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ABSTRACT

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
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A STUDY OF TEACHERS’ SELF-EFFICACY OF THEIR PREPAREDNESS IN
RELATION TO READING COMMON CORE GEORGIA PERFORMANCE
STANDARDS’ PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND
INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT AND THE
IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERS

Committee Chair:  Barbara Hill, Ed.D.

Dissertation dated May 2015

The purpose of this mixed-methods study is to identify the primary factors that
directly affect teacher efficacy within the classroom in the area of reading for teachers in
grades kindergarten through 5. This study examined the role of the administrative team
in shaping the teacher’s pedagogy and skill level, as well as identified the implications
for leaders. Data gathered to inform the research were derived from teacher surveys,
focus groups, and teacher observations. The research examined the relationship between
the classroom teacher’s self-efficacy, professional development, instructional delivery,
and instructional feedback within the school environment. The benefits of the research
are to better understand the importance of instructional support, strategic professional
development, and meaningful feedback in elementary education. Lastly, the benefit is to
determine a correlation between the professional developer’s resources within the school/district professional training and its effect on the teacher’s instructional strategies.

This study took place in an urban school system in Georgia. The surveys, observations, interviews, and focus group were administered at two public elementary school located in Georgia. These schools were located in an urban community and were both Title 1 schools, in which 99% of the student population qualified for free or reduced lunch.

The researcher studied the impact that teacher’s efficacy has on the delivery of the Reading Common Core Standards. During the research, the researcher conducted a focus group and further explored the teacher’s perceptions towards their instructional support, professional development, and meaningful feedback. According to Bandura’s (1994) Self-Efficacy Theory, a teacher’s attitude, ability, and cognitive skills comprise what is known as the self-system. The independent variables affect the results are instructional support from administration, teacher feedback, resources, professional development, age, experience and the dependent factor is teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading Common Core Georgia Performance Standards. In Bandura’s (1994) study, the self-system refers to the behaviors, reactions, and actions concerning the instructional practices and pedagogy of the teacher.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

If we continue on our current course, and the number of nations outpacing us in the education race continues to grow at its current rate, the American standard of living will steadily fall relative to those nations, rich and poor, that are doing a better job. The core problem is that our education and training systems were built for another era, an era in which most workers needed only a rudimentary education. It is not possible to get to where we have to go by patching that system. We can get where we must go only by changing the system itself.

(National Center on Education and the Economy, 2008, p. XXV)

Changing a system requires participation from all stakeholders involved in the process. With all considerations being made, the expectations should be to weigh all factors, such as instructional resources, human resources, and an evaluation system, into the equation. According to the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), all students should have achieved high academic standards by attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics by the 2013–2014 school year. In an effort to meet this federal demand, in 2012, Georgia transitioned from Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) to the Common Core Standards Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) as a part of the Race to the Top Initiative. Georgia is currently in its third year of implementation of the English Language Arts Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (ELACCGPS) and the
tailored professional development, workshops, and webinars are tools, provided by districts, to better equip teachers into this transition. In the area of reading, Georgia has been close to reaching the established goals in grades 3-5. Unfortunately, when you drill down to the individual school systems, the gains become murky and are not consistent across the board. So then the questions are raised, “Do we patch or change the system in place?” or “Is it working?”

During the 2013-2014 school-year, absent of school reforms, an urban school system in Georgia had designed ELACCGPS professional development opportunities that incorporated the essential components of the Balanced Literacy Approach. With the removal of reading reforms within this particular district, the Balanced Framework concept was introduced. This concept was fairly new to teachers; however, the district proceeded with sharing performance expectations regardless of their current professional knowledge or experiences. The idea behind the Balanced Literacy Approach was to incorporate writing, literacy, phonics, and grammar within the literacy instructional block. Within this framework, the teacher is expected to differentiate their instruction based on established needs of the class in addition to meeting students’ individual academic needs. Usually, class begins with whole group instruction; after the Shared Story and Read Aloud (whole group) portion of the lesson, the teacher transitions to the Guided Group and Literacy Centers (small group). The Read Aloud is when the teacher chooses a book slightly above grade level to model how good reading looks and sounds. Shared Reading is when grade level standards are introduced and the teacher uses a text that is on the students’ grade level. Guided Group and Literacy centers occur in a small
group and provide reading support on the child’s academic reading level. The notion is that the lesson starts off with addressing the whole class and then moves into a customized plan for a smaller group setting. Schools were given the autonomy to tailor the professional development and provide instructional support to each teacher in reading.

In comparison to the previous standards, Common Core has decreased the number of standards while it increased the rigor within each standard. According to the Common Core State Standards Initiative, there are three major shifts in the standards. These shifts are complex text, locating grounded evidence from the text, and building knowledge through more nonfiction text. Regular practice with complex text and their academic language calls for a staircase of increasing complexity so that all students are ready for the demands of college and career level readiness (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2014d). By allowing students to locate evidence from the text, students should be able to grasp information, formulate arguments, and emphasize key points. The last shift focuses on the importance of building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction. Because students are immersed in information daily, the need to develop knowledge and vocabulary with this type of text increases. Each grade level has six major components addressed in the area of English Language Arts. These components are Reading Literary (RL), Reading Informational (RI), Language, Writing, Speaking and Listening, and Foundational Skills. The Reading Literary and Reading Informational standards are organized into four categories. The categories are Key Ideas and Details, Craft and
Structure, Integration of Knowledge and Ideas, and Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity (Figure 1).

![Table](image)

**Figure 1.** Third Grade Literacy Standards

Key Ideas and Details emphasize the importance of identifying the key points and ideas in a text for the purpose of understanding what the author is trying to relay. The Craft and Structure help the student understand the importance of the arrangement of the content in the text to better understand the message or information given from the author.
Integration of Knowledge and Ideas refer to the overall goal of reading in which the understanding of the text helps the reader deepen their knowledge and ideas. The Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity, identify the grade level goal of the student reading on grade level by the end of the academic year.

In 2012, Georgia was one of 43 states, District of Columbia, and 4 territories that had agreed to transition from state level objectives to national level objectives (Figure 2). Previously Georgia’s curriculum was created from the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) and the effectiveness was assessed by the Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT). Currently, English language arts and mathematics have already transitioned to Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) and will be assessed using the Georgia Milestones Assessment in the spring of 2015.

Figure 2. Adopted Common Core Standards (Common Core Initiative, 2014c)
In 2012, the Obama Administration initiated the Race to the Top competition for school districts. The intent of this federally funded program was to invest close to $400 billion into schools to encourage schools to create personalized learning models. The purpose of the models was to engage students’ interest so that they can take responsibility for their success. In an effort to assess the effectiveness of instruction, an accountability measure was used to evaluate teachers and leaders. The overall objective of the Race to the Top initiative was to encourage transformative change within schools, targeted towards leveraging, enhancing, and improving classroom practices and resources (Race to the Top, 2014a).

Georgia was one of ten states that won grants within the second phase of the Race to the Top application process. According to United States Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, “Every state that applied showed a tremendous amount of leadership and a bold commitment to education reform. The creativity and innovation in each of these applications is breathtaking” (Nine States and the District of Columbia Win Second Round Race to the Top Grants, 2010, para. 4). The Race to the Top state competition was designed to reward states that are leading the way in comprehensive, coherent, statewide education reform across four key areas (Nine States and the District of Columbia Win Second Round Race to the Top Grants, 2010):

1. Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace;

2. Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals how to improve instruction;
3. Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and

4. Turning around their lowest-performing schools. (para. 12)

In the spring of 2012, as a part of the Race to the Top grant, school districts piloted a comprehensive assessment system known as Teacher Keys and Leader Keys Effectiveness Systems. The Division of Teacher and Leader Effectiveness impacts student achievement and provides access to resources and access that essentially builds teacher and leader effectiveness. The overall goal of this division is to support teachers’ effectiveness and improve student learning. The Teacher Keys Evaluations System includes ten Performance Standards (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Teacher Keys Evaluations System: Performance Standards*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TKES)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment of and for Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional Knowledge</td>
<td>5. Assessment Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructional Planning</td>
<td>6. Assessment Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Delivery</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>7. Positive Learning Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism and Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of these 10 performance standards, Professional Knowledge, Instructional Planning, Instructional Strategies, and Differentiated Instruction are affiliated with the teacher’s self-efficacy within the field. According to Bandura’s (1993) Self-Efficacy Theory, a teacher’s attitude, ability, and cognitive skills comprise what is known as the self-system. This self-system refers to the behaviors, reactions, and actions concerning the instructional practices and pedagogy of the teacher within the Balanced Literacy Framework. In the Knowles’ Theory of Adult Learning (1984), there are factors that influence the extent in which adults learn. The areas that could influence the teacher’s self-efficacy are instructional support, school/district level professional development, and meaningful feedback.

In addition to this teacher and leader accountability measure, the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI) were added. The purpose of the Teacher Keys Evaluation System is to ensure that students are successful in mastering the standards which results in improvements in schools’ CCRPI score. The CCRPI is a school improvement, accountability, and communication platform for stakeholders in education. The idea is that the CCRPI will promote college and career readiness for all Georgia students enrolled in public schools. Within the elementary school area, there are 13 indicators to measure the academic performance growth of both the school and district (Figure 3).
Figure 3. 2013 College and Career Readiness Performance Index, Elementary School, K-5

Statement of the Problem

On June 4, 2014, the Georgia Department of Education announced the awarded bid to CTB/McGraw Hill to develop a more rigorous assessment system. This 5-year contract totaled $107.8-million and the intent was to provide a new testing system that included open-ended questions to better gauge students’ content mastery. Starting with the 2014-2015 school year, Georgia will begin using the Georgia Milestones Assessment System. According to the former State School Superintendent, Dr. John D. Barge, “We need to know that students are being prepared, not a minimum-competency level but with rigorous, relevant education, to enter college, the workforce or the military at a level that
makes them competitive with students from other states” (Georgia Department of Education, 2014d, para. 4). Previously the state used the Criterion Reference Competency Test (CRCT) as an indicator of success on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measure. With Common Core, AYP eventually transitioned to College and Career and Readiness Performance Indicator (CCRPI). Georgia’s performance on the CRCT failed to meet the 2013-2014 federal academic goals of 100% under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). According to the No Child Left Behind Act, all students should have received proficiency in reading by the 2013-2014 school year.

Because of the most recent changes and academic shifts in the state standards, the multiple choice Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) will be replaced with a summative assessment that includes both multiple choice, constructed and extended response questions. The research problem that is addressed within this study focuses on the various levels of support given to teachers at each school site. The teacher’s self-efficacy could be affected by the amount of instructional support, intentional professional development, and meaningful feedback, which can hinder the successful implementation of newly introduced standards, curriculum, and assessment. Considering the increase in academic rigor within the Common Core standards, the role of the administrative team is an essential part of the teachers’ and students’ academic progress. The preparedness of the educator is dependent upon the level of support and feedback provided within the area of reading.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this mixed methodological study is to identify the primary factors that directly affect teacher efficacy within the classroom in the area of reading for teachers in grades kindergarten through 5. This study examined the role of the administrative team in shaping the teacher’s pedagogy and skill level, as well as identified the implications for leaders. Data gathered to inform the research derives from teacher surveys, focus groups, and teacher observations. The research examined the relationship between the classroom teacher’s self-efficacy, professional development, instructional delivery, and instructional feedback within the school environment. The benefits of the research are to better understand the importance of instructional support, strategic professional development, and meaningful feedback in elementary education. Lastly, the benefit is to determine a correlation between the professional developer’s resources within the school/district professional training and its effect on the teacher’s instructional strategies.

The researcher studied the impact that teacher’s efficacy has on the delivery of the Reading Common Core Standards. During the research, the researcher conducted a focus group and further explored the teacher’s perceptions towards their instructional support, professional development, and meaningful feedback. According to Bandura’s (1993) Self-Efficacy Theory, a teacher’s attitude, ability, and cognitive skills comprise what is known as the self-system. The independent variables affect the results are instructional support from administration, teacher feedback, resources, professional development, age, experience and the dependent factor is teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading
Common Core Georgia Performance Standards. In Bandura’s (1993) study, the self-system refers to the behaviors, reactions, and actions concerning the instructional practices and pedagogy of the teacher.

The purpose of this study is to gain insight on CCGPS English Language Arts professional development in an elementary setting and the relationship that it has on the delivery of instructions as it relates to teacher’s self-efficacy. This study determined the influence of instructional support from the administrative team, professional development, and meaningful feedback in relationship to a teacher’s personal growth measure on a teacher’s feeling of self.

The effects of the support from leaders were explored and its implications on the teacher’s self-efficacy were identified. Attitudes towards professional development were observed during the focus group. The purpose of the study is to aid school leaders in making adjustments or improvements among the support given to teachers within the instructional program in order to positively impact student achievement.

