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ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ON TEACHER EFFICACY

by
Michelle L. Pearce
Kennesaw State University, 2017

This study sought to examine the effects of instructional leadership behaviors on teacher efficacy. The body of literature examined influenced the nature and implementation of this study. Previous studies were used to shape the lens of this body of work. The focus was at the elementary level examining the perceptions of principals and teachers. The two forms of instrumentation included the Principal Instructional Rating Management Scale developed by Phillip Hallinger and used in similar studies cited in this work. The teachers completed the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale based on the work of Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy. The perceptions of participants were examined through these surveys with an additional open-ended question to provide a qualitative piece. Examination of the results was through a Multiple Regression Analysis including the variables of gender and years of experience. Although the results did not indicate a significant impact of instructional leadership on teacher efficacy, recommendations were made for school administrators, teachers and education programs to increase the perception of teacher efficacy.

A significant finding of this study was shown by the qualitative questions included on the two survey instruments. The teachers and principals had strong feelings on the behaviors that impacted efficacy the most. They held beliefs about why these behaviors and actions were significant to their efficacy.
The findings of this study should add new dimensions to the educational research on instructional leadership and teacher efficacy. It should serve as an impetus for educators to examine their practice and craft with respect to instructional behaviors and their effects on efficacy. It should increase the reflection of leaders on their impact on teacher efficacy.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

It is school leaders, such as principals, who by the nature of their positions perhaps have the greatest influence upon teacher efficacy, and the levels of confidence exhibited by faculty when teaching science to elementary school children. (Clark, 2009, p. 6). Only a handful of studies examine, either exclusively or as part of a larger analysis, the influence of the school principal (including the use of instructional leadership practices) on the efficacy beliefs of teachers (Hoy & Tarter, 2011). Therefore, instructional leadership and its impact on teacher efficacy will be investigated in this study. It will seek to further the body of literature that addresses this topic with a focus on elementary teachers’ and principals’ perceptions. A greater understanding of the effect between instructional leadership practices and teacher efficacy beliefs (and the indirect relation with student achievement) may be valuable to those who develop, provide, and evaluate leadership preparation, accreditation, and certification programs (Rew, 2013, p. 5).

Statement of the Problem

The problem to be addressed in this study is how the instructional leadership could possibly effect teacher efficacy. Teacher perceptions regarding how building leaders influence their efficacy will be examined. The information gleaned through this process will assist in determining actions that affect teacher efficacy in a positive manner. The analysis will specifically focus on principals’ modeling and effective instructional strategies and teacher perceived efficacy. Current research on the influence of leadership on teacher efficacy is not conclusive and fails to include specific traits and actions that are considered positive. Current literature lacks multiple studies at the elementary level. Further research at this level will add to
the studies that investigate the impact of instructional leadership on teacher efficacy. The review of literature also found the majority of research contains either quantitative or qualitative method. Conclusions from similar studies suggest the need for replication and further examination of the problem.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine what impact instructional leadership has on teacher efficacy. The study will use quantitative and qualitative measures to analyze principal perceptions of leader actions and their impact on perceived teacher efficacy. Results of the analysis will be used to indicate if there is an effect between these two factors.

Theoretical Framework

Self-Efficacy and Social Cognitive Theory

Self-efficacy and Social Cognitive Theory, terms defined and developed by Albert Bandura for decades, will serve as the theoretical framework for this study. Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as the belief in one’s personal capabilities. People with high self-efficacy have specific characteristics and demonstrate certain behaviors that would serve well in the teaching profession. Bandura (1997) identifies these as: 1) the ability to think soundly; 2) exhibiting high aspirations; 3) the ability to set difficult challenges and meet them; 4) to visualize successful outcomes; 5) the ability to motivate themselves to set goals and develop a plan of action; 6) able to attract support from others; and 7) are interested and committed in what they do.

Self-efficacy is grounded in Social Cognitive Theory. Bandura (1986) explains Social Cognitive Theory as changes in human behavior through observation. The conceptual lens of this theory will be applied to teacher self-efficacy in this study.
Instructional Leadership

The work of Phillip Hallinger will serve as the Instructional Leadership Framework for this study. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) authored by Hallinger (1982) measures principal management functions. The PIMRS instrument has been validated as an instrument providing reliable results in studies of school leadership. The PIMRS assesses three dimensions of the instructional leadership construct: Defining the School’s Mission, Managing the Instructional Program, and Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). The elements of this scale will be used to assess how school principals perceive their effectiveness of instructional leadership.

Research Questions

1. How do school principals perceive the effectiveness of their instructional leadership?
2. How do teachers perceive their efficacy in teaching?
3. Does instructional leadership have an impact on teacher efficacy?
Significance of the Study

Teachers are expected to face challenges relating to the student differences in each classroom, the range of ability levels, behaviors, intrinsic motivation, and the values surrounding the educational environment. These challenges and obstacles can overwhelm and defeat even the most veteran of teachers. Studying the impact of instructional leadership on teacher efficacy will provide insight into the effectiveness of exhibiting certain leadership behaviors and their influence on efficacy.

Rew states, “Until additional studies examine the relation between instructional leadership practices and teacher efficacy beliefs, questions will remain concerning how school principals use instructional leadership practices to enhance the efficacy beliefs of their teachers as well as to improve classroom instruction and student achievement (2002, p. 2). This study will add to the limited research in this field by providing evidence in response to this issue. Research in this study seeks to provide a deeper understanding of this impact. By using two scales, one to measure teacher efficacy and one to measure instructional leadership, findings will provide crucial insight on the effect of instructional leadership on teacher efficacy. It seeks to provide an outline specific actions and behaviors that will allow leaders to impact teacher efficacy in a positive manner.

Definitions of Terms

In an effort to clarify meaning and understanding of this study, the following definition of terms will be used to define language used throughout this research.

Domains of Leadership Practice: Domains of leadership practice are those instructional leadership functions of school administrators’ specific to day-to-day operations, based on Hallinger (1982, 1983, and 1990).
**Instructional Leadership**: Hallinger and Murphy (1985), refer to instructional leadership as the influence of leaders on teaching and learning through actions associated with identifying the school’s mission and vision, motivating staff to meet goals, and coordinate classroom-based approaches toward school improvement.

**Instructional Leadership Functions**: Within the framework developed by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) are ten Instructional Leadership Functions. Functions were adapted from the PIRMS instrument for the purposes of this study.

**Leadership Practice** (leadership behavior): Constituted in the interactions of leaders, followers, and their school’s situation or context in the execution of a particular leadership task (Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004).

**Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS)**: A survey instrument originally designed by Phillip Hallinger (1982) to provide a profile of a principal’s instructional leadership across ten functions of leadership to measure the frequency of instructional leadership practices (Hallinger 1982, 1983).

**Teacher Efficacy**: Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as the belief in one’s personal capabilities. For the purposes of this research teacher efficacy refers to the teacher’s belief in his or her capabilities to teach effectively.

