality	.076	.179	.054	.041			.673
Social Intelligence	.106	.354	.050	.029			.767
Kindness	-1.414	.546	-.423	-.248			.014
Leadership	-.006	.528	-.003	-.001			.990
Self-Regulation	.291	.274	.172	.102			.297
Forgiveness	-1.204	.487	-.523	-.237			.019
Curiosity	,509	.465	.192	.105			.262
Appreciation of Beauty & Excellence	.708	.361	.312	.188			.059
Fairness	1.118	.607	.342	.177			.075
Humility	.141	.341	.059	.040			.681
Love of Learning	-.284	.244	-.165	-.112			.253
Creativity	-.808	.337	-.359	-.230			.023
Perspective	.280	.340	.120	.079			.417
Gratitude	-1.008	.506	-.381	-.191			.055
Humour	.515	.304	.249	.162			.100

Zest	-.230	.347	-.115	-.064		.511
Love	1.298	.389	.554	.320		.002
Prudence	-.902	.639	-.387	-.135		.168
Judgement	.581	.615	.211	.091		.352
Teamwork	.580	.466	.233	.119		.223

Table 10 Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale: Instructional Strategies Subscale

Step & Predictor Variable	**B**	**SE B**	**Beta**	**sr**	**Change in R^2**	**R^2**	**p**
Step 1					.000	.000	.980
Constant	31.642	5.029					
Social Desirability	.006	.228	.003	.003			.980
Step 2					.762	.762	<.000
Constant	11.795	5.867					
Social Desirability	.164	.243	.096	.058			.504
Bravery	1.046	.326	.581	.277			.003
Perseverance	.561	.285	.286	.170			.058
Honesty	-.565	.574	-.198	-.085			.333
Hope	-.589	.352	-.294	-.145			.104
Spirituality	.017	.142	.014	.010			.905
Social Intelligence	-.033	.280	-.018	-.010			.906
Kindness	-1.006	.433	-.342	-.201			.027
Leadership	-.553	.419	-.242	-.114			.197
Self-Regulation	.096	.217	.064	.038			.663
Forgiveness	-.956	.386	-.471	-.214			.019
Curiosity	.465	.369	.199	.109			.217
Appreciation of Beauty & Excellence	.352	.287	.176	.106			.228
Fairness	1.196	.481	.415	.215			.018
Humility	.241	.270	.115	.077			.380
Love of Learning	-.213	.194	-.140	-.095			.279
Creativity	-.711	.267	-.359	-.230			.012
Perspective	.400	.270	.194	.128			.148
Gratitude	-.502	.401	-.216	-.108			.220
Humour	.657	.241	.360	.235			.010
Zest	.104	.275	.059	.033			.709
Love	.931	.309	.451	.260			.005
Prudence	-.980	.507	-.477	-.167			.062
Judgement	1.047	.488	.432	.185			.040

Teamwork	.280	.370	.128	.065			.454

Table 12 Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale: Classroom Management Subscale

Step & Predictor Variable	**B**	**SE B**	**Beta**	**sr**	**Change in R^2**	**R^2**	**p**
Step 1					.540	.010	.466
Constant	27.351	6.021					
Social Desirability	.201	.273	.098	.098			.466
Step 2					.754	.763	<.001
Constant	6.942	7.031					
Social Desirability	.288	.292	.140	.085			.331
Bravery	.943	.390	.436	.208			.022
Perseverance	.391	.342	.166	.098			.261
Honesty	-.126	.688	-.037	-.016			.856
Hope	-.676	.422	-.281	-.138			.119
Spirituality	-.016	.170	-.011	-.008			.926
Social Intelligence	-.287	.336	-.127	-.073			.400
Kindness	-1.324	.519	-.374	-.220			.016
Leadership	-.425	.502	-.155	-.073			.403
Self-Regulation	-.107	.260	-.060	-.035			.683
Forgiveness	-.831	.463	-.341	-.155			.082
Curiosity	.759	.442	.269	.148			.096
Appreciation of Beauty & Excellence	.336	.343	.140	.084			.335
Fairness	.785	.577	.227	.117			.183
Humility	.007	.324	.003	.002			.984
Love of Learning	-.077	.232	-.042	-.029			.741
Creativity	-.677	.320	-.284	-.182			.042
Perspective	.139	.323	.056	.037			.670
Gratitude	-.746	.481	-.266	-.133			.131
Humour	.689	.289	.314	.205			.023
Zest	.018	.329	.008	.005			.958
Love	.921	.370	.371	.214			.018
Prudence	-.753	.607	-.305	-.107			.224
Judgement	1.147	.585	.393	.169			.059
Teamwork	1.291	.443	.490	.251			.006

Demographic Questionnaire

1. Which age category do you fall into? Please circle your response.

21-30

31-40

41-50

51-60

61-70

71+

2. How would you describe your gender? Please circle your response.

Male

Female

Non-binary/third gender

Prefer not to say

3. Are you currently in-service or retired? Please circle your response.

In-service

Retired

4. How many years have you been teaching for/have taught for? Please circle your response.

Less than one year

1-5 years

6-10 years

11-20 years

20-30 years

30+ years

5. In your current or latest role, are you or did you teach within mainstream or specialist provision? Please circle your response.