**Research Questions**

The following questions guided this research study:

RQ1: Is there a significant relationship between age and the teacher’s perception of instructional support in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

RQ2: Is there a significant relationship between age and the teacher’s perception of professional development in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

RQ3: Is there a significant relationship between age and the teacher’s perception of feedback in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?
RQ4: Is there a significant relationship between experience and the teacher’s perception of instructional support in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

RQ5: Is there a significant relationship between experience and the teacher’s perception of professional development in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

RQ6: Is there a significant relationship between experience and the teacher’s perception of feedback in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

RQ7: To what extent does the administrative team’s instructional support provided influence to teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

RQ8: To what extent do resources influence teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

RQ9: To what extent does the administrative team’s teacher feedback influence the teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

RQ10: To what extent does Reading CCGPS professional development training influence teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

Significance of the Study

Quality professional development is an essential component that school systems utilize to strengthen the levels of educators. According to Harvard University Professor Heather C. Hill (2009), the “professional development ‘system’ for teachers is, by all accounts, broken” (p. 470). She supports this statement by saying that the reliance on short-term, episodic, and disconnected professional learning for teachers is unlikely to positively impact their teaching and student achievement. According to Mizell (2010) of
the Learning Forward organization, “Professional development is the only strategy school systems have to strengthen educators’ performance levels. Professional development is also the only way educators can learn so that they are able to better their performance and raise student achievement” (p. 1 of the Forward). Knowing the importance of professional development during any implementation period, leaders should understand the value of acknowledging the self-efficacy of the individuals involved. This study examined the relationship between the English Language Arts Common Core Standards’ Instructional Support and teacher’s self-efficacy. In addition, leaders will understand the implications that meaningful feedback has on teacher’s efficacy.

The significance of this study is to acknowledge the impact that a teacher’s self-efficacy has on a teacher’s performance. According to Bandura (1993), “Teachers who lack a secure sense of instructional efficacy show weak commitment to teaching and spend less time on academic matters” (p. 134).

**Summary**

According to Hill (2009), “A broken system of professional learning requires decisive action in order to ensure wise expenditure of limited resources” (p. 470). The reality is that standards drive instruction and the quality of the delivery can impact student success. Teachers are the vehicle used to deliver the instruction within the classroom. According to Bandura (1993), self-efficacy is defined as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. As a result, their beliefs can determine how they feel, think, motivate themselves and behave (p. 117). A teacher’s self-efficacy can
potentially be influenced by instructional support, professional development, instructional strategies, and ongoing feedback.

Mike Varney, President and CEO of the Tucson Metro Chamber of Commerce, stated that “the bottom line is that if we want to continue to lead the world in business and prosperity, we need to do a better job in the classroom. The bar has been set at the world class level. We should accept nothing less” (Varney, 2014, p. 11). Since 2012, Georgia joined 43 states, the District of Columbia, and 4 territories in the transition to Common Core Standards. Coupled with the Teacher Keys (TKES) teacher evaluation system and the College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI), there was no mention of an implementation of a state-wide streamlined professional development plan. The goal of TKES is to impact student achievement. Also the CCRPI is a school improvement, accountability, and communication platform. In Georgia, districts provide access to resources that could essentially build teacher and leader effectiveness. It is at the district level that professional opportunities are provided and monitored for educators to improve instruction.

This study explores the effects of teachers’ self-efficacy on their delivery of the Reading Common Core standards (CCGPS). Teachers included within the study range from kindergarten through fifth grade and deliver instruction in the area of literacy during the school day. In addition, the study explores the relationship between instructional and administrative support and its impact that it has on teacher efficacy. A study group composed of a range of kindergarten through fifth grade teachers, with varied levels of experience, was collected and analyzed to make meaning. Classroom observations were
used to analyze the delivery of CCGPS in reading. Overall, the research supports leaders in ensuring that professional development opportunities are intentional in order to directly impact student achievement.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RESEARCH LITERATURE

Organization of the Review

This chapter is a review of the educational literature directed towards the factors related towards teacher’s self-efficacy of professional development as it relates to their perception of preparedness to deliver instruction. The chapter provides literature that addresses the perceived role that professional development plays amongst teachers.

Robinson (2013), an internationally recognized leader in the development of creativity, acknowledges the importance of utilizing curiosity as a platform to reach students. Teachers are the life blood of the success of schools. Robinson supports the ideas that high performing schools throughout the world share the same three characteristics:

1. Individualizing teaching and learning;
2. Attributing a high status to the teaching profession and understanding that professional development is an investment not a cost;
3. Dissolving responsibility to the school to ensure student success.

This chapter highlights and describes the following themes: (a) Educational Perception of Professional Development, (b) Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory: Teacher Efficacy, (c) Common Core Standards, (d) Administrative Support, and (e) Teacher Feedback: Standardizing a Measure of Success.
Educational Perception of Professional Development

Quick fixes never last and teachers resent them: they resent them going to in-services where someone is going to tell them what to do but not help them follow up. Teachers want someone that’s going to be there, that’s going to help them for the duration, not a fly-by-night program that’s here today gone tomorrow.

(Knight, 2007, p. 1)

For years public education has been bombarded with reform models and initiatives that promise student success in their academic performance. As required by the profession, most teachers engage in only the minimum professional learning required each year (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000). In 1999-2000, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) disseminated a survey to educators and discovered that they spent a day or less in professional development over the past year. In addition, only a small group reported that they attended four or more within the last year.

Malcolm Knowles, an American educator, conceptualized how and why adults learn. The term andragogy is defined as the art and science of adult learning (Pappas, 2013). Knowles identified five assumptions about adult learners. These assumptions were self-concept, adult learner experience, readiness to learn, orientation to learning, and motivation to learn. The self-concept assumptions assume that the learner acknowledges an area of growth. This process can occur through self-reflection. Adult learner experience and readiness to learn can occur together because the experience is used as a tool or vehicle for learning to occur but the learner must be ready and willing to receive the information. The orientation to learning assumes that the adult learner is able
to apply the learned knowledge to their everyday practice. Lastly, the motivation to learn assumes that the learner has internalized the learning and has taken ownership over their growth.

Hill (2009) stated, “Without a hard look at the actors in the system and the incentives facing those actors, these fads will prove the educational equivalent of pouring new wine into old bottles” (p. 471). Teachers are sometimes lukewarm about their confidence when their professional development is inconsistent. Teachers were questioned about the impact that professional development has played in their classroom and less than a quarter felt that it impacted their instruction (Hill, 2009).

In 2005, Hill surveyed individuals that delivered professional development in mathematics. In addition to asking them about their background, she asked them to complete a series of math problems. Not only did she discover that the individuals had other responsibilities outside of mathematics, she recognized that one-sixth of the professional development individuals fell below the 50th percentile on the given math problems. Also, when the teachers who received the professional development took the lesson or activities back to their classrooms, they were often unsuccessful.

The quality of the product, capacity of the providers, transfer, and coherence are all factors that suggest that we must look closer at the effectiveness of professional development (Hill, 2009). Businesses and community leaders understand that the educational system directly relates to the economic success of the community. The success of the school translates to the increase in tax revenue, real estate value, and
satisfaction from the community. At the end of the day, parents and the community want the best teacher in every classroom (Mizell, 2010).

The New Teacher Center (NTC) in the Alaskan Statewide Mentor Project (ASMP) uses a set of tools and a process that links veteran teachers with new teachers. Within this project, Plan, Teach/Act, and Reflect are used to accomplish the goal of this project which is to embed within the teacher’s day-to-day practice, a natural part of their on-going professional thinking and learning (Figure 4). “This program guides early career teachers as they develop practices, habits, and skills that ensure the cultivation of highly qualified and effective teachers” (Alaska Mentor Project, 2014, para. 1).

![Figure 4. Alaska Statewide Mentoring Project: Mentoring Model](image)

Acknowledging the fact that this model was created primarily to support new teachers, the components can address professional development across the board. In this model, Plan, Teach/Act, and Reflect are the three stages that a teacher must complete in
order to impact student achievement. The stages are a continuum and supports teachers in all areas. During the *Planning* stage, the focus is established to carry out the work to meet the individual needs of those involved. During this stage, the mentor will determine outcomes that are aligned with professional and content standards. Next, the *Teach/Act* stage allows for the new teacher to observe a lesson that directly relates to the items that were identified in the previous stage. This stage allows the new teacher to practice the strategies and lessons that were modeled. Lastly, the *Reflection* stage allows the new teacher to self-reflect and assess their practice against the identified professional standards.

According to the Standards for Staff Development, Learning Forward “advocates that school districts dedicate at least 10% of their budgets to staff development and that at least 25% of an educator’s work time be devoted to learning and collaboration with colleagues” (National Staff Development Council, as cited in Mizell, 2010, p. 14). Jim Knight, the president of the Instructional Coaching Group, has spent several years studying instructional coaching and interviewing United States teachers in the area of staff development. During his interviews he acknowledged, “Teachers are unanimously critical of one-shot programs that fail to address practical concerns. Teachers criticize training that lacks follow-up and that fails to recognize their expertise” (Knight, 2007, p. 2).

**Bandura’s Social Learning Theory: Teacher Efficacy**

Learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people had to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do.
Fortunately, most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action.

(Bandura, 1977, p. 22)

Albert Bandura, a psychologist and professor at Stanford University, focused his efforts on understanding the acquisitions of behavior. In Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory, three core concepts were known as the heart of the study. Bandura strongly believed that direct reinforcement did not account for people’s actions. The three concepts were:

1. People can learn through observations;
2. Mental states are important to learning;
3. Learning does not necessarily lead to a change in behavior.

It is evident in various instructional models that observation or modeling of expected behavior is essential to allow growth to occur. Bandura’s 1961 famous *Bobo doll experiment* (as cited in Cherry, 2014), proved to the world that children simply imitate behavior that they observe in others. The children watched an adult violently interact with the Bobo doll and were then allowed to play later with the same type of doll. In this study, he identified three models of observational learning (Cherry, 2014):

1. A live model, which involves an actual individual demonstrating or acting out a behavior;
2. A verbal instructional model, which involves descriptions and explanations of a behavior;
3. A symbolic model, which involves real or fictional characters displaying behaviors in books, films, television programs, or online media. (para. 5)

Concerning the mental stages for learning, Bandura (1994) found that environmental reinforcement was not the only influence of behavior. He made a reference to the intrinsic reinforcement as a form of the internal reward. The internal reward, similar to the self-efficacy, can be influenced by pride, satisfaction, and a sense of accomplishment. Self-efficacy is simply “the belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations” (Bandura, 1994, para 1).

Since Bandura’s (1977) published paper, “Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change,” more psychologist continue to study self-efficacy. They have found that it can have an impact on everything from psychological states to behavior to motivation (Cherry, 2014). The role of self-efficacy in an individual helps them in how they carry out their goals, tasks, and challenges. Most people easily identify their life accomplishments, what they want to change, and what they aspire to achieve. Bandura (1977) outlines the effects that self-efficacy has on individuals (see Table 2).

Lastly, the third concept of Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory is the idea that learning does not lead to changes in behavior. It was discovered that individuals can participate in observational learning without displaying new behaviors. According to Bandura, this concept can be successful through the modeling process. The process includes four components, which are attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation.
Table 2

*Effects of Self-Efficacy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Sense of Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Weak Sense of Self-Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• View challenging problems as tasks to be mastered</td>
<td>• Avoid challenging tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop deeper interest in the activities in which they participate</td>
<td>• Believe that difficult tasks and situations are beyond their capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Form a stronger sense of commitment to their interests and activities</td>
<td>• Focus on personal failings and negative outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recover quickly from setbacks and disappointments</td>
<td>• Quickly lose confidence in personal abilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keeping an individual’s attention and free from distractions could allow them to dedicate more of themselves to learning. Similar Jean Piaget’s (2015) Cognitive Learning Theory, an individual’s schema is important in that it allows individuals to recall previously observed information of their actions. Reinforcement and punishment play an essential part in the motivational concept. Not only does experience reinforcement and punishment effect an individual’s behavior, so does their observation of someone else experiencing reinforcement and punishment.

According to Bandura’s (1995) research, self-efficacy has four major sources: (a) Mastery experiences, (b) Social Modeling, (c) Social Persuasion, and (d) Psychological Response. “The most effective way of developing a strong sense of efficacy is through mastery experiences” (p. 3). Being successful in the performance of a task can strengthen
our sense of self. When we are consistently failing, we tend to weaken our sense of self-efficacy. Social modeling is when individuals observe others completing a task. It is important to note that the greater assumed similarity the more the models can persuade success and failures. The social persuasion is also a way that a person’s self-efficacy can be influenced. As Bandura (1994) noted, “Persuasive boosts in perceived self-efficacy lead people to try hard enough to succeed, they promote development of skills and a sense of personal efficacy” (para. 8). Lastly, psychological responses are the individual’s emotional reaction to situations. By reducing the individual’s stress reaction and altering their negative emotional tendencies and misunderstandings, self-beliefs can be modified.

In 1984, Patricia Ashton (as cited in Silverman & Davis, 2009) published a study that expanded Bandura’s (1977) Theory of Self-Efficacy to include the extent in which teachers feel confident that they are capable of delivering instruction. Ashton identified two dimensions of teacher efficacy: the extent to which they believe their students can master the content and the extent to which the teacher believes that the students can learn under their leadership. Ashton’s argument was that a teacher’s beliefs directly affect their outcome in the class. The confidence in the teacher plays a central role in their ability to meet the needs of the students.

Megan Tschannen-Moran and Anita Woolfolk Hoy (1998) conducted research on the Teacher’s Sense of Efficacy and defined it as the teacher’s perceptions of their resources and strategies for bringing about student behavioral and instructional outcomes. According to Figure 5, the teacher’s efficacy is derived from vicarious experiences and verbal feedback. These experiences are then analyzed and interpreted by the individual.
This combination forms the perceived sense of efficacy and contributes to the influence of consequences that leads to the outcome performances of the teacher.

**Figure 5. The Cycle of Teacher’s Efficacy Judgment**

This combination forms the perceived sense of efficacy and contributes to the influence of consequences that leads to the outcome performances of the teacher.