**Summary**

As stated, the purpose of this study is to determine what impact instructional leadership has on teacher efficacy. The findings of the study will assist leaders in determining which leadership actions will increase teacher efficacy; therefore, having an impact on student achievement. The nature of the study will provide both qualitative and quantitative results.
adding to the literature contained in this field. The results have the potential to lead principals in a positive direction for promoting teacher efficacy and a positive school climate.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

This chapter comprises an overview of the study, including an introduction to the topic, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, the research questions, and definitions of terms associated with the study. Chapter II will be a review of the literature used to inform this study. Chapter III will offer detailed information about the research design and methodology, including a description of the participants, instruments, collecting data, conducting the statistical analysis to answer the research question, and a summation. Chapter IV will be a presentation of the research findings. Chapter V will be a report that entails a discussion on the conclusions, recommendations, and implications drawn from the study.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Several studies have been examined in the review of literature related to the effects of instructional leadership on teacher efficacy. These studies have provided insight into this topic and provided groundwork to begin the proposed study. The designs and research from these studies have helped to shape this proposal and to develop the research questions needed to provide additional findings to contribute to the body of research already available on this topic.

Sources of Current Literature

The review of current literature began with a search on the topic of teacher efficacy and leadership. Articles were carefully selected from journal holdings within the institution library resources. These journal articles were reviewed and cross-referenced leading to a search within ProQuest dissertations for related studies.

Organization of the Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to determine what impact instructional leadership has on teacher efficacy. The literature reviews included provide previous research studies related to this study. Therefore, the topics covered in the literature review will be divided into the following sections:

Leaders’ Perception of Instructional Leadership
Teachers’ Self-Perception of Efficacy
Leadership and Teacher Efficacy - K-12 studies
Leadership and Teacher Efficacy - Middle School studies
Leadership and Teacher Efficacy – International Studies
Leadership Efficacy – A study of principals

Self-perception

Teachers’ education background and their perception

Teachers’ gender and their perception

**Leaders’ Perception of Instructional Leadership**

Marshall (2005) believes, “Stakeholders perspectives need to be evaluated to determine effective leadership strategies” (p. 30). Her research sought to examine principals’ perception of instructional leadership strategies. The study examined the perceptions of middle school principals and teachers. The instrument used was the Principals’ Instructional Management Rating Scale developed by Philip Hallinger (1985).

The findings of the study found, “The principal behavior that received the highest percentage rate of almost always from principals and identified as most important in influencing instructional practices was recognizes students who do superior academic work with formal rewards such as the honor roll or mention in the principals newsletter, as identified in Item 68 of the PIMRS” (p. 82). In addition to this, there are five leadership behaviors that were reported as important instructional leadership behaviors performed by principals either almost always or frequently by 100% of the principals (p. 86). These five instructional leadership behaviors are:

- use data on student academic performance when developing the school’s academic goals,
- set high standards for the percentage of students who are expected to master important instructional objectives,
- encourage teachers to start class on time and teach to the end of the period,
- make known what is expected of students at different grade levels,
- support teachers when they enforce academic policies.
Johnson (2004) conducted a study that examined several research questions one of which held the purpose of determining the relationship between principals’ perceptions of the relative importance of instructional leadership functions and student achievement (p. 8). He believed,

“Principals of schools in the days before accountability and standards did not have to focus on instruction, as this was viewed as the teacher’s job. Instead, principals managed tasks, which are more visible, traditional, and easier to accomplish than those related to instructional leadership” (p. 4).

This study used a questionnaire developed by the researcher to examine principal behaviors. For the purpose of this study, the functions and behaviors examined were:

**Instructional Leadership Behaviors:**

1. Conducts formal classroom observations.
2. Conferences with teachers and provides feedback.
3. Maintains visibility.
6. Monitors student progress.
7. Supports and fosters collaborations among teachers.

**Instructional Leadership Functions:**

1. Establishes and communicates school goals.
2. Uses data when making curricular decisions.
3. Coordinates, supervises, and evaluates curriculum.
4. Promotes the professional development of teachers.
5. Communicates high standards for student academic achievement.
6. Protects instructional time.

In another study, findings suggest that the frequency with which principals engage in specific instructional leadership behaviors is related to student achievement and principals’ perceptions of the relative importance of instructional leadership functions is related to specific independent measures (p. 13). Chester and Beaudin (1996) pointed out in their study that besides “the timing and frequency of feedback, the focus of the feedback is also an important aspect of the findings regarding supervisor observations” (Chester & Beaudin, 1996, p. 252). New teachers, in particular, appreciate feedback that aims at validating their effectiveness or improving their instructional practices. The absence of such feedback, according to Chester (1992), may engender in them feelings of anxiety and uncertainty, and this may have a negative influence on their self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Being told they have put up a credible performance as a teacher, or rewarded with the perception that they have been accomplished in their teaching has the effect of boosting teachers’ self-efficacy, especially if this “success is achieved on difficult tasks with little assistance or when success is achieved early in learning with few setbacks” (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy & Hoy, 1998, p. 229). Bandura (1997) described these as mastery experiences, and they wield the greatest influence on new teachers’ sense of self-efficacy (Mulholland & Wallace, 2001). Besides mastery experiences, teachers’ sense of efficacy may also be boosted by vicarious experience of watching other teachers teach, particularly those who are considered effective teachers (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007).

**Teachers’ Perception of Self-Efficacy**

There is a great deal of empirical evidence indicating that teachers' sense of self-efficacy has a critical effect on the quality of teaching and on students' achievements (Plourde, 2002;
Teachers’ sense of self-efficacy is defined as "beliefs in one's capability to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations" (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Teachers' self-efficacy has been found to be positively related to teaching effectiveness, pupils' achievements, and the rate of burn-out among teachers (Friedman, 2003; Plourde, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2007).

Some findings suggest that, teachers’ self-efficacy increases during teacher preparation and student teaching, and falls during first year of teaching (Rushton, 2000; Woolfolk Hoy & Spero, 2005). The decline of self-efficacy among first year teachers, according to Chester and Beaudin (1996), may not be all-embracing. Chester and Beaudin’s (1996) findings are particularly interesting when juxtaposed with research which suggests that teachers in high performing schools have a stronger sense of efficacy compared to their fellow teachers in middle or low performing schools (Chong et al, 2010), for the teachers that participated in Chester and Beaudin’s (1996) study came from schools with challenging contexts. Some research also suggests that teachers experience greater efficacy teaching high performing students than middle or low performing students (Raudenbush, Rowan & Cheong, 1992). It indicates as well that teachers’ sense of self-efficacy varies from subject to subject; they may feel more effective teaching mathematics than language arts (Bandura, 1997). Their sense of efficacy may also depend on the kind of students they deal with. They may feel more competent working with students who are better behaved.