Mainstream

Specialist

6. In your current or latest role, are you or did you teach within a state or independent school? Please circle your response.

State School

Independent School

7. In your current or latest role, which Key Stage are you or did you teach? Please circle all that apply.

Early Years Foundation Phase

Key Stage 1

Key Stage 2

Key Stage 3

Key Stage 4

Key Stage 5

Teacher Efficacy Scale (Short Form)

Teacher Efficacy Scale (Short Form)*

A number of statements about organizations, people, and teaching are presented below. The purpose is to gather information regarding the actual attitudes of educators concerning these statements. There are no correct or incorrect answers. We are interested only in your frank opinions. Your responses will remain confidential.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of each statement.

KEY: 1=Strongly Agree 2=Moderately Agree 3=Agree slightly more than disagree 4=Disagree slightly more than agree 5=Moderately Disagree 6=Strongly Disagree

1.	The amount a student can learn is primarily related to family background.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2.	If students aren't disciplined at home, they aren't likely to accept any discipline.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3.	When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4.	A teacher is very limited in what he/she can achieve because a student's home environment is a large influence on his/her achievement.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5.	If parents would do more for their children, I could do more.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6.	If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7.	If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him/her quickly.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8.	If one of my students couldn't do a class assignment, I would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9.	If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.	1 2 3 4 5 6
1O.	When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.	1 2 3 4 5 6

*In Hoy, W.K. & Woolfolk, A.E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *The Elementary School Journal 93*, 356-372.

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Short Form)

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale[1] (short form)

Teacher Beliefs	How much can you do?								
Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.	Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		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 get students to believe they can do well in school work?	(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 calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	(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. How much 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 strategies in your classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)

Values in Action (VIA) Survey -72

I have taken frequent stands in the face of strong opposition	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I never quit a task before it is done	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I always keep my promises	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I always look on the bright side	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am a spiritual person	1	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5

	Very Much Unlike Me				Very Much Like Me
I know how to handle myself in different social situations	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I always finish what I start	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I really enjoy doing small favours for friends	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
As a leader, I treat everyone equally well regardless of his or her experience	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
Even when candy or cookies are under my nose, I never overeat	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I practice my religion	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I rarely hold a grudge	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am always busy with something interesting	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
No matter what the situation, I am able to fit in	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I go out of my way to cheer people up who appear down	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
One of my strengths is helping a group of people work well together even when they have their differences	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am a highly disciplined person	1	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5

	Very Much Unlike Me				Very Much Like Me
I experience deep emotions when I see beautiful things	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
Despite challenges, I always remain hopeful about the future	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I must stand up for what I believe even if there are negative results	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I finish things despite obstacles in the way	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
Everyone's rights are equally important to me	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I see beauty that other people pass by without noticing	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I never brag about my accomplishments	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am excited by many different activities	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am a true life-long learner	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am always coming up with new ways to do things	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
People describe me as 'wise beyond my years'	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
My promises can be trusted	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me

I give everyone a chance	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
To be an effective leader, I treat everyone the same	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am an extremely grateful person	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I try to add some humour to whatever I do	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I look forward to each new day	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I believe it is best to forgive and forget	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
My friends say that I have lots of new and different ideas	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I always stand up for my beliefs	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am true to my own values	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I always feel the presence of love in my life	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I can always stay on a diet	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I think through the consequences every time before I act	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me

I am always aware of the natural beauty in the environment	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
My faith makes me who I am	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I have lots of energy	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I can find something of interest in any situation	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I read all of the time	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
Thinking things through is part of who I am	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am an original thinker	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I have a mature view on life	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I can express love to someone else	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
Without exception, I support my teammates or fellow group members	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I feel thankful for what I have received in life	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I know that I will succeed with the goals I set for myself	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I rarely call attention to myself	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me

I have a great sense of humour	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I always weigh the pros and cons	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I enjoy being kind to others	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I can accept love from others	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
Even if I disagree with them, I always respect the leaders of my group	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am a very careful person	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I have been told that modesty is one of my most notable characteristics	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am usually willing to give someone another chance	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I read a huge variety of books	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I try to have good reasons for my important decisions	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I always know what to say to make people feel good	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
It is important to me to respect decisions made by my group	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me