**Common Core State Standards**

The Common Core Standards are a set of high-quality academic standards in both mathematics and English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA). The goals were based on the expected level of performance at the end of grades K-12. The intent was to ensure that all high school graduates obtained the necessary skills to succeed in college, career, and life. Forty-three states, the District of Columbia, and four territories, and the Department
of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) have adopted Common Core. Because of the usage of Common Core Standards, the values of consistent learning goals across states have been recognized.

These standards originated in 2009 and were comprised by state school chiefs and governors who make up the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center). This state-led effort was developed out of the collaboration among teachers, school chiefs, administrators, and other experts. The intent of the creating the standards was to provide a clear and consistent framework for educators. According to the Common Core Standards Initiative (2004a), the standards are:

1. Research- and evidence-based;
2. Clear, understandable, and consistent;
3. Aligned with college and career expectations;
4. Based on rigorous content and application of knowledge through higher-order thinking skills;
5. Built upon the strengths and lessons of current state standards;
6. Informed by other top performing countries in order to prepare all students for success in our global economy and society. (para. 5)

Within the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts, students are required to read complex text and are challenged to ask questions that push them to refer to what they have read. These requirements allow critical-thinking, problem-solving, and analytical thinking to take place. In addition, the College and Career Readiness Anchor
Standards form the backbone of the standards by outline the ELA/Literacy standards’ core knowledge and skills. These skills are planned for the purpose of preparing students for life outside the classroom. Students are taught how to closely and attentively read text in ways that help them understand and enjoy complex works of literature. In addition, the students will use cogent reasoning and evidence based skills to navigate through the text. The major shifts in ELA/Literacy CCGPS are

1. Regular practice with complex texts and their academic language;
2. Reading, writing, and speaking grounded in evidence from texts, both literary and informational;
3. Building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction. (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2014d, para. 2)

Georgia is in its third year of the Common Core adoption and continues to make efforts to provide opportunities to help teachers adjust to the major shifts within their teaching. The state has allowed districts to develop individual plans to effectively meet the professional growing needs of the educators within their system. Overall, the ELA/Literacy standards present the vision of what it means to be a literate person who is prepared for success in the 21st century (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2014c).

**Administrative Team Support**

The Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) were a guide for Georgia educators to identify benchmarks appropriate for students in each grade level. Just recently, Georgia transitioned to the Georgia Common Core Standards (GCCS) and the major shifts have
caused school systems to evaluate the academic rigor of their instructional program. Over the years, the role of the instructional coach has taken a more prominent role in academics. Concerning reading instruction, there are several models that have been proven to be effective when developing the self-efficacy of educators. Considering that reading instruction is an integral part of a child’s overall academic success, it continues to be a major focus for low performing schools. There are several reform models that schools use to increase student’s reading comprehension capabilities and one of which is America’s Choice Schools, which has a great influence on preparing coaches for the implementation of teacher’s reading instruction. Within the school setting, the three areas that are most important are Coaching Modalities (i.e., joint planning, co-teaching, observations, feedback, etc.), Coaching Support, and Standards-based Professional Development (Poglinco, Bach, Hovde, Rosenblum, Saunders et al., 2003).

Unfortunately the duties and responsibilities are not always clearly defined and the administrator faces challenges in trying to adequately support teachers. Factors such as scheduling and coverage issues, teacher resistance, and the administrative team’s knowledge about implementation are a few of the challenges identified by Poglinco et al. (2003) in the article, “The Heart of the Matter: The Coaching in America’s Choice Schools” (see Figure 6). With administrative support, according to the research, it was determined that the America’s Choice Schools program had a great influence on individuals that would become administrators that focused on academics. In addition, the reform was better preparing the administrators to the work of the Standards-Based Reform.
In order for an administrator to be effective, he or she must develop a professional development plan for staff, as a means to increase student achievement. Professional Development is essential in every educator’s life and can greatly increase the self-efficacy of the educators being served. Unfortunately, there remain challenges that the administrator has when developing professional growth sessions for their staff. In the

---

**Figure 6.** The Heart of the Matter: The Coaching Model in America’s Choice Schools
article, “Making Time for Teacher Professional Development” by Ismat Abdal-Hagg (1996), the greatest challenge to implementing effective professional development is lack of time. It is important that all stakeholders are on the same page when it comes to providing professional development for any organization. If the value is not seen from the top down, then the support needed to execute the task becomes more difficult. Because time is an issue, adding additional time for planning within the schedule is beneficial. This additional time could be referred to as collaboration, common planning, or vertical alignment. Adding additional time to the day or allowing teacher planning days to be used for planning and professional growth will assist in the challenging undertaking.

Professional development should not be seen as a one-size-fits-all program, but should be used as a tool to advance the entire organization. The professional development should be ongoing and should meet the direct needs of the people being served. According to Abdal-Hagg (1996), some of the characteristics that are evident in effective professional development are collaborative, student focused, provides adequate time and follow-up support, and recognizes teachers as professionals and adult learners. Bandura’s (1993) Theory of Self-Efficacy states that a person’s attitudes, abilities, and cognitive skills encompass what is referred to as the *self-system*. The role of the administrator directly affects the feeling of adequacy within a teacher. The expectations of teachers should be made clear and the path to get there should be even clearer.

Reforms understand the value in the designation of an administrator during implementation. They provide support, model, and collaboration in the instruction aspect
of teaching. The administrator is more of a resource that is continuously monitoring the needs and the progress of all parties involved. In 2008, there was a study completed on the overview of the impact of the Reading First federally funded program. The findings were (National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, 2008):

1. Reading First produced a positive and statistically significant impact on the amount of instructional time spent on the five essential components of reading instruction promoted by the program (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) in grades one and two. The impact was equivalent to an effect size of 0.33 standard deviations in grade one and 0.46 standard deviations in grade two.

2. Reading First produced positive and statistically significant impacts on multiple practices that are promoted by the program, including professional development in scientifically based reading instruction (SBRI), support from full-time reading coaches, amount of reading instruction, and supports available for struggling readers.

3. Reading First did not produce a statistically significant impact on student reading comprehension test scores in grades one, two, or three. (p. 17)

Of the three major findings in the study, the success of the teacher relied greatly on the ability to fully fund a full-time reading coach to provide professional development and continuously assess growth in reading among the students. With any reading reform, it is very important that the focus is on building the capacity of the teachers that facilitate the program. Using scientifically based reading instruction and the support of the
instructional coach is not as vital as strengthening the knowledge base of the teachers involved.

Regardless of the career path, the professional development model should be consistent. The goal should be to increase the capacity of everyone involved in an organization. Each member directly contributes to the overall success of the organization, and the ability to make outcome improvements possible. All professional development communities share a common understanding of what professional learning experiences look like and how teacher development should be nurtured (Loucks-Horsley et al., 1996). According to a study done about effective professional development, there are seven principles that are found in excellent professional developments. These principles are (Loucks-Horsley et al., 1996):

- Clear, well-defined image of effective classroom learning and technology;
- Providing teachers with opportunities to develop knowledge and skills and broaden their teaching approaches;
- Using instructional methods to promote learning for adults which mirror the methods used with students;
- Building or strengthening the learning community of science and mathematics teachers;
- Preparing and supporting teachers to serve in leadership roles;
- Providing links to other parts of the educational system;
- Making continuous assessment part of the professional development process.
Within all of these principles, the requirement for someone to facilitate this process is quite clear. It is the responsibility of the administrator in the school building, to maintain and foster and support the efforts of the instructional coach.

In addition to the many factors that have been identified as challenging for the professional growth to occur, the experience of the teacher should be considered. First year teachers face a lot of challenges in education and professional growth is one of them. The preparation from their certification program and the way in which they are evaluated is important. Above all, the amount of support that they receive from instructional coaches is an essential part of their growth. In quality professional development schools the teachers learn specific practices and goes into classrooms to practice them. In order for growth to occur, teachers should be able to debrief, and problem solve collaboratively. The instructional coach creates a trusting environment in which sharing is common. Great schools, principals, and teams should support teachers by structuring group collaboration for planning curriculum by building professional development learning communities and encouraging ongoing inquiry into practice (Scherer, 2012).

In order to rectify the issue of lack-luster professional development implementation the goal and vision of the organization should be revisited. Conducting a needs analysis would help schools to identify short term goals and objectives within the organization. During this process, the accountability is acknowledged and the plan of execution can be launched. There are various structures for fostering a professional learning community and learning, collaboration, viewing members as learners, and self-accountability are essential components of the bigger picture.
By creating a professional learning community, the pressure is removed from the instructional coach and ownership of growth is taken on by the participation members. Ronald W. Rebore (2007) in the book, *Human Resources Administration*, identified six sequential processes in creating staff development:

1. Establishing school district goals and objectives;
2. Assessing the needs of the school district employees;
3. Establishing staff development goals and objectives;
4. Designing a program that will meet staff development requirements;
5. Implementing the designed plan so that effective learning can occur;
6. Evaluating the program to ensure the objectives have been met.

Within these sequential processes, the instructional coach becomes the facilitator of the process and not the dictator of the steps that should be taken. Professional learning communities build the capacity and the self-efficacy of the participants involved. They began to feel empowered in the process and the outcome is increased student achievement.

**Teacher Feedback: Standardizing a Measure of Success**

One of the criteria points for Race to the Top funds is recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most (Race to the Top Fund, 2014b). In the spring of 2012, Georgia piloted a teacher evaluation system called Teacher Keys. The Division of Teacher and Leader Effectiveness impacts the achievement of students and provides access to resources that intentionally builds teacher capacity (Georgia Department of Education, 2014c).
Under the Teacher Keys Effectiveness System, teacher assessment on performance standards is supported through the documentation and support from administration (see Figure 7). Teachers are given feedback on 10 standards (see Table 1 in Chapter I).

![Diagram of Teacher Keys Effectiveness System]

**Figure 7. Teacher Keys Effectiveness System**

In relation to the efficacy of the teacher, professional knowledge, instructional planning, instructional strategies, and differentiated instruction are the areas of focus. The Department of Education defines each of the component in the 2014 TKES Handbook. In *Professional Knowledge* the teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences. In *Instructional Planning*, the teacher plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies,
resources, and data to address the differentiated needs of all students. In *Instructional Strategies*, the teacher promotes student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content area to engage students in active learning and to facilitate the students’ acquisition of key knowledge and skills. In *Differentiated Instruction*, the teacher challenges and supports each student’s learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences (Georgia Department of Education, 2014c).

The administrator gives feedback to the classroom teacher throughout the year, using the guidelines within the assessment system. To determine the area of support needed, the administrator conducts both formal and informal classroom observation throughout the year. With documentation and support, the administrator uses the teacher evaluation tool to build the capacity of the teachers within their school.

**Summary**

Michael Rustin (cited in Fruchter, 2007) noted, “If the aim is to find out what could be done to improve an organization, and to think about how to bring improvements about, a different state of mind is called for” (p. 51). A different state of mind, or self-efficacy, can impact an individual’s view of their experiences. The research discussed in this chapter focused on the variables that make up this study and build a foundation of what self-efficacy is and how it relates to teachers. Bandura’s (1993) Theory of Self-efficacy emphasizes the importance of self-perceptions and how experiences directly affect the individual’s outlook and reactions in different situations. According to the
literature, support from the administrative team is a variable that should be acknowledged when discussing the efficacy of a teacher.
CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Research Design

This research was designed to take a mixed methodology approach to explore teachers’ self-efficacy of the preparedness in relation to the reading CCGPS instructional support and the implications that it has for school leaders. The researcher chose a mixed methodology approach because this exploratory method weighed the qualitative data more heavily. The researcher used the explanatory method by collecting the quantitative data prior to conducting the qualitative procedures. Qualitative data can provide meaning and context in the participant’s environment of study. Quantitative data discloses generalizable information for a large sample of participants. The researcher chose to conduct a qualitative and quantitative study because together, both methods yield the information necessary to adequately address the study. This research began with a single focus or concept being explored, which in this study was teacher efficacy (Creswell, 2007). The independent variables that were explored were instructional support from administration, teacher feedback, resources, professional development, age, experience and the dependent factor was teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS (see Figure 8).
The researcher used real-life contemporary bounded systems to explore teacher efficacy. According to Creswell (2007), “Problems in qualitative research span the topics in the social and human sciences, and a hallmark of qualitative research today is the deep involvement in issues of gender, culture, and marginalized groups” (para. 1). Exposing both quantitative and qualitative approaches to the development of the study helps to deepen the understanding of extent in which the independent variables affect the dependent variable. A mixed methodological approach recognizes that the world is not exclusively quantitative nor qualitative (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). The integration of both numeric and narrative approaches and data, qualitative and quantitative methods as necessary and relevant, to meet the needs of the research rather than the allegiances or preferences of the researcher, and in order to answer research questions fully (Johnson et al. as cited in Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). The
multiple sources within this study are teacher surveys, interviews, focus group, and classroom observations.

**Definition of Variable and Other Terms**

**Reading Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS)** are standards that allow students’ analytical skills to extend in order to identify main idea/theme, understand character and plot development, and evaluate the impact of word choice. A key component is the expectation of appropriate grade level complexity in text choices.

**Instructional Support from the Administration Team** is defined as support given from the instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal, to assist teachers in planning, modeling, and delivering instruction. Throughout the interaction with teachers, this includes the planning of curriculum among teachers that require a discussion of formal and informal student data to determine an instructional focus.

**Resources** are defined as the tools and manipulatives used with the students to explicitly teach the literacy Common Core Standards.

**Instructional Support** is defined as support given from the administrative team (including principal, assistant principal, and instructional coach) to assist the classroom teacher in ensuring that instructional delivery is effective in literacy.