Leadership and Teacher Efficacy - K-12 studies

Howard Ebmeier (2003) conducted a study designed to test a model that describes how supervision works in schools to influence teacher efficacy and commitment. “The purpose of the study was to investigate possible linkages among teacher efficacy, teacher commitment, teacher
supervision, and a defined set of organizational variables (confidence in the principal, commitment to the building’s goals, satisfaction with working conditions, confidence in peers)” (Ebmeier, p. 113). The study included K-12 teachers working full-time in a Midwestern metropolitan area. Students enrolled in a master’s degree program at a Midwestern State University collected the 50-item questionnaire surveys from 1993-1998. A structural equation model was established called the calibration data set and an additional validation data set was established in order to validate the model. The commitment and trust scales used in the study were derived from the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument. “Because this study focused specifically on the supervision process, appropriate questions from the original instrument were extracted and reformatted into four new scales” (p. 125). The four scales fell into the following categories: personal efficacy and external influences, active principal supervision, principal support of teaching, and satisfaction with working conditions. The data collected from the survey questionnaires was analyzed using Cronbach’s Reliability and Structural Equation Modeling. The analysis was conducted in five stages. The first consisted of collecting calibration and validation samples. During this stage, those surveys with unusual characteristics were eliminated. The second stage combined multiple indicators in order to reduce the number of questions presented to respondents. A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in the third stage to establish the model. In the fourth stage, the calibration sample was fitted to the hypothesized model to establish goodness of fit. Finally, the established model was cross-validated against the validation model to complete the fifth stage.

“The goal of the investigation was to begin to understand through path analytic modeling, how principal supervision of teachers influences individual teacher efficacy and commitment, and what organizational influences play a collateral role in this process” (Ebmeier, p. 113).
Findings indicate the major influences on teacher efficacy beliefs are initially based on four sources of information (Ebmeier, p. 113-114.). The first is mastery experiences. As teachers gain experience and master tasks, teacher efficacy is raised which will increase proficient performance in the future. Second, physiological arousal occurs throughout performance. The levels of arousal occur through anxiety or excitement. They are attributed to internal controllable causes, not luck or context. Third, vicarious experiences influence teacher efficacy. These experiences determine the extent that a teacher can learn from others. This can occur through observation and increased skills through collaboration with others. The final influence based on the research findings is verbal persuasion. Since it is believed that risk-taking performances increase teacher efficacy, receiving specific encouraging performance feedback increases the level of risks taken by teachers. Ebmeier’s research contributed affective findings to the topic of leadership impact on teacher efficacy. He indicates that future studies could be conducted on observable behaviors not just attitudes. This study provided findings in relationship to the attitudes affecting teacher attitudes. It was based on a specific model of supervision that influences teacher efficacy. Like this study, the proposed study would seek to contribute to the body of research that helps define what impacts teacher efficacy; however, the research design and instrumentation would be different. The proposed study would also focus on observable instructional leadership behaviors.

Another K-12 study conducted by Amy Mullins Sallee (2014), focused on the impact of the principal on teacher efficacy in a relationship between principal and teacher. “The purpose of this study was to examine the nature of the relationship between followers’ perception of their relationship with leaders and teacher efficacy in a school setting” (Sallee, p. 30). This study was conducted in a rural school district in Virginia and encompassed data collection from fourteen
schools. Three high schools, one is a vocational school, one is classified as a middle school, and nine elementary schools are located in this school district. There are approximately 300 teachers in the school district. This particular study included all teachers and principals in the system. The instrumentation included in this mixed methods correlational study was the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale with additional open-ended questions and the LMX-7 questionnaire.

Three research questions were examined within this study. The findings for the first question revealed, “While the relationship between the perception of the quality of the leader-follower relationship and teacher efficacy was positive, the strength of the relationship was definite, but weak” (Sallee, p. 63). The second question addressed the perception of the quality of the leader-follower relationship based on several factors. Those factors include school level, teachers’ years with current leader, size of school, gender of teacher, teachers’ years of experience, principals’ years of experience as leader, or gender of principal (p. 64). “The null hypotheses were retained for all variables, except teacher’s years of experience” (p. 64). For the third research question, participants answered two open-ended questions and responses were qualitatively analyzed. “The qualitative results revealed five themes that principals could utilize to promote high-quality relationships and enhance teacher efficacy. Those themes include: communication, support and encouragement, visible involvement, professionalism and respect, and promoting teachers as professionals” (p. 65).

These results indicate that the teachers participating in the study feel they have high-quality relationships with their principal. In addition, these results indicate that the teachers have a sense of teacher efficacy. The results of this research provide further evidence that additional research on this topic could help refine implications for leaders on their behaviors and how they
impact teachers’ sense of efficacy. The similarities between this study and the proposed study include the use of the TSES scale.

In their study, Chester and Beaudin (1996) established that new teachers, in particular, experience greater sense of self-efficacy if their supervisor observes them multiple times, and gives them frequent feedback on their performance. This corroborates Bandura’s (1997) view that verbal persuasion, which takes the form of specific feedback about a teacher’s performance and ‘pep talks’ influences self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1986), the effectiveness of persuasion depends on the credibility, trustworthiness, and expertise of the persuader. Although verbal persuasion can convince one to attempt new strategies and try hard to succeed, exhortations to work harder can also exacerbate low self-efficacy, especially if the individual does not have the required skills to perform well on a particular task (Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

**Leadership and Teacher Efficacy - Middle School studies**

A study conducted by Jeffrey Walker (2009) focused on the impact of principal leadership behaviors and efficacy of middle school teachers. The researcher suggests that principals must understand how their behaviors and personal characteristics influence teacher self-efficacy in order to impact teachers positively (p. 1). The quantitative study consisted of 366 middle school teachers in a mid-Atlantic state. The instrumentation consisted of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale long form with additional demographic questions. The researcher created his own questions, also on a likert-type scale, to examine eleven principal behaviors. Their findings suggest that, “teacher efficacy is significantly affected by the principal behaviors based on years of teaching experience” (pg. 46).

Three principal behaviors were found to significantly impact teacher efficacy amongst the entire group: modeling instructional expectations, communication, and providing contingent
rewards. The most significant was modeling instructional expectations. Teachers expect leaders to believe in the work that they do and to be able to talk to them about their classroom practice. “When principals demonstrate their belief in the instructional process and participate in that process with teachers, efficacy increases” (p. 114). The next most influential principal behavior to impact the whole group was communication. Teachers defined communication as, “establishing strong lines of communication with and among teachers. When the principal ensures that staff members know what is going on, teachers take ownership and work together toward common goals” (p. 114). The third principal behavior, providing contingent rewards, was found to have a negative impact on teacher efficacy. “Of the eleven principal behaviors in question, only three showed a statistically significant relationship to teacher efficacy. The combination of the involvement of the principal in the instructional program, increased levels of communication, and an understanding of how rewards influence teachers are essential for addressing the efficacy of an entire school staff” (p. 115).

