

TABLE 7
Revised Items for the Confirmatory Factor Analysis

1. I am capable of helping students to become more flexible in their thinking.
2. My school district provides professional development that stresses the fostering of creative thinking in the classroom.
3. The societal benefits of creativity are worth risking my job to make sure my students are creative thinkers.
4. All students can develop original ideas.
5. I am capable of enhancing my students' abilities to take meaningful academic risks.
6. Teaching creative thinking would be frowned upon in my school.
7. I am capable of fostering creative problem solving in my classroom.
8. If there were more creative people, the world would be a much better place.
9. My school's priorities do not include teaching students to think creatively.
10. When individuals approach problems in unique ways, they add to humanity's knowledge of the world.
11. Teaching creative thinking is one of my strengths.
12. I am capable of increasing my students' abilities to create unique solutions.
13. Inventive thoughts are necessary for growth in any field of study.
14. Creativity is an ability that only a few students possess.
15. I am capable of developing a classroom atmosphere that welcomes imagination.
16. My administration encourages me to foster innovative thinking in my students.
17. I believe thinking creatively is the most important skill for students to learn.
18. Students are either creative or they are not.
19. I am capable of promoting flexible thinking.
20. My current school environment does not encourage teachers to produce independent thinkers.
21. Without new and creative ideas, America will be left behind.
22. I am capable of helping my students to see the world from new perspectives.
23. Creativity can save lives.
24. All students can grow in their creative problem solving skills.
25. I am capable of teaching my students to find connections in seemingly unconnected ideas.
26. I have helped many students to become more creative.
27. My current school environment places little value on the development of student creativity.
28. If there were more creative people, more problems would be solved.
29. I am capable of increasing the quantity of original thoughts my students have.
30. New ideas must be generated to enact positive change.
31. All students can contribute innovative thoughts to a discussion.
32. I am capable of helping students to elaborate on their own unique ideas.
33. It is a priority in my school to increase students' inventiveness.
34. We really need creative people.
35. There are only a few creative students.
36. I am unsure of how to foster creativity in my classroom.
37. Innovative ideas can move society forward.
38. All students can learn to produce something innovative.
39. At the end of the year, I am confident that all of my students are more creative thinkers.
40. Old problems can be solved with new ideas.
41. All students can learn to be as creative as Einstein or Picasso.
42. Teaching creative problem solving is not one of my strengths.
43. All students have the potential to change the world with their creative ideas.

TABLE 8
Pattern Coefficients for Teaching for Creativity Scale from the Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Item Number	Factor 1: Teacher Self-efficacy	Factor 2: Environmental Encouragement	Factor 3: Societal Value	Factor 4: Student Potential
19	.85			
12	.82			
7	.76			
26	.79			
15	.73			
11	.74			
1	.66			
25	.73			
42R	.52			
32	.77			
22	.76			
29	.78			
5	.66			
27R		.89		
16		.78		
9R		.84		
20R		.86		
33		.68		
2		.65		
6R		.61		
28			.80	
37			.84	
34			.82	
21			.67	
30			.58	
10			.73	
40			.73	
13			.71	
23			.66	
17			.49	
31				.82
38				.77
4				.66
43				.63
14R				.41
24				.76

Note. Teachers (n = 287).

Campbell's (1999) criteria (below .05 represents a good fit, and values up to .08 represents a reasonable fit).

The original model included all 43 items (see Table 7), but the model fit was less than adequate (CMIN/df = 2.252, CFI = .856, TLI rho2 = .848, RMSEA = .066), so items with the largest modification indexes were systematically analyzed to determine their effect on the model fit. To determine which item should be deleted, we first noted if either item had large modification indexes with other items. If the items were relatively equal, we then determined if the items conceptually similar and kept the item with the lowest mean and larger standard deviation. When the means were relatively similar, we consulted the effect the item has on the sub-scale reliability and kept the item that most positively