**Professional Development** is defined as formal and informal training in literacy. The content is delivered by the instructional coach or district for the purpose of providing opportunities for professional growth in the area of literacy instruction.
Teacher Feedback is defined as formal and informal feedback given from the principal and assistant principal and is aligned with Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES). In addition, it is defined as informal feedback, aligned with TKES, given from the instructional coach for the purpose of focused support in literacy instruction.

Teacher Keys Effectiveness System is defined as a system used by Georgia principals and assistant principals to provide teachers with meaningful feedback and support opportunities for their individual growth (Georgia Department of Education, 2014c).

Teacher’s Efficacy (adapted from Bandura’s Social Learning Theory) is defined as the teacher’s belief in their capabilities to deliver and organize literacy instruction, in addition to executing the courses of action required to manage prospective situations (Bandura, 1994).

Age is defined as an educator’s chronological age.

Experience is defined as the number of years an educator has worked in the field of education.

Theory of Variables

Knowles’ Theory of Adult Learning: Andragogy

Malcolm Knowles (1984), an American educator, based his research on conceptualizing how and why adults learn. He is well known for the use of the andragogy term and made five assumptions about the characteristics of how adults learn. These assumptions are self-concept, adult learner experience, readiness to learn, orientation to learning, and motivation to learn (see Figure 9).
According to Knowles (1984), the self-concept is needed to help an individual transition from the dependent stage to the self-directed stage. As the individual matures, he/she changes their perception or personality towards his/her learning.

When teachers understand the overall goal of education, it becomes easier for them to take ownership over his/her learning and shift to the self-directed stage. Next, Knowles (1984) identified the adult learning experience that allows for experiences to be used as a tool for increasing learning. These experiences can be used as a resource for his/her learning experience. Throughout a teacher’s career, he/she will participate in a variety of professional growth experiences and it is from these experiences that they can use these resources for future learning. The readiness to learn deals with the individual’s willingness to adjust to the development tasks of their social role. In order for teachers to experience success within their classroom, according to this assumption, they should be content with engaging in their role as an educator.
The fourth assumption, orientation to learning, described the process of shifting from a postponed application of knowledge to an immediacy of application (Pappas, 2013). At this point, the learning begins to shift from subject-centeredness to problem-centeredness. Lastly, the assumption of the motivation to learn alludes to the individual’s internalization of his/her learning. It is the point in which they are self-motivated to grow in their particular field of study.

In addition to Knowles’ five assumptions of adult learning, there are four principles that are applied to this type of learning (Pappas, 2013):

1. Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.
   Georgia uses the self-assessment component of TKES to allow teachers to reflect and identify the areas that they need growth in.

2. Experience (including mistakes) provides the basis for the learning activities.
   Within the classroom, teachers engage in peer modeling and professional learning communities (PLC) to assist with this process.

3. Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance and impact to their job or personal life.

4. Similar to the five assumptions, adult learning is not content-oriented but rather problem-centered. (para. 3)

Both andragogy and pedagogy are relevant to the adult educator. Although conflicting at times, each theory acknowledges that learning is a process of gaining new information. Unlike andragogy, the pedagogical theory mostly refers to children and assumes that they learn what they have been told. For the majority of today’s adult
learners who are exposed to classroom learning in previous educational experiences that promoted these types of practices, their perception could be influenced. Unfortunately, as a result they may be unwilling to participate in adult education type courses later in life (McGrath, 2009).

**Bandura’s Self-Efficacy Theory/Teacher Efficacy**

Derived from Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory, self-efficacy can directly influence teacher’s behavior and performance. Most people desire to be successful in any given task; therefore, mastery experiences, social modeling, social persuasion, and psychological response play a major role in the outcome. *Mastery Experiences* are the positive and negative experiences of individuals that can impact the ability to complete an assigned task. For example, if a teacher experiences success within their classroom on a particular grade level then their self-efficacy might be high on that grade level going into the next school year. *Social Modeling* refers to an individual’s observation of another individual’s experience. Administrators use modeling and co-teaching as a tool to help teachers experience success through others’ implementation of instruction. *Social persuasion* can be positive or negative and can lead to individuals putting forth more effort and could increase their chance of success. A teacher can experience this from their colleagues or administrative team and can potentially affect their behavior or attitude. Another source is *Psychological Response* and is considered the least influential among the four. This source is dependent on the other four sources and the more they are completed with ease, the potential of the individual improving their self-efficacy increases (see Figure 10).
This study was interpreted through the theory of self-efficacy and adult learning. In this study, self-efficacy was defined as, “the belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations” (Bandura, 1994, para. 1). Professional learning is an essential component of any new curriculum adoption; therefore, the relationship between andragogy and the teacher’s efficacy of their preparedness to deliver instruction is explored.

Of Knowles’ (1984 as cited in Pappas, 2013) five assumptions of adult learners, self-concept and motivation to learn are both factors that lead to a person’s self-efficacy. Both of these assumptions require the individual to reflect on their perception in order to influence their behavior or attitude towards learning. As individuals mature, their concept of self begins to form and eventually becomes a self-directed action. Knowles acknowledged that “As a person matures, the motivation to learn is internal” (para. 2).
Bandura’s (1995) theory incorporates the four sources of information in which the behavior or performance is affected. Of these sources, the social modeling and social persuasion seemed to build upon one another in order to have a positive outcome on a person’s performance. Within the adult learning theory, the willingness to learn can hinder or enhance the experience thus creating a high or low efficacy of one’s self. The performance and perception of the individual can be determined by their adult experience throughout the process.

**Limitations of the Study**

Within this study, there were various limitations that should be acknowledged. The information was gathered came from two elementary schools in an urban school system in Georgia. One of the limitations of the study was that the schools selected from this sampling process both have a student enrollment of less than 350 and a teaching staff of less than 2-3 teachers per grade level. This resulted in limited themes and generalization surrounding the variable of administrative support needed to influence teacher’s efficacy. Because of the convenience sampling, only the site where the researcher was employed, was used for teacher observations and the focus group. Another limitation was that the number of instructional coaches varied from school to school. Therefore, this prohibited each site to provide the same amount of support and professional development in literacy using one coach versus two. In addition, the limitation of the focus group and teacher survey was that teachers may have not been honest in hopes that their instruction and perceptions are portrayed to be better than they actually are. Additionally, the researcher was employed in one of the elementary schools
used in the study. This may have possibly created a bias in the results because of the participant’s working relationship with the researcher.

Using the Georgia Department of Education to collect outcome data on the delivery of Reading CCGPS was a limitation. The newly adopted literacy standards are only in its third year of implementation. In addition to the short time of implementation, during the study, the end of year assessment transitioned from Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) to the Georgia Milestones. Because of the change in the outcome measures the limitation lies with the change in instruction and a measurement tool of a successful implementation that will calculate the College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI) versus the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measure. Another limitation is that there was a transition of the teacher’s evaluation tool that measured success from Class Keys to Teacher Keys (TKES). Prior to the study there was only one year of full implementation on this type of feedback. Lastly, a limitation lies within the district resource used to deliver Common Core standards. The researcher participated in the district’s initial development team to create curriculum units that align with the literacy standards.

Summary

This chapter defines the variables and terms that were used in this study. The independent variables included instructional support from administration, teacher feedback, resources, professional development, age, and experience. The dependent variable was teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS). The theoretical references that were used to examine
the relations between the variables are Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory, Bandura’s (1994) Self-Efficacy Theory, and Malcolm Knowles’ (1984) Adult Learning Theory. In addition, limitations of the study were explored.
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study examined the relationship between the dependent variable of teacher efficacy when delivering Reading CCGPS through the lens of the independent variables of instructional support, resources, professional development, and teacher feedback. The research conducted a mixed methodology study, in which the researcher explored subjects in a real-life, contemporary setting. A collection of detailed information was obtained through a variety of data collection procedures (Creswell, 1994). With the information gathered, a case description theme was be derived (Yin, 2009). The research focused on the teacher’s perspective of their preparedness to deliver the Reading Common Core Georgia Performance Standards. This was a mixed methodology approach in which each stage was implicit. Stake (2005) indicates that case studies are not a methodology rather a case within a bounded system in time and place. The inspection of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables took place through a mixed methodology approach. In this study, the researcher took the qualitative method to examine the relationship between the teacher efficacy and the administrative instructional support, teacher feedback, professional development, and resources. The feedback of reference was both informal and formal given from the principal, assistant principal and instructional coach. A qualitative study builds towards a
theory to guide the observation or investigation (Merriam, 1998). In addition, the quantitative approach was used to examine the extent that administrative feedback and Reading CCGPS’ instructional support has on a teacher’s efficacy.

The quantitative approach allowed the researcher to determine to what extent teacher efficacy has on the delivery of Reading Common Core Standards. Teacher Keys Evaluation System includes both formal and informal feedback and is only given by the principal and assistant principal. The instructional coach provides only informal feedback and that is not directly placed on the TKES form, but is solely used as additional information to inform their evaluation. The principal and assistant principal use the role of the instructional coach to carry out instructional recommendations based on the TKES evaluation. Because of this, the teacher’s perception of the instructional coach as a member of the evaluation team was explored. The researcher also explored the significance of the delivery of instructional strategies to the teacher’s self-efficacy. Qualitatively, the research included a focus group, interview, and classroom observation, in order to derive generalizations and commonalities among the data collected. The teachers used within the study have delivered instruction in grades K-5 using the Reading CCGPS.

**Description of the Setting**

This study took place in an urban school system in Georgia. The surveys, observations, interviews, and focus group were administered at two public elementary school located in Georgia. These schools were located in an urban community and were both Title 1 schools, in which 99% of the student population qualify for free or reduced
lunch. Both schools consisted of grades Pre-Kindergarten to fifth grade. School A, had a total enrollment of 250 students; of that number, 23% were English as a Second Language students and 10% were special education (Governor's Office of Student Achievement, 2012). The student population of School A had an ethnic make-up of 55% African American and 45% Hispanic (Institute of Education Sciences, 2012). School B, had a total enrollment of 369 students; of that number, 21% were English as a Second Language students and 9% were special education (The Governor's Office of Student Achievement, 2012). The student population of School B had an ethnic make-up of 75% African American, 25% Hispanic, and .001% American Indian/Alaska Native (Institute of Education Sciences, 2012). Each of the schools was listed as an alert school by the Georgia Department of Education. An Alert School status is defined as schools whose subject area performance on any statewide assessment falls three standard deviations or more below the statewide subject area average (Governor's Office of Student Achievement, 2012). Schools were selected according to the following descriptors: Title I status, ethnicity of student population, English proficiency of student population, disabilities of student population, and teacher and student population in each grade level.

**Sampling Procedures**

Each school was selected to participate in the study by using convenience sampling. According to Creswell (2007), this type of sampling minimizes time, money, and effort in conducting the research. The participants in the study were selected from the school district in which the researcher was currently employed. Because of these factors, the researcher benefited from the accessibility of the schools and participants.
Through the focus group, the emerging design was based on individual’s experience in their natural setting (Merriam, 1988). The teachers in the focus group were selected using the maximum variation sampling procedure (see Table 3). By using this type of sampling procedure, different perspectives are derived and are ideal for a qualitative study (Creswell, 2007).

Table 3

*Profile of Sample Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of certified homeroom teachers (K-5)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Early Intervention Plan (EIP) Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Instructional Coaches from Administrative Team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alert School</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(The Governor’s Office of Student Achievement, 2012)*
Working with Human Subjects

The researcher requested that participants volunteer for participation in the study. A consent form was given to all participants. Included in the consent form was the purpose of the study, what participants were asked to do, participation risks, and participation benefits were shared. Anonymity and confidentiality was guaranteed in the form. Participants were asked to sign the consent form and complete the survey online for the results to remain anonymous. The researcher also submitted a proposal to and received approval from Clark Atlanta University’s Office of Research and Sponsored Programs to go through the Institutional Review Board process.

Instrumentation

Data collected on each variable was gathered through surveys, focus group interviews, classroom observations, and administrative interviews. The teacher survey, focus group interviews, classroom observations, and administrative interview protocols were developed by both the researcher and the researcher’s dissertation committee. Each item on these instruments was aligned with a research question (see Table 4).

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher secured approval from a metropolitan area school district to conduct research. Once approved the participating schools were contacted. The principal of each school was asked if they were interested in participating in the study. After the agreement of participation, the researcher forwarded teachers the Teacher Survey on the Teacher Perception of the Efficacy of the Instructional Support Received in Implementing the Common Core State Standards (Appendix A).
### Table 4

**Alignment of Research Protocols to Research Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Focus Group Question</th>
<th>Classroom Observations</th>
<th>Administrator Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1 Is there a significant relationship between age and the teacher perception of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional support in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age and the teacher perception of</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2 Is there a significant relationship between age and the teacher perception of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?</td>
<td>7,8,9,10,11,12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3 Is there a significant relationship between age and the teacher perception of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?</td>
<td>12,14,15,16,17,18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ4 Is there a significant relationship between experience and the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perception of instructional support in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ5 Is there a significant relationship between experience the teacher perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of professional development in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?</td>
<td>7,8,9,10,11,12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ6 Is there a significant relationship between experience and the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perception of feedback in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?</td>
<td>13,14,15,16,17,18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Focus Group Question</th>
<th>Classroom Observations</th>
<th>Administrator Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ7</td>
<td>To what extent does the administrative team’s instructional support provide influence to teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ8</td>
<td>To what extent do resources influence teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ9</td>
<td>To what extent does the administrative team’s teacher feedback provide influence to teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ10</td>
<td>To what extent does Reading CCGPS professional development training influence teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
<td>1,2,4,5</td>
<td>1,2,4,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher composed the survey in Microsoft Word and distributed it at the school site. The survey was given to a total of 34 teachers who deliver instruction using the reading CCGPS. Of that total, there were 30 homeroom teachers and 4 Early Intervention Plan teachers. All surveys and participant responses were kept anonymous and participants completed them during a faculty meeting. A timeframe of 10 business days was given to account for participant absences. Eighteen items were on the survey; the expected completion time was 20-25 minutes.
The researcher interviewed one school principal from each school, during the study. The participants signed an Interview Informed Consent Form (Appendix B). The Administrator Interview Protocol on the Teachers’ Self-Efficacy of their Preparedness in Relation to the Reading CCGPS Professional Development consisted of nine questions (Appendix C). Principal interviews lasted 15-20 minutes and were conducted at their home school. The interviews were transcribed and the data were coded to determine the themes derived from the data.