Teacher efficacy is significantly affected by principal behaviors based on years of teaching experience. Whereas, newer teachers required more support and modeling from their principals, specifically providing clear guidance on expectations. “As teachers become more experienced, the modeling of instructional expectations remains important, but becomes secondary to increasing communication and the building of relationships between teacher and principal (consideration)” (p. 119). The efficacy of more experienced teachers was influenced by emotional factors such as inspiration and purpose. “Based on the responses of participants in this study, building teacher efficacy is a concept that must be approached differently when working with teachers across a wide range of experience levels” (p.119). Further results indicate that statistically significant findings were obtained in each of the demographic comparisons as well.
Empowering staff and monitoring and evaluating instruction were found to not be statistically significant for any group of participants. These two behaviors were identified as allowing teachers decision making opportunities and feedback on instructional strategies in the classroom. “This finding is surprising given the increasingly important value placed on shared decision making and accountability in schools” (Walker, p. 129).

This study ascertains, “A principal’s influence on teachers extends beyond matters relating directly to curriculum and assessment, and permeates the individual teacher’s belief system and confidence in the classroom” (Walker, p. 50). It contains some similar components with the proposed study. The proposed mixed methods study would expound on the findings from the Teacher Self-Efficacy scale to provide deeper findings to contribute to the body of literature already available.

Another study completed by Tamela Horton (2013) examined the effect between teachers’ sense of efficacy and perceptions of principal instructional leadership behaviors in high poverty schools. The instrumentation used was the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale and the Principals’ Instructional Management Rating Scale. Two hundred and seventy-eight middle school teachers in low, middle, and high income schools in two metropolitan Nebraska school districts were participants in this study. The findings of this study indicated that principal leadership behaviors do impact teacher self-efficacy in high poverty schools. Given the influence of teacher self-efficacy on student achievement outcomes this finding is significant (p. 92). Consistent with prior research regarding the relationship between variables across three scales: teacher efficacy, teacher efficacy for instructional strategies and teacher efficacy for classroom management (Hipp & Bredson, 1995; Walker & Slear, 2011; Ware & Kitsantas, 2007), this study found the
principal behaviors of framing school goals and communicating school goals were significant predictors of teacher efficacy (p. 93).

Research question one examined whether teacher sense of efficacy could be predicted by the ten variables contained in the Principals’ Instructional Management Rating Scale. “The variables, frames the school goals and communicates the school goals, were found to be significant predictors of teacher self-efficacy, with frames the school goals being the more significant predictor” (Horton, p. 93). The second research question contained in this study whether teacher sense of efficacy for instructional strategies could be predicted by same ten variables contained in the rating scale. “Analysis of the variables in research question two found both frames the school goals and communicates the school goals to be significant predictors of teacher efficacy for instructional strategies. Frame the school goals was the more significant of the two variables” (p. 94). Using these same variables, another research question examined whether teacher sense of efficacy for classroom management could be predicted. The results for this predictor yielded frames and communicates school goals as significant predictors for teacher efficacy. Finally, the variables in the PIMRS instrument were found to have no evidence of a significant relationship on student engagement (p. 95).

This study used the same instrumentation as the proposed study; so replication could yield results that provide supporting evidence for these variables. The proposed study would be at a different levels and would also include the views of elementary principals as well as encompass the views of teachers at schools with varied demographics.

The purpose of McFarland’s study (2014) was to investigate perceptions of instructional leadership behaviors of principals on self-efficacy for teachers through a qualitative lens. He interviewed eight participants that taught remedial education in 6-11 grades. The Teacher Self-
Efficacy Scale (TSES) short form was used in the preliminary identification of the participants. Interviews consisted of the research questions using a guided protocol that allowed for open-ended responses. “Participants selected the following three behaviors as the most influential on their own efficacy levels: (1) provides a supportive work environment, (2) articulates a shared mission and vision, and (3) communicates high levels of expectations” (McFarland, p. 133). Participants were then asked to select from a list of behaviors that negatively impacted their sense of teacher efficacy. No specific stand-alone behavior was identified; however, “there was a perception that any of the behaviors could be perceived to be negative by teachers” (p. 140).

The findings in this study led McFarland to suggest that principals could make the working environment of teachers as pleasant as possible to increase their sense of teacher efficacy. He found this conclusion to be consistent with the suggestion that teachers possess higher efficacy levels in schools that have an environment in good condition (Lambeth, 2008; Rimm-Kaufman & Sawyer, 2004). This hypothesis is similar to the hypothesis of the proposed study. It has the same instructional leadership framework and seeks to add findings to this body of work. However, the levels are different as well as the research method. The proposed study would have a mixed method approach that will broaden the scope of the findings and add more to the findings currently available.

Leadership and Teacher Efficacy – International Studies

Çalik, Sezgin, Kavgaci, & Kilinç, (2012) conducted research that examined the relationships between school principals’ instructional leadership behaviors and self-efficacy of teachers and collective teacher efficacy. The researchers developed a model based on hypothesis to determine the relationships among variables. The study sample included 328 classroom teachers working in primary schools in Ankara, Turkey. Data for the research was
collected using the Instructional Leadership Scale, the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, and the Collective Efficacy Scale. Structural Equation Modeling was performed to test the model.

The results of this study showed that the highest level of impact was between the evaluation of teacher process and students, a dimension of instructional leadership, and teachers’ self-efficacy for using instructional strategies. The researchers found, “teachers’ self-efficacy plays a mediator role between instructional leadership and collective teacher efficacy. As a result, it can be asserted that self and collective efficacy of teachers increase depending on the instructional leadership they perceive” (Calik, et al., p. 2500). “When the school principals demonstrated instructional leadership behaviors, teachers’ perceptions about their own self efficacy grew stronger. They saw themselves more sufficient in educating and teaching the students, and they made a great effort for this purpose” (Calik, et al., p. 2501).

Based on these findings, future studies were suggested by these researchers. The proposed study would also focus on the dimensions of instructional leadership contained in the PIRMS Scale and how they influence teacher efficacy. The participants would also be from the elementary level using the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale. The differences would be the leadership scale and the cultural differences between the countries of the studies.

The purpose of the study conducted by Duyar, Gumus, and Bellibas in Turkish middle schools (2013) was to investigate whether teachers’ self-efficacy and job satisfaction could be predicted by the instructional and leadership practices of principals. The multilevel data included 178 schools/principals and 2,967 teachers. Two-level Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) method was used to investigate whether principals’ leadership and teachers’ collaboration predict teacher self-efficacy and teacher job satisfaction. “The findings showed that some select aspects of principal leadership and teacher collaborative practices significantly predict teachers’ self-
efficacy and job satisfaction at, within and across schools. Among all independent and control variables, teachers’ collaboration appeared to be the strongest predictor of both teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction” (p. 700). The study included the research question, “Do the managerial and instructional leadership practices of school principals significantly explain the variation in teacher self-efficacy and teacher job satisfaction within and across schools?” The findings reached through TALIS and HLM methodology indicate that, “select principal leadership actions played moderate yet significant roles on levels of teacher self-efficacy beliefs and job satisfaction” (pg. 713). The leadership actions fall into the category of direct supervision of instruction; specifically, observing classrooms, monitoring students’ work, and providing instructional suggestions. The authors conclude their work with the suggestion that future research should investigate the impact between and among the variables with a focus on principal leadership practices. Therefore, this study has had an impact on the proposed study. Although, the sample sizes and level of teachers would be different, they would similarly provide findings on the effects between the variables of principal leadership practices and teacher efficacy.