I always make careful choices	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I feel a profound sense of appreciation every day	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I awaken with a sense of excitement about the day's possibilities	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
Others consider me to be a wise person	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I believe that it is worth listening to everyone's opinions	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me
I am know for my good sense of humour	1 Very Much Unlike Me	2 Unlike Me	3 Neutral	4 Like Me	5 Very Much Like Me

Values in Action (VIA) Survey -72 Items & Corresponding Character Strength

VIA Survey-72

#	Item	Strength
1	I have taken frequent stands in the face of strong opposition.	Bravery
2	I never quit a task before it is done.	Perseverance
3	I always keep my promises.	Honesty
4	I always look on the bright side.	Hope
5	I am a spiritual person.	Spirituality
6	I know how to handle myself in different social situations.	Social Intelligence
7	I always finish what I start.	Perseverance
8	I really enjoy doing small favors for friends.	Kindness
9	As a leader, I treat everyone equally well regardless of his or her experience.	Leadership
10	Even when candy or cookies are under my nose, I never overeat.	Self-Regulation
11	I practice my religion.	Spirituality
12	I rarely hold a grudge.	Forgiveness
13	I am always busy with something interesting.	Curiosity
14	No matter what the situation, I am able to fit in.	Social Intelligence
15	I go out of my way to cheer up people who appear down.	Kindness
16	One of my strengths is helping a group of people work well together even when they have their differences.	Leadership
17	I am a highly disciplined person.	Self-Regulation
18	I experience deep emotions when I see beautiful things.	Appreciation of Beauty & Excellence
19	Despite challenges, I always remain hopeful about the future.	Hope
20	I must stand up for what I believe even if there are negative results.	Bravery
21	I finish things despite obstacles in the way.	Perseverance
22	Everyone's rights are equally important to me.	Fairness
23	I see beauty that other people pass by without noticing.	Appreciation of Beauty & Excellence
24	I never brag about my accomplishments.	Humility
25	I am excited by many different activities.	Curiosity
26	I am a true life-long learner.	Love of Learning
27	I am always coming up with new ways to do things.	Creativity
28	People describe me as "wise beyond my years."	Perspective
29	My promises can be trusted.	Honesty
30	I give everyone a chance.	Fairness
31	To be an effective leader, I treat everyone the same.	Leadership
32	I am an extremely grateful person.	Gratitude
33	I try to add some humor to whatever I do.	Humor
34	I look forward to each new day.	Zest
35	I believe it is best to forgive and forget.	Forgiveness
36	My friends say that I have lots of new and different ideas.	Creativity
37	I always stand up for my beliefs.	Bravery
38	I am true to my own values.	Honesty
39	I always feel the presence of love in my life.	Love
40	I can always stay on a diet.	Self-Regulation
41	I think through the consequences every time before I act.	Prudence

VIA Survey-72

42	I am always aware of the natural beauty in the environment.	Appreciation of Beauty & Excellence
43	My faith makes me who I am.	Spirituality
44	I have lots of energy.	Zest
45	I can find something of interest in any situation.	Curiosity
46	I read all of the time.	Love of Learning
47	Thinking things through is part of who I am.	Judgment
48	I am an original thinker.	Creativity
49	I have a mature view on life.	Perspective
50	I can express love to someone else.	Love
51	Without exception, I support my teammates or fellow group members.	Teamwork
52	I feel thankful for what I have received in life.	Gratitude
53	I know that I will succeed with the goals I set for myself.	Hope
54	I rarely call attention to myself.	Humility
55	I have a great sense of humor.	Humor
56	I always weigh the pro's and con's.	Judgment
57	I enjoy being kind to others.	Kindness
58	I can accept love from others.	Love
59	Even if I disagree with them, I always respect the leaders of my group.	Teamwork
60	I am a very careful person.	Prudence
61	I have been told that modesty is one of my most notable characteristics.	Humility
62	I am usually willing to give someone another chance.	Forgiveness
63	I read a huge variety of books.	Love of Learning
64	I try to have good reasons for my important decisions.	Judgment
65	I always know what to say to make people feel good.	Social Intelligence
66	It is important to me to respect decisions made by my group.	Teamwork
67	I always make careful choices.	Prudence
68	I feel a profound sense of appreciation every day.	Gratitude
69	I awaken with a sense of excitement about the day's possibilities.	Zest
70	Others consider me to be a wise person.	Perspective
71	I believe that it is worth listening to everyone's opinions.	Fairness
72	I am known for my good sense of humor.	Humor

Marlowe-Crowe Social Desirability Scale (Short Form)

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide how it pertains to you. Please respond either TRUE (T) or FALSE (F) to each item. Indicate your response by circling the appropriate letter next to the item. Be sure to answer all items.

1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. T F

2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. T F

3. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. T F

4. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. T F

5. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. T F

6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. T F

7. I'm always willing to admit to it when I make a mistake. T F

8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. T F

9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. T F

10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. T F

11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. T F

12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. T F

13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. T