The researcher conducted a focus group of six teachers. Each teacher represented a grade in K-5. The focus group was conducted in one session and the session lasted 30 minutes. Focus group participants were asked nine questions (Appendix D).

The researcher conducted one classroom observations with three teachers. Each observation took 15 minutes and was recorded on the Observation Log (Appendix E). Instructional strategies were observed using the observation form (see Appendix F). The classroom observation was transcribed and coded to determine themes. The participants observed represented literacy instruction in grades 3-5.

**Statistical Applications (Quantitative)**

The researcher used the software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze the teacher efficacy survey. This software was used to administer the Pearson Correlation tests to analyze the relationship between the independent variables and the independent variable. In addition, the Post Hoc was used to further analyze the relationship amongst the significant variables. The independent variables are instructional support from administration, teacher feedback, and professional
development and the dependent factors is Teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS. The relationship among instructional support, professional development, and feedback are all below the acceptance level indicating that there is a significant relationship. Tables 5-7 show the item to scale correlation which displays the validation among the instructional support, professional development, and feedback.

Table 5

*Item to Scale Correlation of Instructional Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Support Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>VAR00001</th>
<th>VAR00002</th>
<th>VAR00003</th>
<th>VAR00004</th>
<th>VAR00005</th>
<th>VAR00006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.618**</td>
<td>.632**</td>
<td>.597**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table 6

*Item to Scale Correlation of Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>VAR00007</th>
<th>VAR00008</th>
<th>VAR00009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>VAR00010</th>
<th>VAR00011</th>
<th>VAR00012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

Table 7

*Item to Scale Correlation of Feedback*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>VAR00013</th>
<th>VAR00014</th>
<th>VAR00015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>VAR00016</th>
<th>VAR00017</th>
<th>VAR00018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Description of Data Analysis Methods (Qualitative)

The teacher efficacy survey results, classroom observation forms and notes, focus group transcripts, and interview transcripts will be used for issue-relevant meaning to emerge (Creswell, 2007). Within the data, the researcher identified emerging themes and patterns. The patterns were collapsed into the thematic categories. The researcher used the themes derived from the research to develop generalizations that were implications for leaders.

Assumptions and Limitations

There are limitations in this study that may have impacted the findings. The use of the focus group, interview protocols, and teacher questionnaire had a variety of limitations. In addition, there are conditions outside of the researcher’s control that could have impacted the study. These limitations included:

1. The definition of the administrative team members and the perception of how the teacher’s view the instructional coach’s role on that team.
2. The reliability and validity of the instruments used to determine teacher’s efficacy.
3. The analysis method and sample size selected
4. The amount of literacy instructional support may vary from school to school.
   School A has one instructional coach and School B has two instructional coaches.
5. Because of convenience sampling, focus group and classroom observation were collected only from School B.
6. Because of the working relationship with the researcher, data collection from the participants may not be truthful.

7. The researcher is currently an instructional coach in the study setting.

8. The findings may not be themes may be limited and generalization cannot be made to all schools because of the small sample used. The school enrollment in both schools is less than 350 and a teaching staff of 2-3 per grade level.

9. The researcher assisted with the initial development of the district’s ELA curriculum units.

**Delimitations**

The researcher had included certain qualifiers to assist in setting boundaries for the setting in the study. Decisions regarding the sample population, school profile, variables, and instruments all contributed to the delimitations of the study. The delimitations were:

1. Teacher efficacy of their delivery of CCGPS Literacy standards was measured through a survey and focus group with an instrument designed specifically of this study.

2. Participation in this study is delimited to teachers working within a particular public school district in Georgia that included similar demographics and profile.

3. Only questions approved by the dissertation committee were included in the survey, focus group instrument, and interview protocol sheet.

4. Convenience sampling can limit credibility and information collected.
5. The study was delimited to teacher efficacy of their preparedness to deliver CCGPS Literacy standards based on school level support. Other areas of teacher efficacy were not explored.

6. The questionnaire and interview protocols may not have include all of the independent variables may influence the delivery of CCGPS Literacy standards.

**Summary**

The outline of the research framework was presented in this chapter. A detailed description of the setting, demographics, and the selection process for the participants was given. This chapter described a mixed methodology research that was utilized while providing a rationale for approach selection. Details of the ethical and legal considerations that were employed in working with human subjects were given. In addition, instrumentation, data collection procedures, description of data analysis methods, and verification procedures were mentioned, as well as limitations and delimitations of the study were explored.
CHAPTER V
DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this mixed method study was to identify the primary factors that directly affect teacher efficacy within the classroom in the area of reading for teachers in grades kindergarten through 5. The data analysis was conducted based on the research questions with a concentration on determining the relationship between independent variables: (a) instructional support from administrative team, (b) resources, (c) professional development, (d) teacher feedback, (e) teacher’s years of experience, and (f) teacher’s age; the dependent variable was teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS. The research resulted in a collection of significant statements that were clustered to define themes. The eight themes were extracted from 32 teacher surveys, three school-level administrator interviews, three classroom observations, and a focus group. In addition, a survey composed of 18 questions was distributed to 34 individuals and 32 were completed. Data regarding the effect of years of experience and the effect of age on teacher efficacy of instructional support, professional development, and feedback were analyzed to address the research questions.
Qualitative Data Analysis

Figure 11 displays the frequency of the themes evident in the data analysis. There were a total of eight themes derived from the administrative interview, focus group, and classroom observations.

Figure 11. Frequency of Themes

RQ10: To what extent does Reading CCGPS professional development training influence teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

Theme 1: Effective Professional Developments

In analyzing the survey using a Likert scale, 33 participants were asked to respond to the statement, “Based on the professional development from the instructional coach, I can use a variety of assessment techniques to explicitly meet the academic needs of my students.” Of the 33 participants, 82% responded with a positive perspective, while 12% were neutral in their response versus the less than 1% that responded with a negative
perspective: “I think it’s [professional development delivery] co-shared but I think the primary person would be the instructional coach. With me and the assistant principal as close second” (Administrator 1, School A, personal communication, December 16, 2014).

During the focus group, all of the teachers agreed when a Teacher B said, “The most impactful was the balanced literacy because it was brand new and the workshop was hands on” (personal communication, Focus Group—School B, December 15, 2014).

Another teacher added the following:

The school level [it] recently was awesome because it provided the hands-on interactions with the participants…the second half of the training was interactive and we were able to look at how the program works and the benefits that it would be when using it with our class… (Teacher D, personal communication, Focus Group—School B, December 15, 2014)

During the focus group, the teachers made many positive references to the school level professional development received: “The most impactful type of professional development is when we are able to unpack or repack, not sure of the correct term, the standard” (Teacher D, personal communication, Focus group—School B, December 15, 2014). One participant expressed the following:

Most impactful was that year that we had a chance to um it was the year before we had to implement common core and we received an opportunity to review the standards as a grade level. We really focused on nouns and verbs and developing learning targets for um each standard um that was the best school level impactful
resources that we received. (Teacher C, personal communication, Focus Group—School B, December 15, 2014).

**Theme 2: Ineffective Professional Developments**

One administrator shared the following:

I think the most impactful had been those professional learning opportunities that have given them very clear examples, um, on how to teach specific strategies and skills, such as main idea and supporting details and actually delving down to the actual grade level. (Administrator 1, personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014)

In 2005, Heather Hill surveyed teachers about their perception on the usefulness of the professional development received and how effective it was when taken back to their classes. The outcome was that the teachers were very unsuccessful. Teacher C in the focus group had the same concerns: “The professional developments from the district have been offered but sometimes disconnected from each other” (personal communication, Focus Group—School B, December 15, 2014). Professional development is offered to all district employees in a platform that allows staff to register for face-to-face and online courses. According to participant 1,

The least impactful professional developments are most of the ones that I attend. Just sitting in professional developments doesn’t seem to be a good use of my time and I am least likely to go in to my class to use the information. (personal communication, Focus Group—School B, December 15, 2014)
During the study, administrators were asked to share their perspectives on the impact of district and school-level professional development. Administrator 1 has been in education for 20 years and has been a principal for four years and stated the following:

I think that we still have lots of work to do when it comes to students who are struggling um how we accommodate them and help them to engage in the rigor that common core puts forth…I think the least impactful is probably trying to define professional learning that really gets down to the um RTI [Response to Intervention] process in tackling specific kids who can’t seem to master standards on grade level when it comes to reading. (Personal communication, School A, December 16, 2015)

There were similarities in the responses of the participants of the focus group and the administrators, concerning the application of the content not being consistently used. Administrator 2 commented, “So with the professional development that has been delivered thus far at the district level, I don’t think that it has been impactful as I am not seeing it fully implemented in my school” (personal communication, School B, December 19, 2015).

**Theme 3: Strategic implementation plan not evident for professional development**

The qualitative data was gathered from interviews, a focus group, and classroom observation. Based on the responses from the participants, it was evident that professional development was offered to the staff at the school and district level. Administrator 1 acknowledged the following:
…[A]t the district level, there have been several opportunities in our professional learning data base in which teachers are able to sign up or could sign up to take professional learning development related to Common Core… I am not sure if they provided a real strategic and intense support for specific grade levels on how to use data at specific schools relative to the implementation of Common Core. (Personal communication, School A, December 16, 2015).

Administrator 2 also commented, “…there are courses in MyPLC [My Professional Learning Community Web-based resource] that will help to support teachers in unpacking standards” (personal communication, School B, December 19, 2015).

Determining what to focus on at the school level was a point addressed by Administrator 1:

I think at the school level, it has been more definitive than the 10,000 feet that the district provides. They are looking at everything from 10,000 feet, but at the school we are able to really unpack, I guess, the standards, um, as grade levels meet with the instructional coach during their common planning and then really, um, scaffold what the expectation is or what we expect students to know and be able to do with that particular standard being at the forefront of instruction. So most of the professional learning is done during a staff meeting, um, or it’s done during a common planning. And then we have had some other professional developments aligned to reading where we have subs to come in and we do K-2 and 3-5 in one whole day. (Personal communication, School A, December 16, 2015)
According to the administrators, an attempt was made to address professional development at the school level. Administrator 1 expressed the following:

In this urban school system we operate in regions and in clusters. Um, there are some commonalities that we share as clusters that we do try to highlight or bring our instructional coaches or when we bring grade level teachers together for a specific PL or professional learning opportunity. (Personal communication, School A, December 16, 2015)

Administrator 2 addressed the role of the instructional coach, by saying, “I think it’s [professional development] co-shared but I think the primary person would be the instructional coach, with me and the assistant principal and other individuals serving as a close second” (personal communication, School B, December 19, 2015).

Administrator 1 expressed, “I personally do not prepare professional development, but I do have wonderful instructional coaches that, uh, prepare the staff development. And, uh, we typically try to do something every month… (personal communication, School A, December 16, 2015).

Each classroom observation was for the duration of 15 minutes. The measure of frequency of professional development was gathered from the teachers’ actions displayed during instruction (see Figure 12). The components of the lesson, within the balanced literacy framework knowledge, were derived from district and school level professional developments.
Figure 12. Classroom Observation Frequency of Evidence of Professional Development

As shared by an administrator, “Well, our focus this year has been on Guided Reading, so several of our teachers have attended training on, um, on Guided Reading whether it's been inside of the building or outside of the building” (Administrator 2, personal communications, Focus group—School B, December 19, 2014). During one of the observations, the teacher reviewed the focus of the small group lesson and shared the close strategy that they would use for the lesson. Teacher B stated, “…did a lot of scaffolding and redirected them back to the text to answer the questions” (personal communication, December 19, 2014).

Theme 4: Teacher-efficacy by displaying ownership and willingness to grow

Teacher A, in a focus group, shared the following comments:

You know the saying, we have something to my madness…yes! A method to my madness. Sometimes my method may look different from what your expectation is but if you sit back and observe you will see that it’s not that bad. (Personal communication, School B, December 15, 2014).
When asked their thoughts on the statement, “If your students didn’t learn it then you didn’t teach it,” one administrators responded by saying:

I think it solely depends on data and you will have, even with my previous comment, you will have some teachers that won’t take ownership of it or don’t see themselves as part of the equation of needing additional support.