Joshua Rew (2013) believes the indirect relationship between instructional leadership practices and student achievement via efficacy beliefs is a valuable contribution to this field of literature. Only a handful of studies examine, either exclusively or as part of a larger analysis, the influence of the school principal (including the use of instructional leadership practices) on the efficacy beliefs of teachers (Hoy & Tarter, 2011). The objective of this study was to surmount the limitations of the previous studies and ascertain whether school principals using specific instructional leadership practices positively influence the efficacy beliefs of lower
secondary education teachers. The study examined the relation between instructional leadership practices and teacher efficacy beliefs in a sample of twenty-one countries that participated in the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) of 2007-2008. The sample consisted of twenty-one countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium (Flemish), Brazil, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Italy, Korea, Lithuania, Malta, Malaysia, Mexico, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, and Turkey. These countries represent different geographic regions (East and Southeast Asia, Europe, Central and South America, Middle East, and Oceania) and have moderately diverse national characteristics (such as national income, educational governance, and national culture). The teacher and school samples ranged from 1,142 teachers and 58 schools in Malta to 5,834 teachers and 380 schools in Brazil.

The objective of the analysis was to cross nationally estimate (1) the relations between three instructional leadership practices and teacher efficacy beliefs, (2) the instructional leadership practices as moderators of the relation between teacher characteristics and teacher self-efficacy, and (3) the influence of national characteristics on the relations between the instructional leadership practices, teacher characteristics, and teacher efficacy beliefs (p. 80). Findings confirm that goals and supervision have statistically significant impact on teacher efficacy beliefs, and one instructional leadership practice significantly moderates the relation between teacher collaboration and teacher self-efficacy (i.e., Instruction) (p. 81). These research findings positively support the hypothesis that instructional leadership practices influence teacher efficacy.

This research indicates that, “school principals may positively enhance the efficacy beliefs of their teachers and, indirectly, improve classroom instruction and the achievement of their students” (Rew, p. 26). These findings indicate the need for further research on this topic (p.
The proposed study will use similar components of this study on an elementary level without the international focus.

**Leadership Efficacy – Principal Studies**

Two researchers prominent in the field of teacher efficacy studies are Kenneth Leithwood and Doris Jantzi. Their research is based on the original works of Bandura, Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy and Hoy. Bandura (1997) self-efficacy’s most prominent theorist, claims that:

> People make causal contributions to their own functioning through mechanisms of personal agency. Among the mechanisms of agency, none is more central or pervasive than peoples’ beliefs about their own capabilities to exercise control over their own level of functioning and over events that effect their lives (p. 118).

Based on this definition and research, Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) state, “Efficacy is a key variable in better understanding effects in most organizations” (pg. 497). In order to examine efficacy beliefs these researchers and others have used efficacy scales to investigate the effect of leadership actions on teacher efficacy. 96 principal and 2,764 teacher responses to two separate surveys, along with student achievement data in language and math averaged over 3 years were analyzed using path analytic techniques in this particular study. The findings for this study were a part of a larger research project on successful leadership and the effect on student learning. Additionally this study focused on leadership efficacy rather than teacher efficacy. However, the methods were similar to other studies on this topic and were influential in shaping the proposed study. In addition the work of Bandura, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk and Hoy provided the conceptual framework and foundation for studies on efficacy.

Stephen Keith believed, “It is a well-accepted principle in psychology that behaviors are a reflection of beliefs. Principals that have efficacious beliefs, as do teachers, should demonstrate
specific behaviors” (1989, p. 5). Therefore, he conducted a study on teacher efficacy and the relationship between elementary principal’s instructional leadership and self-perception of efficacy. The purpose of Keith’s study was to determine if there was a statistically significant impact on the identified variables relating to an elementary principal's feelings of efficacy and instructional leadership behaviors. This study was conducted in Virginia and the participants consisted of a random sampling of principals. The study concluded, “As a result of the findings in this study, the influence of a sense of efficacy also influenced a teacher's perceptions of the instructional leadership behaviors of principals” (p. 101). Keith also suggested that leadership style as it relates to effectiveness bears further investigation (p. 103). The proposed study will be similar in that the Principals Instructional Management Rating Scale will be part of the instrumentation. But in contrast, the proposed study would encompass instrumentation completed by teachers as well as principals. The findings will address specific instructional behaviors as in this study but have the additional component of teacher efficacy beliefs.

Based on previous research, Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy & Hoy (1998) argued that the principal plays a central role in raising or lowering the self-efficacy of the staff. A good principal is expected to emphasize and praise achievements, boost teachers’ confidence in the value of their work, allocate appropriate resources, allow freedom of instruction in the classroom, generate a learning atmosphere, and mobilize the staff to work towards a common goal. Several studies have shown that a high sense of teacher self-efficacy is associated with less pressure placed on teachers as well as management that is considerate of its teaching staff’s needs and welfare (Blase & Kirby, 2000; Ross, 1994).

As the principal is considered the leader at the school level, it is important to identify the management practices and leadership styles that enhance and those that impede teachers’ sense
of self-efficacy. (Kass, 2013, p. 208) Data analysis demonstrated that in two groups of teachers, the HSE (high self-efficacy) and the LSE (low self-efficacy) teachers, referred to five identical subcategories of management, but expressed opposing views about these categories. The five subcategories are *modes of communication, feedback from the principal, social atmosphere, strength of the principal, and shared values* (p. 213).

**Self-perception**

According to Bandura, self-efficacy is an effective qualification to the formation of behaviors and is described as “the judgement of an individual about the capacity of organizing and doing the activities which are necessary to show a particular performance successfully” (Bandura, 1986). The concept is expressed as self-efficacy perception, belief or judgement in the publications related with the concept of self-efficacy. For the purposes of this study, the “self-efficacy” will be adopted.

There is no question that biases exist in people’s self-perceptions (Dunning, Heath, & Suls, 2004). Biases are present in all aspects of self-perceptions, from self-views of skills and abilities (Kruger & Dunning, 1999) to personality traits (Back & Vazire, 2012; John & Robins, 1994; Vazire, 2010). Self-biases lead to both overly positive self-views (i.e., self-enhancement) and overly negative self-views (i.e., self-diminishment). On average, people tend to self-enhance, for example, reporting that they are more charitable, fairer, better drivers, and better teachers than their peers and colleagues (Alicke, 1985; Cross, 1977; Epley & Dunning, 2000; Messick, Bloom, Boldizar, & Samuelson, 1985; Sedikides, 1993; Svenson, 1981; Van Lange & Sedikides, 1998). Findings suggest that not only do people report their self-views are biased, but also, they are surprisingly accurate in these judgments. Although people may be biased in their self-perceptions, they are capable of tapping into more accurate self-perceptions when prompted.
Taken together, these findings provide support that people are moderately aware of the biases in their self-perceptions of their personality. (Bulloch, et. al, 2015).