(Administrator 1, personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014)

Administrator 2 was passionate in her answer, saying:

Well, I wholeheartedly agree with that statement. I think that that's a statement that when you talk to most teachers they don't want to own, but because I have been in this profession for 22 (pauses) 23 years and with educational growth and wisdom you begin to see they're with us most of the time and so if they don't learn something it's because we have not taught it effectively. So I am in total agreement with that statement and I say it all of the time, but the issue is that teachers just do not want to own it. (Personal communication, School B, December 19, 2014)

In this research professional development was a factor that was considered to determine the application of the training in Reading CCGPS. Administrator 2 said:

…I don’t think that the professional development for balanced literacy has been impactful at all. Not that the information itself is not impactful but I think it goes back to the mindset, um, of the teachers that we have in the building and being able to receive that information and being able to fully implemented, I think that it
is great information and it can be impactful but it depends on the individual that is in the classroom. (Personal communication, School B, December 19, 2014)

Administrator 1 added: “Some people see their data and say that this is not me at all, it's the kids and the blame is always shifted to the students first, instead of ‘what can I do to improve myself and improve instructional practice?’” (Personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014)

The willingness was an issue among the administrators and it was pointed out by one of them by saying the following:

…[B]ut I also think that teachers have to be willing and recognize that I need help. Because some teachers are not always open about what their shortcomings are and not opening up about those shortcomings until that data comes. And so, I think the teacher has to be willing. And so there is a difference between can't do and won't do. And if you won't do that's different from can't do. Can't do just means that I need some help in this area and I think that that makes it easier and makes the situation more workable that I just won't do. (Personal communication, Administrator 1, School A, December 16, 2014)

Administrator 1 added the following:

Most people takes their data and say that this is me, but there are some outliers to that. Some people see their data and say that this is not me at all, it's the kids and the blame is always shifted to the students first. Instead of what can I do to improve myself and improve instructional practice. (Personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014)
According to Bandura (1994), “Efficacy is the belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations” (para. 1). During the 10 minute classroom observation, data were collected on the teachers’ confidence to deliver instruction. Frequency of the display of teacher efficacy, was gathered based on the number of times the teacher referred to the strategies used during instruction within the observation (see Figure 13). In one classroom, the teacher did continue to refer to the strategy of context clues to assist them with locating the answers. During the lesson, the teacher was explicit with her directions and established the routines of the lesson; therefore, the students were familiar with the routine.

![Pie chart](image)

Figure 13. Classroom Observation Frequency of Evidence of Teacher Efficacy

RQ7: To what extent does the administrative team’s instructional support provided influence to teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?
Theme 5: Evidence of streamlined support for teachers

Teacher C stated that, “The professional developments from the district have been offered but sometimes seemed disconnected” (personal communication, School B, December 15, 2014). The interviewed administrators acknowledged the need for support at the school level. Administrator 1 shared the following:

I think that instruction support is a big piece of development, um, and the school is always very open and flexible in giving that type of support with the instructional coach that person is able to go and not only observe on an informative playing field, but they can also give feedback, they can also model, they can provide additional resources, provide additional strategies. (Personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014)

Utilizing the instructional coach as a bridge between the district and the school level was addressed during the interview. Administrator 1 stated,

…[W]e use the instructional coach heavily…we make sure that person goes to the district level Common Core trainings so that he or she is able to come back and train teachers in an effective manner on how to redeliver and how to enhance pedagogical practices… (Personal communications, School A, December 16, 2014)

Individualized teacher support was used to meet the needs of the teachers, according to Administrator 2:

I do think that we are, um, effective with meeting the needs of the teachers. I think we have two fantastic instructional coaches who sit with teachers um pretty
much every day to make sure that they understand what they are supposed to be teaching and to support and to provide resources. So yes, they do get the individual assistance that they need. (Personal communication, School B, December 19, 2014)

In addition to the support from the instructional coach, the teachers used each other for additional support. Teacher C said, “Sitting with my grade level has helped a lot because the standards are sometimes confusing so we have to research other states to see how they have unpacked the standard for their lessons” (Personal communication, school B, December 15, 2014). Another teacher added, “I sat down with my team to understand the standards better” (Teacher E, personal communication, School B, December 15, 2014).

RQ9: To what extent does the administrative team’s teacher feedback influence the teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

**Theme 6: Relevance and type of feedback from administrator**

Teacher A responded to the question about feedback by saying the following: This is about, you know, education and so if there is a situation where you feel is a deficit then educate me on it. That never happened…only criticism. There was never any feedback or guidance from the head of administration, but fortunately I was surrounded by great coaches and great support from that section. Because of that I was able to get better and at the end of the day… (Personal communication, School B, December 15, 2014)
Administrator 1 acknowledged the difference between the feedback given from an instructional coach versus from an administrator. The feedback from the instructional coach was referred to it as being able to “observe on an informative playing field, but they [instructional coach] can also give feedback, they can also model, they can provide additional resources, provide additional strategies” (personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014).

On the other hand the same administrator said, “Well, I think the feedback from the administrative staff is real and relevant because when we give feedback, it's not only based on, um, classroom observation and what we see in terms of practice but it's based on data” (Administrator 1, personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014).

Clear feedback was an area addressed by Administrators 2:

…I[n my feedback when I am going around and doing observations, I am very specific with my feedback in terms of what the standard is truly asking them to do. I feel that most of the time that the teachers (pause) their understanding is very limited and so as an instructional leader (pause) its job to ensure that they understand the full scope of the standard. So I am very specific and very detailed in my feedback in making sure that they really understand what they are supposed to be teaching. (Personal communication, School B, December 19, 2014)

RQ8: To what extent do resources influence teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

Theme 7: Usefulness of District provided resources

Administrator 2 expressed the following: “I think the resources are very limited, um, the [district] units that we have are not great in the area of literacy. So we have to find a lot of resources and purchase a lot of resources for the teachers…” (personal communication, School B, December 19, 2014). According to the participants, they were aware of the resources available at the district level in the area of literacy. They were given the frameworks and pacing charts, but no assessments were given from the district level to assist with the assessment of the reading standards being taught. Administrator 1 stated the following:

So at the district level I said once again they sent out the shifts. Um, so the teachers could clearly have a visual of where certain skills and standards lie. They also provided units in reading for teachers to use as a guide to develop their lesson plans. And then they also provided suggested resources to use for teachers to use either that were already in their building or a recommendation to purchase so that the Common Core Standards and reading specifics could be taught with fidelity. (Personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014)

In response to the questions of the usefulness of the district resources for the teachers, Teacher D expressed the need to “…go to different counties’ websites to assist me with sample units, lesson plans, and activities to teach the standards” (personal communication, School B, December 15, 2014). A kindergarten teacher expressed that the district units and scope and sequence helps with pacing; however, she continues to use other districts resources.
The unit plans are helpful and the kindergarten level, the district scope and sequence, is very helpful to assist with pacing. I think I remember seeing that Bibbs County is the only county that I saw that repacked the standards when it comes to Common Core. They have a scope and sequence, a pacing chart, a sample lesson plans in there...um... along with activities and resources. (Teacher D, personal communication, School B, December 15, 2014)

**Theme 8: Usefulness of school provided resources**

In regards to resources, the administrator described one of their primary functions as saying, “So, I have to make sure that I am physically responsible by making sure that the teachers and the students get the resources that they need to support them in, uh, in the academic areas in reading and math” (Administrator 1, personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014). Based on the school profile, both schools are Title 1 schools and utilize their funds to support instruction. “So we are having to find a lot of resources and purchase a lot of resources for the teachers to be able to support them in that area” (Administrator 2, personal communication, School B, December 19, 2014).

Programs and resources are specific to each school and are based on need. According to Administrator 2,

We have, uh, put a lot of money into our leveled book room so we have purchased a lot of nonfiction books. We have purchased a lot of Time for Kids, um, nonfiction text to be able to support teachers in the area of Common Core. (Personal communication, School B, December 19, 2014)
Teacher A responded with excitement saying:

> The book room is an awesome resource. It is leveled and colored coded and widely available for use. The computers, the iPads…oh gosh, the iPads, and incoming kindles. And along with the book room, the actual guided lessons that goes along with it…the teacher guide to help you hone in on those skills.

(Personal communication, School B, December 15, 2014)

In addition to consumables, the schools in the study also utilized technology to support teachers. Administrator 2 acknowledged, “We have iRead for our K-2 and because we are an alert school, we have um been chosen to implement Achieve 3000, which is all nonfiction text and based on the Common Core Standards” (personal communication, School B, December 19, 2014). Administrator 1 added: “Technology resources are aligned to the Common Core Standards…and the students are able to engage in the standards in a more I guess creative and rigorous way…” (personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014). The school level resources include professional development and explicit support for the technology programs at the school site. Teacher D remarked, “Achieve 3000…and the school level recently (pause) the iRead program was awesome because it provided the hands-on interactions with the participants” (personal communications, School B, December 15, 2014).

During the informal observation, the researcher observed the two components of the lesson which were Differentiated Instruction and Academically Challenging Environment (see Table 8).
Table 8

*Scoring Rubric for Classroom Observation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Needs Development</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Needs Development</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assist the teachers with instruction, they used resources to teach the standard. During a lesson, the teacher projected the story on the promethean board and read a page and asked the students to determine the main idea of the passage (Classroom observation A, school B, December 19, 2014). In another classroom the teacher enhanced the instruction by doing a lot of scaffolding and redirected them back to the text to answer the questions (Informal observation, December 19, 2014). The proficient teacher that displayed an Academically Challenging Environment, did a lot of questioning with the students and prompted the students to find evidence from the text when using the reading strategy for the day (Classroom observation C, school B, December 19, 2014).
During the classroom observation, each teacher utilized tools during their instruction. The frequency usage of resources was determined by the use of the district and school level resources to deliver instruction during the observation (see Figure 14). The figure shows how many times each teacher referred the students to the resources that were used during the 10 minute observation.
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**Figure 14.** Classroom Observation Frequency of Evidence of Usage of Resources

Teacher distributed the text and told them to look for details to help answer questions about the information in the text. The students were reminded of the strategy to highlight and go back into the text to support their answers (Classroom observation B, school B, December 19, 2014).

**Quantitative Data Analysis**

The researcher administered a survey consisting of 18 questions to certified teachers that teach literacy in an elementary school in grades K-5. The researcher
distributed the survey to two schools with similar demographics. A total of 34 surveys were distributed and 32 were completed for a rate of 94%. In addition, the survey was addressed the variables, which were instructional support (1-6), professional development (7-12), feedback (13-18), resources (6, 12), age (20), and experience (19).

As noted in Table 9, of the 32 participants, the following demographics factors were noted: Age: 3 of the participants were 20-29 years old, 14 of the participants were 30-39 years old, 11 of the participants were 40-49 years old, and 4 of the participants were 50+ years old. The majority of participants were between the ages of 30-39. Concerning the participants’ teaching experience, Table 9 also shows that 3 of the participants had 1-5 years of experience, 8 of the participants had 6-10 years of experience, 8 of the participants had 11-15 years of experience, and 13 participants had 16+ years of experience. The majority of the participants had 15+ years of experience in education.

Data Analysis and Demographics

To determine the correlations between the participants’ age, years of experience, and instructional support, professional development, and feedback, data analysis was conducted. The Pearson Correlation test and the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with a post hoc test were both used to analyze the data and determine its significance (see Table 10).
Table 9

Age and Teaching Experience of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29 years old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39 years old</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 years old</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ years old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 14 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

Pearson Correlation of Variables and Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Instructional Experience</th>
<th>Instructional Age</th>
<th>Instructional Support</th>
<th>Instructional Development</th>
<th>Instructional Feedback</th>
<th>Professional Experience</th>
<th>Professional Age</th>
<th>Professional Support</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Professional Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.687**</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.426*</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 10 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Support</th>
<th>Instructional Support</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.426*</td>
<td>.569**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Professional Development | Pearson Correlation | .284                     | .277     | .569**   | .770**   |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .129                  | .138                     | .001     | .000     |
| N                       | 30                    | 30                       | 30       | 29       |

| Feedback                | Pearson Correlation   | .333                     | .286     | .549**   | .770**   |
| Sig. (2-tailed)         | .078                  | .133                     | .002     | .000     |
| N                      | 29                    | 29                       | 29       | 29       |

Data Analysis and Instructional Support

RQ1: Is there a significant relationship between age and the teacher perception of instructional support in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

As indicated in Table 11, there is a significant relationship between age and instructional support as indicated with a level of significance at .015. Lastly, there is a significant relationship among instructional support and feedback with a significant of .002.

The correlations were tested for the relationship between age and instructional support. The correlation showed a significant relationship at the level of .015. But because age consisted of 4 groups, the ANOVA with a Post Hoc test (Table 12) was then done to find exactly where in the age groups the significant difference laid.
Table 11

ANOVA of Age and Instructional Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>666.318</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>222.106</td>
<td>3.291</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1889.682</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67.489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2556.000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

Post Hoc of Age and Instructional Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Age</th>
<th>(J) Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50000</td>
<td>5.22655</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>-14.0397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-2.27273</td>
<td>5.35085</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>-18.1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-13.00000</td>
<td>6.27442</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>-31.6553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.50000</td>
<td>5.22655</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>-17.0397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-3.77273</td>
<td>3.30998</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>-13.6140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-14.50000*</td>
<td>4.65755</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-28.3479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.27273</td>
<td>5.35085</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>-13.6365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.77273</td>
<td>3.30998</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>-6.0686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-10.72727</td>
<td>4.79661</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>-24.9887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13.00000</td>
<td>6.27442</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>-5.6553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14.50000*</td>
<td>4.65755</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.6521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.72727</td>
<td>4.79661</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>-3.5341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
Table 13 shows that the significant difference lies between group 2 and group 4, that is between those in the age range 30-39 and the age range 50 and over with the older members having the higher mean score.

Table 13

*Mean Scores by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>24.0000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>22.5000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.40299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>26.2727</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.58456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>37.0000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.81666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.7500</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.08029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ4: Is there a significant relationship between experience and the teacher’s perception of instructional support in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

Table 14 shows that there is not a significant relationship between experience and instructional support. The table shows the coefficient of .306 and significance level of .089; this is above the acceptance level and indicates that there is no significance.
Table 14

*Pearson Correlation of Experience and Instructional Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Instructional Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Data Analysis and Professional Development**

RQ2: Is there a significant relationship between age and the teacher’s perception of professional development in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

According to the Pearson Correlations in Table 15, there were no significant findings. The table shows the coefficient of .277 and significance level of .138; this is above the acceptance level.

Table 15

*Pearson Correlation of Age and Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
RQ5: Is there a significant relationship between experience and the teacher’s perception of professional development in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

Table 16 shows that there is not a significant relationship between experience and instructional support. The table shows the coefficient of .284 and significance level of .129; this is above the acceptance level and indicates that there is no significance.

Table 16

*Pearson Correlation of Experience and Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience (Pearson)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Data Analysis and Feedback**

RQ3: Is there a significant relationship between age and the teacher’s perception of feedback in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

The Pearson Correlations were run to determine the relationship among age and feedback. Table 17 displays that there is not a significant relationship. The table shows the coefficient of .286 and significance level of .133; this is above the acceptance level and indicates that there is no significance.
Table 17

Pearson Correlation of Age and Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

RQ6: Is there a significant relationship between experience and the teacher’s perception of feedback in the delivery of Reading CCGPS?

According to the Pearson Correlation in Table 18, there were no significant findings. The table shows the coefficient of .333 and significance level of .078; this is above the acceptance level and indicates that there is no significance.

Table 18

Pearson Correlation of Experience and Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Summary

This chapter provided a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the data collected within this research. The data collected derived from classroom observations, a focus group, interviews, and surveys. The analysis of the data revealed that the independent variables: (a) instructional support, (b) professional development, (c) teacher feedback, (d) resources, and (e) age have a significant relationship with the dependent variable of teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading CCGPS. The qualitative data collected were transcribed, analyzed, coded, and grouped into themes. The quantitative data were analyzed using the software Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to determine the correlations among the variables. By using the mixed-method approach, the researcher was able to see the relationship between the descriptive and statistical data in order to accurately answer the research questions that provided guidance for the study.
CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this mixed method approach was to gain insight on how instructional support, professional development, and feedback affects a teacher’s efficacy when delivering Reading Common Core Georgia Performance Standards. The researcher studied the dependent variables of instructional support, professional development, resources, feedback, age, and experience and the relationship that it had on the dependent variable of teacher efficacy in the delivery of Reading Common Core Georgia Performance Standards. This chapter highlights the finding within the study, states the conclusion, and identifies the implications and recommendations for the study.

Findings

The researcher’s intent was to study factors that affect the teacher’s efficacy in the delivery of Reading Common Core Georgia Performance Standards. The data were collected through surveys, classroom observations, interviews, and focus groups. The quantitative survey was collected from 32 individuals to teachers that delivered Reading CCGPS standards to students in grades K-5. Using the Pearson Correlation, the researcher determined the relationship between experience, age, and instructional support, professional development, and feedback. It was determined that there was a significant relationship between the age of the teacher and instructional support received
in literacy. Data analysis by analysis of variance with a post hoc test showed that there was a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions of the instructional support provided between those in the age group 50 and older and the 30-34 age group with the older group significantly higher in their perception. In addition, there was a significant relationship between instructional support and the feedback received from the administrative team.

The impact of professional development varied from the district to the school level. According to the administrator, the teachers and the instructional coach were instrumental in the implementations of school level professional development. Survey results showed that 82% of the participants agreed that, based on the professional development from the instructional coach, they could use a variety of assessments techniques to explicitly meet the academic needs of students. During the focus group, the teachers express that the most impactful professional were those that were hands on and interactive in format. In addition, the administrators believed that clear examples are important because they give teachers a clear example of the expectations. During the qualitative data collection, most of the participants identified the most effective professional development as being one that allowed them to unpack and understand standard at the school level during Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.

During the focus group interview, a teacher acknowledged the fact that the district offered professional development; however, the concern was that they were disconnected from each other. Both administers mentioned the professional learning platform that was used for trainings and workshops; however, they were not able share how it supports the
learning within their school. One administrator was not sure of all of the courses offered that would help support teachers at the district level. In addition, one participant shared that they felt that the district struggled with helping teachers to engage in rigor that common core puts forth.

According to one of the themes identified, teacher efficacy related to teachers displaying ownership and willingness to grow. Of the participants, it was discovered that administrators and teachers within the study had contrasting views on displaying teacher efficacy. Teacher D said, “You know the saying we have something to my madness…yes! A method to my madness. Sometimes my method may look different from what your expectation is but if you sit back and observe you will see that it’s not that bad” (personal communications, School B, December 15, 2014). On the other hand, the administrator stressed the importance of teachers taking ownership over their students’ outcomes. Administrator 1 said the following:

Most people take their data and say that this is me, but there are some out liars to that. Some people see their data and say that this is not me at all, it's the kids and the blame is always shifted to the students first. Instead of what can I do to improve myself and improve instructional practice. (Personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014)

One of the variables, feedback, was researched throughout the data collection process. Based on administrative interviews and focus group interviews, it was discovered that there was a contrast in the perception of the way that feedback was given and received. Administrator 1 expressed, “Well I think the feedback from the
administrative staff is real and relevant because when we give feedback, it's not only based on um classroom observation and what we see in terms of practice but it's based on data” (personal communication, School A, December 16, 2014). The administrators thought that it was important to be clear and explicit when giving feedback to teachers. On the other hand, one teacher felt that the feedback from the administrator was not as useful as the feedback from the instructional coach. Teacher D noted, “… fortunately I was surrounded by great coaches and great support from that section” (personal communications, School B, December 15, 2014).

There were various sources of data collected to explore the resource variable. Data from the interviews, focus group, observations, and surveys allowed the researcher to triangulate the data to determine major themes. The findings showed that the district level and the school level resources differed greatly from each other. Administrator 1 felt that his/her role was, “to make sure that I am physically responsible by making sure that the teachers and the students get the resources that they need to support them in uh in the academic areas in reading and math” (Administrator 1, personal communications, School A, December 16, 2014). At the district level, the participants in the study identified the district units, sample plans, and scope and sequence as a resource that the district provide to support literacy instruction; however, the teachers also go to different county websites to assist them with sample units, lesson plans, and activities to teach the standards. At the school level, one administrator referred to the instructional coach as a resource for the teachers because they primarily pull resources, vet through materials, and
assist with lesson planning for Literacy. According to Teacher C, there was a sufficient amount of resources within the building.

The book room is an awesome resource. It is leveled and colored coded and widely available for use. The computers, the iPads…oh gosh, the iPads, and incoming kindles. And along with the bookroom the actual guided lessons that goes along with it…the teacher guide to help you hone in on those skills.

(Personal communications, School B, December 15, 2014)

During the classroom observations, it was evident that the resources were being used to help to teach the guided reading lesson. Out of the three classrooms that were observed, two of the three classrooms used the provide resources to deliver instruction in the area of literacy. During the lesson, the teacher distributed the text and told them to look for details to help answer questions about the information in the text. The students were reminded of the strategy to highlight and go back into the text to support their answers (Classroom observation B, school B, December 19, 2014).

**Conclusions and Implications**

The study researched the relationship between various variables that effected teacher efficacy and their preparedness to teach reading common core standards. Upon researching the data collected, there were several conclusions and implications within the study. Based on the age of the teacher, there was a positive and negative perception of instructional support. The higher the age group of the teacher yielded less of a need for instructional support in order to deliver instruction in literacy. The lower the age group of the teachers yielded more of a need for instructional support in order to deliver
instruction in literacy. Also, there was a strong relationship between the instructional support given to the teacher and the feedback given from the administrator. Based on the implication from these correlations of age to instructional support, leaders should consider age when addressing support in literacy.

There was a variation in views on professional development from the district level and the school level. Understanding that the instructional coach has been considered the key component of the delivery of professional development, it could be concluded that their support in unpacking and understanding the standard is important. It could also be concluded that giving teachers clear examples of the administrator’s expectations for instruction, is a component that should not be neglected. The implications were simply that the administrator should acknowledge the role of the instructional coach as a key player in a teacher’s efficacy of their preparedness to teach literacy.

The data showed that participants felt disconnected from the purpose of the district professional developments to the school professional developments. One administrator said the following:

They [the district] are looking at everything from 10,000 feet, but at the school we are able to really unpack, I guess, the standards, um as grade levels meet with the instructional coach during their common planning and then really um scaffold what the expectation is… (Administrator 1, personal communication, School A, December 16, 2015)

Based on the data, the researcher discovered that there was not a connection between the professional developments offered to the district versus the development that
was offered to the school. The district goals did not seem to be a consideration when addressing the school goals. Understanding that the professional development decisions were based on the direct needs of the teachers and students, some teachers still felt that the information gained from the district was not as useful as the information gained from the school. The implication that this has on leaders is that all resources within an organization should complement each other and provide overall support for all participants involved.

The contrast in the perception of ownership and willingness as a display of a strong teacher efficacy was addressed in the finding. It was concluded that the perception of the teachers idea of displaying ownership and willingness was more of a trust issue and was referred to as “…a method to my madness…but if you sit back and observe you will see that it’s not that bad” (Teacher A, personal communications, School B, December 15, 2014). The administrators placed the evidence in the data; however, acknowledging the outliers, it was still concluded that the question should be, “…What can I do to improve myself and improve my instructional practice?” As a leader, the implication would be to share with the members of the organization the evidence that is used to display ownership and willingness to grow. When members are clear about the evidence to monitor success, it makes it easier for all parties to begin with the same talking points.

It was concluded that the purpose and view of feedback should be clear for both the teacher and administrator. Although the administrator understood that feedback should be clear, real, and relevant, they should also ensure that it also received with that
intent. A comment from a teacher supported the idea that the way an administrator’s feedback was received was different from the way that an instructional coach’s feedback was received. Within the study, one of the administrators did mention the following:

I think that instruction support is a big piece of development, um and the school is always very open and flexible in giving that type of support with the instructional coach that person is able to go and not only observe on an informative playing field, but they can also give feedback, they can also model, they can provide additional resources, provide additional strategies. (Administrator 1, personal communications, School A, December 16, 2014)

The implication that this conclusion has on leaders is that all feedback should be considered when supporting teachers. The perception of the purpose can sometimes be unclear, so helping the teacher see the value in all feedback would assist them with how they apply to their instructional practices.

It was concluded that the administrators understood that it was their responsibility to ensure that funds were available to ensure that teachers had the necessary tools and resources to effectively deliver instruction. However, resources from the district were based on the needs of the entire organization while the resources from the school level were based on needs of the schools. The researcher concluded that district level resources, such as units, lesson plans, and scope and sequence, were not sufficient enough to support all of the teachers. According to the teachers, these resources tended to lack assessments, therefore forcing teachers to go outside of the district by using their units, plans, and assessments. Because the school level resources were specific to direct
needs of the school, with excitement, teachers quickly listed all resources available to them in the area of literacy instruction. The implication for leaders is to be intentional in making teachers aware of resources available at all levels. The leader should work to help teachers understand that district resources should be the primary source used for instruction because they are specific to the needs of and materials available in the district.

**Recommendations**

This study lends itself towards further research in the area of improving teacher efficacy in relationship to instructional support, professional development, and meaningful feedback. According to Bandura (1977),

Those who have a high sense of efficacy visualize success scenarios that provide guides and supports for performance. Those who doubt their efficacy visualize failure scenarios and dwell on the many things that can go wrong. It is difficult to achieve much while fighting self-doubt. (p. 118).

As a learning community, all members of the organization should be clear on the instructional expectations needed to accomplish student success.

I’ve learned that people will forget what you said,

people will forget what you did,

but people will never forget how you made them feel.

----Maya Angelou

This quote from Maya Angelou highlights the humanistic side of professional growth. It is important for leaders to remember that feelings ultimately can affect the efficacy of the classroom teacher.
Curriculum Resources Recommendations

1. Curriculum writers should align the district literacy unit and curriculum scope and sequence to the state unit plan.

2. To promote consistency, use of district resources (i.e., unit, lesson plans, pacing calendar, etc.) as a primary source for literacy instruction.

3. Streamline resources between the district and school, to ensure that materials and books are available for the full usage of the district units, lesson plans, and pacing calendar.

4. Along with literacy units and pacing calendars, curriculum developers should provide teachers with assessments for examples of assessing each standard.

5. To assist with the teacher’s understanding of the Reading CCGPS, curriculum writers should include the unpacking and repacking of each standard within the unit.

Professional Development Recommendations

1. Using the pacing calendar, professional development writers should include trainings specific to each unit.

2. Professional development writers should create modules or series of courses that assist teachers with unpacking and repacking of standards.

3. State, district, and school level administrators should collaborate to provide a systematic approach to supporting teachers with literacy instruction.

4. Districts should provide more opportunities for teacher and administrator collaboration among school clusters or regions.
5. District and school level should provide differentiated instructional support for teachers through small group and direct individual assistance by using the Professional Learning Community (PLC) model.

6. State, districts, and school administrators should consider Malcolm Knowles Theory of Adult Learning, when developing professional developments in literacy.

7. Districts and school level administrators should encourage peer coaching and modeling.

School Practice Recommendations

1. District and school level administrators should integrate their literacy instructional goals with state goals.

2. School level administrators should foster a Professional Learning Community (PLC) that includes administrators, instructional coaches, and teachers.