John Roden (1998) succinctly pointed out a few of the most common pitfalls to surveys and questionnaires: problems getting a representative sample or a sample of the right size to reduce the margin of error; problems with nonresponse or getting responses primarily from those with strong opinions; problems with the right timing in gathering survey information without unanticipated negative interference from other events; and a whole gamut of problems with creating good questions so that respondents don't misinterpret them or deliberately inflate their responses.

**Teachers’ education background and their perception**

Teachers’ education preparation, retention rates, and experience all have implications for teacher perception. Thomas and Pederson (2003, p.1) state “Indications are that pre-service teachers beliefs, attitudes and practice may be linked to previous experiences”. Woolfolk Hoy and Kolter (2006) found that prospective teachers tended to increase in their personal sense of efficacy as a result of completing student teaching.

High teacher turnover rates impede teacher’s ability to gain the experience needed to increase their teaching capacity. Dillon observed that “With one-third of all novice teachers leaving the profession in three years and more than 40% leaving within five, some students rarely get the benefit of having an experienced teacher” (2009, p. 27). Teacher experience in the classroom influences the quality of education students receive.

Evidence of an impact between teacher self-efficacy, experience and teacher retention was found in a study by Coladarci (1992). The effects between teacher self-efficacy and teacher commitment to teaching was studied. The researcher commented that his study of these variables
augments research on teacher attrition by providing information that “Contributes to the current profile of teachers who are “at risk” of leaving the profession (e.g. Darling-Hammond, 1944)” (1992, p. 327). A random sample of 364 elementary Maine teachers participated in the study. The Gibson and Dembo (1984) instrument was used to measure teacher self-efficacy. A likert scale was developed to address teacher commitment. Regression analysis was used to measure the effect between the variables. A significant impact was found to exist between teacher self-efficacy and commitment to teaching. Coladarci observed that “Insofar as this outcome suggests a mechanism fostering teachers’ commitment to teaching, this finding similarly is encouraging to those concerned with offsetting teacher attrition” (1992, p. 334).

In a more recent study, Ware and Kitsantas (2007) also examined the effect between teacher self-efficacy and professional commitment to the job. The researchers used the Public School Teacher questionnaire (TQ) and the Public School Principal questionnaire (PQ) of the SASS 1999-2000 to examine the relationship between the variables (U. S. Department of Education, 2005). The national surveys were completed by 26, 257 teachers and 6, 711 principals who participated in the study. Exploratory factor analysis was used to develop three teacher efficacy scales. Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the effects between the three efficacy scales and teacher commitment. The researchers found an impact on teacher self-efficacy and professional commitment. Three areas of efficacy were related to professional commitment: a) efficacy to enlist administrative support, b) efficacy to influence decision making in the school, and (c) efficacy for classroom management. Ware and Kitsantas observed that “Given the teacher turnover rate, the present findings are significant for retaining teachers in the profession” (2007, p. 303).
A teacher’s educational level was shown to predict teacher self-efficacy; teachers with graduate degrees were more likely to have higher perceptions of teaching efficacy (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). However, the teacher characteristics of age, gender, and years of teaching experience did not impact perceptions of efficacy in a statistically significant way.

**Teachers’ gender and age and their perception**

Bhella’s (1982) study suggested that female teachers are more satisfied than male teachers. Also, teachers who are young are less satisfied than older teachers. It was found that those who did not like teaching resign before they reach older age groups. In their research of 80 women in secondary school principalships in Vermont schools, Duval and Carisen (1991) supported the Bhella’s findings that the overall level of job satisfaction is high; most are 40-60 years of age. They found that many women were vice-principals first and that their school faculties have more females, and myths and discrimination about women are still plentiful.

Smith (1999) concluded that male and female teachers do not differ in their motivation and job satisfaction. The current study suggests that teachers, whether male or female, have similar goals and needs. The gender of teachers does not appear to cloud the perception that the teachers have of the principal’s leadership style (p. 73). The study utilized quantitative methods to determine the effect of teacher perception of the principal’s leadership style and teacher motivation associated with the particular leadership style. The Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (1962) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (19771 were the two instruments utilized for data collection in this study.

The findings of this study contribute to the body of literature involving teacher perception and demographic characteristics. The results indicated the following: (a) The more democratic the leadership style, the higher the level of teacher motivation; (b) gender had no effect on
teacher motivation; (c) years of experience had no effect on motivation or job satisfaction; (d) gender had no effect on teacher perception of the principal's leadership style; and (e) years of experience had no effect on teacher perception of the principal’s leadership style. The principal’s leadership style is a key factor in teacher motivation. Principals who practice a democratic leadership style are more likely to have staffs with higher motivational levels. Teachers’ gender had no effect on their motivational level, job satisfaction, or perception of the principal’s leadership style. Finally, it may be concluded that the teachers’ years of service or years of experience had no effect on the teachers’ level of motivation (p. 73-74).

Based on the review of literature many researchers guarantee anonymity to teachers completing efficacy surveys; therefore, demographic information is often omitted. Goddard (2001) recommended the inclusion of teacher demographic data to determine the possibility of relative effects on teacher efficacy and collective efficacy. Teacher characteristics of experience, grade level taught, and gender were found to be related to teacher concerns about teaching, including self-survival, task concerns, and student impact concerns (Ghaith & Shaaban, 1999).

Kurz (2001) found that female secondary teachers reported a higher perception of teacher efficacy than did their male counterparts. Still other researchers concluded that preschool and elementary teachers believed more strongly that positive student outcomes were a result of their actions than secondary teachers did, and that teachers with more years of teaching experience maintained higher perceptions of personal teaching efficacy (Soodak & Podell, 1996).

**Summary**

The potential contributions of the proposed study are multi-faceted. Based on the review of literature examined, the proposed study would add to the findings already available. An exact replica of the proposed study was not found, but various studies with specific components of the
study clearly establish the need for additional findings that would be produced by the proposed study. In addition, very few studies were comprised of elementary level teachers from the United States and no studies were found in the southern region of the country. The findings from the proposed study could confirm previous findings while expanding the body of literature found on the impact of instructional leadership on teacher efficacy. Analyzing teacher efficacy from the perspective of instructional leadership will also narrow the findings into specific observable actions that principals could use to have a positive effect on teacher efficacy. Finally, looking at the topic from a mixed methods perspective will provide a deeper, richer, understanding of the perceptions of teachers on leadership behaviors.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The methodology for the proposed research study is outlined in this chapter. The research methodology has been designed to collect data in order to provide comprehensive responses to the research questions on the topic of perceived effects of leadership on teacher efficacy. A mixed methods approach has been carefully identified as the approach that will yield results that would add to the literature available regarding the effects of leadership on teacher efficacy.

Research Questions

1. How do school principals perceive the effectiveness of their instructional leadership?
2. How do teachers perceive their efficacy in teaching?
3. Does instructional leadership have an impact on teacher efficacy?

Research Context/Setting

Research will be gathered from a metro school district with a large number of elementary schools. Responses to surveys will be gathered from elementary level teachers and principals. Teachers will teach a range of ages from kindergarten through fifth grades. Principals will also supervise schools that serve kindergarten through fifth grades. Each principal that agrees to participate in the study will complete a principal survey. That principal will send the teacher survey to five teachers on his or her staff for completion.

Research Design

A mixed methods research design based on the work of John Creswell was utilized for this study. Mixed methods may be defined as “the collection or analysis of both quantitative and
qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are
given a priority, and involve the integration of the data at one or more stages in the process of
research” (Creswell, Plano, Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003, p. 212). Both principals and
teachers were given an electronic survey that contained multiple-choice and open-ended
questions designed to capture their perceptions on instructional leadership and efficacy. Analysis
of the data was conducted to examine specific perceptions between instructional leadership and
teacher efficacy. Using both quantitative and qualitative forms of data allows researchers to
simultaneously generalize results to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of interest
(Hanson, J. Creswell et. al, 2005, p. 224).

Participants

Participation in this study consisted of a random sampling of elementary school
principals and teachers through a survey presented in a voluntary, anonymous online format.
Participants included principals and teachers from schools located in a metro school district in
Georgia. The principal survey (PIRMS) was sent to the email addresses of 33 principals. They
were asked to complete the survey and send a teacher survey (TSES) to 5 teachers on their staff.
Responses from 29 principals and 109 teachers were collected.

Instrument(s)

Teacher efficacy has been studied widely and measured historically by self-administered
surveys and questionnaires, generally including a series of statements to which teachers’
responses, in Likert format, indicated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed
(Ross, 1994). This kind of research about efficacy relies on the teacher or respondent to self-report ideas based on a series of statements and their opinions about those statements (Kaminski,
p. 27). The TSES (Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale), used in this study, instructs respondents to
rate their own efficacy for each of three areas of teaching (i.e., classroom management, instructional practices, and student engagement). Respondents answer on a 9-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (nothing) to 3 (very little) to 5 (some influence) to 7 (quite a bit) to 9 (a great deal; for details, see Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). The long form of the TSES, comprised of 24 items, was used for the purposes of this study (see Appendix). This survey also contained open-ended questions about what instructional leadership strategy teachers consider to be most effective in impacting teacher efficacy.

The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) was given to elementary principals to measure instructional leadership. This particular scale was created in 1985 by Phillip Hallinger. This framework has been used for over thirty years to providing valid and reliable results. The scale measures instructional leadership across three domains consisting of: defining the school’s mission, managing the instructional program, and developing the school learning climate. The elements contained within those domains was examined to explore the impact of instructional leadership on teacher efficacy. The elements contained within the domain of defining the school’s mission are framing the school’s goals and communicating the school’s goals. The elements contained within the domain of managing the instructional program are supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, and monitoring student progress. The third domain, promoting a positive school learning climate, contains the elements of protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, and providing incentives for learning. This scale is measured through a likert-type scale as well. It also contains open-ended questions about what instructional leadership strategy teachers consider to be most effective in impacting teacher efficacy.
Data Collection Procedures

The process of data collection was through the use of anonymous, electronic surveys for all participants. Surveys were distributed through the use of individual email addresses of principals which allowed for easier collection and analysis of data. The data were collected and analyzed by the researcher. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Kennesaw State University. The data were kept confidential and participant anonymity was maintained throughout the study. To ensure anonymity and comply with the IRB requirements, the electronic data collection forms did not capture the Internet Protocol (IP) addresses of the participants. The study was also subject to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the school district in which the research was conducted. The same measures of confidentiality and anonymity applied with the specific guidelines of the district IRB process.

Method of Data Analysis

To analyze the collected data, a quantitative approach was employed using descriptive statistics of means and standard deviations to indicate the extent of the responses of principals and teachers. Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the impact of leadership instructional practices on teacher efficacy. Teacher variables such as gender and teaching experience were included as independent variables in the regression process to minimize their possible effect on teacher efficacy so that a truer picture of possible impact can be displayed. Qualitative data collected from open-ended questions from principals and teachers were examined separately by observing the emergence of similar themes and patterns of responses. All the responses were recorded and identified by the relevant key words and terms. They were then carefully tallied for their frequency of appearance. The most effective leadership instructional
practice that impacted teacher efficacy was then identified. All the principals’ and teachers’
effective narrations were coded for systematic categorization for analysis.

**Limitations**

Limitations to this study included responses from participants in one school system, the
willingness of the respondents to participate, and that only one level of education was examined.
The fact that only one school system was examined could be considered a limitation because of
the variance in demographics between and amongst school systems. Another limitation was the
number of respondents that did not participate. The other limitation that exists is the fact that the
study only encompassed the elementary level. Middle and high school levels of respondents
could have differing views.

**Summary**

In summary, the methodology of this research study was designed to add to the data
available pertaining to the topic of the effects of leadership on teacher efficacy. The data
collected from the responses to the survey questions provided sufficient information in support
of this study. The results of this study provided valuable information for leaders desiring to have
a positive effect on teacher efficacy. The methodology was designed to be reliable and valid
while diminishing the limitations to the greatest extent possible.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if the instructional leadership behaviors of principals have an impact on teacher efficacy. Instructional leadership behaviors were determined using the Principals Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) and teacher efficacy was measured using the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES). The population for this study consisted of 29 elementary school principal participants and 109 teachers serving kindergarten through fifth grade in a metropolitan school district of a southern state. Descriptive statistics of research participants were calculated for gender, years of experience, and highest degree earned. Multiple Regression method was used to measure the impact of principals’ perceived instructional behaviors on the teachers’ perceived efficacy.

Research Questions

This chapter presents the detailed findings and discussion of the analysis of data as guided by the following research questions:

1. How do school principals perceive the effectiveness of their instructional leadership?
2. How do teachers perceive their efficacy in teaching?
3. Does instructional leadership have an impact on teacher efficacy?

Study Participants

The population for this study included 7 male and 22 female principals. Their demographic data, the number of years as principal of their current school and the number of years as principal, were collected. The study also contained 5 male and 104 female elementary school teachers. Data concerning their years of experience and their highest degree earned were
also collected. Consent to conduct the research was obtained for each participating principal. Each participating principal sent the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale survey to 5 teachers in their building. Surveys were sent electronically to all participants using a web link.