3. Regardless of age and experience, schools should capitalize on the instructional coach providing direct individual assistance.

4. State, district, and school level administrators should solicit ongoing feedback quarterly from teachers to ensure that their professional learning needs are being met.

5. To ensure the validity of the feedback from teachers, schools and districts should gather all feedback on a district created form.
6. District and school level administrators should follow-up with teachers and instructional coaches to ensure that adequate support is given to each teacher and improvement of teacher efficacy.

7. District and school level administrators should ensure that adequate training is given to assist teachers with the usage of materials, text, resources, etc.

8. The younger teachers need to have supervision that is more closely aligned to the Common Core standards to be perceived as useful or effective.

Policy Recommendations

1. To assist state, district, and school level administrators with the knowledge, skills, abilities, and dispositions needed to support teachers, engagement in professional learning should be required.

2. To assist with a streamline of support, instructional coaches should work directly with the district to align the strategic professional development plan with the overarching goals of the district and state.

3. State, district, and school administrators should provide an adequate amount of resources that are equitable across the state, district, and school.

4. State, district, and school level administrators should collaborate to monitor the implementation of professional learning into classroom practices.

5. Instructional coaches or teacher leaders should be primarily responsible for teacher development and their performance should be evaluated annually.
6. State, district, and school level administrators, should have a systematic approach to implementing their professional learning program to support teacher in literacy instruction and improve the teacher’s efficacy.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Examine the district level professional learning plan and compare it to the school level’s implementation of professional learning
2. Postsecondary education practices in preparing education to students to implement Reading CCGPS
3. Teacher perception towards both state, district, and school level professional learning and its effect on their instructional practice in literacy
4. Examine the state level professional learning and explore the collaboration between the district to ensure an effective implementation
5. Increase the sample amount of schools used within the study to determine areas of growth or strength within the district
6. Compare teacher efficacy of their preparedness to deliver Reading CCGPS among other districts
7. Impact of age and experience on efficacy of Reading CCGPS instruction

Summary

This study provided significant findings as it relates to teacher’s efficacy of their preparedness to deliver Reading CCGPS. The variables instructional support, professional development, feedback, resources, age, and experience were used to determine its effect on teacher’s efficacy. As a former teacher and instructional coach,
the researcher could validate the findings from both the administrator and teacher perspective. As a district, they have been very intentional in streamlining the professional development offered at the district level. The use of the MyPLC (Professional Learning Community) online platform to support teachers is a priority. While there are positive efforts towards supporting schools and teachers, there is still a need for collaboration between the district and school level administration to provide a systematic and streamlined approach to professional learning. Initiatives such as cluster planning and grade level planning should continue, in addition to using the instructional coach and teacher leaders as a primary vehicle to deliver instructional support. Aligning the districts efforts with the efforts of the state will assist with pacing and alignment of resources, units, and lesson plans.

The researcher identified significant findings, conclusion, and implications for leaders. In addition, recommendations were categorized as curriculum recommendations, professional development recommendations, school practice recommendations, policy recommendations, and recommendations for further research. The researcher will continue to advocate for a systematic approach to professional learning in the delivery of Reading CCGPS instructions and equitable access to resources at the state, district, and school level.
APPENDIX A

Teacher Survey

Teacher survey questions on the Teachers’ Self-Efficacy of their Preparedness in Relation to the Reading CCGPS Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicate the range of your years of experience.</th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>11-15 years</th>
<th>15+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicate the range of your age.</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT

1. Based on the instructional support from the administrative team, I can use a variety of assessment techniques to explicitly meet the academic needs of my students

2. Based on the instructional support from the administrative team, I can evaluate students’ work and provide explicit feedback based on the focus standard

3. Based on the instructional support from the administrative team, I can facilitate class discussions to deepen students’ understanding of the standard or skill
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Based on the instructional support from the administrative team, I can address all learning styles by differentiating the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Based on the instructional support from the administrative team, I can develop a standards aligned assessment rubric for performance task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Based on the instructional support from the administrative team, I can create cross curricular lessons and activities to teach the standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Based on professional development from the instructional coach, I can use a variety of assessment techniques to explicitly meet the academic needs of my students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Based on professional development from the instructional coach, I can evaluate students’ work and provide explicit feedback based on the focus standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Based on professional development from the instructional coach, I can facilitate class discussions to deepen students’ understanding of the standard or skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Based on professional development from the instructional coach, I can address all learning styles by differentiating the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Based on professional development from the instructional coach, I can develop a standards aligned assessment rubric for performance task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Based on professional development from the instructional coach, I can create cross curricular lessons and activities to teach the standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEEDBACK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Based on formal and informal feedback from the administrative team, I can use a variety of assessment techniques to explicitly meet the academic needs of my students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Based on formal and informal feedback from the administrative team, I can evaluate students’ work and provide explicit feedback based on the focus standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Based on formal and informal feedback from the administrative team, I can facilitate class discussions to deepen students’ understanding of the standard or skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Based on formal and informal feedback from the administrative team, I can address all learning styles by differentiating the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Based on formal and informal feedback from the administrative team, I can develop a standards aligned assessment rubric for performance task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree 1</td>
<td>Disagree 2</td>
<td>Neutral 3</td>
<td>Agree 4</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Based on formal and informal feedback from the administrative team, I can create cross curricular lessons and activities to teach the standard
Dear Colleague:

I am a doctoral student at Clark Atlanta University located in Atlanta, Georgia. As a part of my requirements for graduation, I am conducting a research study on “Teachers’ Self-Efficacy of their Preparedness in Relation to the Reading CCGPS Professional Development and the Implications for Leaders.” The purpose of the study is to investigate how teachers perceive the instructional support provided by district and school level administrators in implementing the Reading Common Core State Standards. I am requesting your permission to include you as a participant in this study.

The research will begin on 12/8/2014 and end on 12/19/2014. The research involves an interview that consists of approximately 9 questions. The interview will be recorded and transcribed. Words from participants will be reduced into significant statements. The statements will then be combined, or clustered, to formulate themes. These themes will be used to compose an essence of the mixed methodology study, summarizing the common experiences of the participants and detailing the overall meaning of the experiences. Please be as honest as possible in completing the survey. The interview will take approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

There are no known risks and/or discomforts associated with this study. The expected benefits associated with your participation are the opportunity to participate in a research study as well as the opportunity to share your experiences as an educator implementing the Reading Common Core State Standards. Additionally, your responses will help educational administrators identify and subscribe to practices that are most effective in supporting teacher instruction.

Your participation in the research is voluntary and you can withdraw from the study at any time. Your identity will be kept confidential and your name will not be associated with the research findings in any way. You will not be penalized or lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled if you decide that you will not participate in this research project. If you decide to participate in this project, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. You may additionally choose to skip any question you prefer not to answer.
By signing below, you are providing your informed consent to participate in the study. If you have any questions about this research study or your participation, feel free to e-mail me at Towanda.Harris@students.cau.edu or call me at (404) 246-4454. My Clark Atlanta University dissertation committee chair is Dr. Barbara Hill. She can be contacted at bhill@cau.edu or (404) 880-6126.

_________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Participant                        Date

Towanda Harris
Candidate for Doctor of Education
Clark Atlanta University
APPENDIX C

Administrator Interview Protocol

Administrator Interview on the Teachers’ Self-Efficacy of their Preparedness in Relation to the Reading CCGPS Professional Development

**General Questions Relating to Teacher Efficacy**

**DISTRICT LEVEL**

1. At the DISTRICT LEVEL, what professional development has been offered to teachers to assist with the understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

2. At the DISTRICT LEVEL, of the professional development in Reading CCGPS, based on your observation, what was most impactful and least impactful session in assisting with the teacher’s understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

3. At the DISTRICT LEVEL, what resources have the teachers received to assist you with understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

**SCHOOL LEVEL**

4. At the SCHOOL LEVEL, what professional development has been offered to teachers to assist with the understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

5. At the SCHOOL LEVEL, of the professional development in Reading CCGPS, what was most impactful and least impactful in assisting with the understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

6. At the SCHOOL LEVEL, what resources have you received to assist the teachers with understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

7. At the SCHOOL LEVEL, how has the feedback from the administrative team impacted your observation of the understanding and delivery of the Reading CCGPS?
TEACHER LEVEL

8. What are your thoughts about the statement, “IF MY STUDENTS DIDN’T LEARN IT, THEN THE TEACHER DID NOT TEACH IT?”

9. Instructional support directly effects improvement in teaching and learning. Is the SCHOOL LEVEL effective with direct individual assistance (one-to-one support) in meeting the teacher’s needs? Explain.

Prior to Interview:

1. Identify interviewee and essential background information about them.

   **Background Information on Interviewee**

   What is your job title?

   What primary functions does your job involve?

   How long have you been in the education field?

   What positions and amount of years have you been in since entering into education?

   How many professional development sessions do you prepare for your staff each semester?

   Are you the primary professional developer at your school site? If not, please identify the person.

Before Interview:

- Arrange date, time, and location of interview, explain aims of project
- Send interview questions ahead of interview
- Request permission for taping interview.
- Inform interviewee that a transcript will be provided for clarification and amendment.
- Check tape recorder

During Interview:

- At interview, provide background information to the project
- Re-confirm permission to record, confidentiality and transcript to be provided.
• Check tape recorder and conduct voice test.
• Throughout interview, take notes.
• At end of interview ask for consent form to be signed.
• Request permission to follow up issues by telephone/face-to-face/email.

After Interview:

• Write up contextual interview notes.
• Transcribe tape of interview.
• Write a letter of thanks to interviewee.
• Check and edit transcript.
• Send transcript to interview and ask to confirm/amend accordingly.
APPENDIX D

Focus Group Interview Protocol

Focus Group questions on the Teachers’ Self-Efficacy of their Preparedness in Relation to the Reading CCGPS Professional Development

DISTRICT LEVEL

1. At the DISTRICT LEVEL, what professional development has been offered to teachers to assist with the understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

2. At the DISTRICT LEVEL, of the professional development in Reading CCGPS, what was most impactful and least impactful session in assisting with the understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

3. At the DISTRICT LEVEL, what resources have you received to assist you with understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

SCHOOL LEVEL

5. At the SCHOOL LEVEL, what professional development has been offered to teachers to assist with the understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

6. At the SCHOOL LEVEL, of the professional development in Reading CCGPS, what was most impactful and least impactful in assisting with the understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?

7. At the SCHOOL LEVEL, what resources have you received to assist you with understanding and delivery of Reading CCGPS?
8. At the SCHOOL LEVEL, how has the feedback from the administrative team impacted your understanding and delivery of the Reading CCGPS?

TEACHER LEVEL

9. What are your thoughts about the statement, “IF MY STUDENTS DIDN’T LEARN IT, IT’S BECAUSE I DIDN’T TEACH IT”?

10. Instructional support directly effects improvement in teaching and learning. Is the SCHOOL LEVEL effective with direct individual assistance (one-to-one support) in meeting your needs? Explain.

Prior to Interview:

1. Identify interviewee and essential background information about them.

   Background Information on Interviewee

   What is your job title?

   What primary grade level do you teach?

   How long have you been in the education field?

   What positions and amount of years have you been in since entering into education?

   Have you taken on any leadership roles since you were a teacher? If so, what roles?

During Interview:

- At interview, provide background information to the project
- Re-confirm permission to record, confidentiality and transcript to be provided.
- Check tape recorder and conduct voice test.
- Throughout interview, take notes.
- At end of interview ask for consent form to be signed.
- Request permission to follow up issues by telephone/face-to-face/email.
After Interview:

- Write up contextual interview notes.
- Transcribe tape of interview.
- Write a letter of thanks to interviewees.
- Check and edit transcript.
- Send transcript to interviewees and ask to confirm/amend accordingly.
# APPENDIX E

Observation Log

Observer’s Name: ________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Name</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Date of Observation</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Comments (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School (circle one): A or B
## APPENDIX F

### Observation Form

**Teacher Name:** ________________  
**Grade Level:** ______  
**Date/Time:** ______/______  
**Duration:** __15 min.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of the Delivery of Reading Common Core Standards</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Instructional Planning  
- Explicit standards based objectives | The teacher continually seeks and uses multiple data and real world resources to plan differentiated instruction to meet the individual student needs and interests in order to promote student accountability and engagement. |
| Instructional Strategies  
- Use of best practices | The teacher continually facilitates students’ engagement in metacognitive learning, higher-order thinking skills, and application of learning in current and relevant ways. |
| Differentiated Instruction  
- Addresses the academic needs of all of the students during the lesson | The teacher continually facilitates each student’s opportunities to learn by engaging him/her in critical and creative thinking and challenging activities tailored to address individual learning needs and interests. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher consistently plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the differentiated needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher consistently promotes student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning, and to facilitate the students’ acquisition of key skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher continually challenges and supports each student’s learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher inconsistently uses state and local school district curricula and standards, or inconsistently uses effective strategies, resources, or data in planning to meet the needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher inconsistently challenges students by providing appropriate content or by developing skills which address individual learning differences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not plan, or plans without adequately using state and local school district curricula and standards, or without using effective strategies, resources, or data to meet the needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not use research-based instructional strategies, nor are the instructional strategies relevant to the content area. The strategies do not engage students in active learning or acquisition of key skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher does not challenge students by providing appropriate content or by developing skills which address individual learning differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Keys Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academically Challenging Environment - Provides rigorous instruction and practice throughout reading lesson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observer Notes:
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