**Description of Surveys**

The primary data collection instruments for this study were the Principals Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) and the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES). Both perception surveys employed a Likert-type scale. The Principal Instructional Management Rating scale was comprised of 5-point Likert-type scale rated as 1 = Almost Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Frequently, and 5 = Almost Always. The Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale was comprised of a 9-point Likert-type scale rated as 1 = Nothing, 3 = Very Little, 5 = Some Influence, 7 = Quite A Bit, and 9 = A Great Deal with an increment in between each labeled point. The survey was conducted on-line through a SurveyMonkey.com application and was intended not to exceed twenty minutes for participation.

**Principals Instructional Management Rating Scale**

The first part of the PIRMS survey consisted of demographic questions categorically arranged as follows: Question 1 asked for respondents’ years of experience working at current school (1 year, 2-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-15 years, 15 or more years); Question 2 required the total years serving as principal (1 year, 2-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-15 years, 15 or more years); and lastly, Question 3 requested the participant to indicate gender (male or female).

The second part of the survey consisted of 50 behavior statements designed to provide a profile of the principal’s leadership. The statements described principal job practices and behaviors. The survey contained three domains and was divided into ten sections to reflect the
10 functions of instructional leaders and contained 5 items per section. The domains were: defining the school’s mission, managing the instructional program, and positive school climate. The sections were as follows: I. Frame the School Goals; II. Communicate the School Goals; III. Supervise and Evaluate Instruction; IV. Coordinate the Curriculum; V. Monitor Student Progress; and VI. Protect Instructional Time; VII. Maintain High Visibility; VIII. Provide Incentives for Teachers; IX. Promote Professional Development; and X. Provide Incentives for Learning.

The third part of the survey was designed to ask open-ended questions allowing for a qualitative approach. The first question asked participants what instructional practice influenced teacher efficacy the most. The second questions followed up on the first by asking why. Participants were provided a text box in which they could provide whatever response they wished. The qualitative answers to the question were coded and analyzed for common themes and patterns.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale**

Similarly, Part One of the teachers’ survey consisted of demographic questions asked as follows: Question 1 asked for respondents’ gender (male or female); Question 2 inquired as to the years of experience working at current school and also asked for the participant’s total years of service (1 year, 2-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-15 years, 15 or more years); Question 3 required the participant to provide their highest degree earned (Bachelor’s, Master’s, Specialist, or Doctorate).

Part Two of the survey was designed to gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. They were asked to complete a 24 question survey to determine the extent of their beliefs on those indicators. The items were
broken into three domains: efficacy in classroom management, efficacy in instructional practices, and efficacy in student engagement.

The third part of the survey was designed to ask open-ended questions allowing for a qualitative approach mirroring the items asked of the principal participants. The first question asked participants what instructional practice influenced teacher efficacy the most. The second questions followed up on the first by asking why. Participants were provided a text box in which they could provide whatever response they wished. The qualitative answers were coded and analyzed for common themes and patterns.

**Demographic Data**

The demographic data contained in the surveys of the study formed the independent variables for this study. Inclusive in this list of variables were responses to questions on gender, years of teaching experience, the highest degree earned, and years of principal experience both at the current school and in total.

**Principals**

The PIRMS survey instrument captured demographic data from 29 elementary school principals. Of the 29 participants, 24.1% of the population were male, and 75.9% were female. The largest percentage of principals (48.3%) reported having between 5 to 15 years of principal experience. The majority of participating principals (51.7%) had been working at their schools from 5 to 9 school years. (See Table 1).
Table 1.

Participating Elementary School Principals Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Experience/Current School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Experience as Principal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years or more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers

The TSES survey instrument captured demographic data from 109 elementary school teachers. Of those teachers, 4.6% of the population were male (5 teachers), and 95.4% were female (104 teachers). The largest percentage of elementary school teachers (34.9%) reported having 2 to 4 years of teaching experience. The largest percentage of teachers held a master’s degree (48.6%). That percentage was closely followed by those holding a bachelor’s degree (42.2%). None of the respondents held a doctoral degree. (See Table 2.)
Table 2.

*Participating Elementary School Teachers' Demographic Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Degree Earned</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quantitative Data Analysis**

**Research Question 1**

How do school principals perceive the effectiveness of their instructional leadership?

This research sought to examine principals’ perception of their instructional leadership. Descriptive statistics were utilized to generate an answer to this question. The average mean score of each of the ten functions of instructional leadership (I. Frame the School Goals; II. Communicate the School Goals; III. Supervise and Evaluate Instruction; IV. Coordinate the Curriculum; V. Monitor Student Progress; and VI. Protect Instructional Time; VII. Maintain High Visibility; VIII. Provide Incentives for Teachers; IX. Promote Professional Development; and X. Provide Incentives for Learning) was calculated to ascertain the principals’ perceptions of the instructional behaviors they exhibit in their practice. The average mean scores were produced by grouping together the question items associated with each function. *(See Table 3).*
Framing the school goals resulted in the highest mean (M=4.6667, SD=.35949) in a five-point scale of measurement. High visibility yielded the lowest mean (M=3.8966, SD=.73021). All other indicators fell within this range. All the average responses to each of the ten instructional leadership functions were way above the average of 3. These responses indicate that principals perceived themselves as having a high sense of effectiveness in using instructional leadership behaviors in their daily practice as a school leader.

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Perceptions of Instructional Leadership Practices (Behaviors)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frame the School Goals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate the Goals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise and Evaluate Instruction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate the Curriculum</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Student Progress</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Instruction Time</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain High Visibility</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Incentives for Teachers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Professional Development</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Incentives for Learning</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results were then combined into the three domains of the survey. These domains consisted of Defining the School’s Mission, Managing the Instructional Program, and Positive School Climate. (See Table 4). The highest of these calculations was Defining the School’s Mission (M=4.3815, SD=.40671). The lowest calculation was in the domain of Positive School Climate (M=4.0993, SD=.46692). However, in consideration of a five-point scale, all the three domains have displayed a scoring way above the average of 3 indicating that the principals perceived themselves to be very effective in Defining School’s Mission, Managing the Instructional Program and nurturing a Positive School Climate.
Table 4.

Principals Perceptions of Instructional Leadership Practices – (Domains)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining School Mission</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Instructional Program</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive School Climate</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2

How do teachers perceive their efficacy in teaching?

This research sought to examine teachers’ perception of their efficacy in teaching. Descriptive statics were utilized to generate an answer to this question. The average mean score of each of three functions of teacher self-efficacy (I. Student Engagement; II. Instructional Strategies; and III. Classroom Management) was calculated to ascertain the teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy in relationship to these indicators. The average mean scores were produced by grouping together the question items associated with each function. (See Table 5).

Instructional Strategies resulted in the highest mean (M=7.810, SD=.7868) out of a nine-point scale. Student Engagement yielded the lowest mean (M=7.332, SD=.9519). All other indicators fell within this range. These responses indicate that teachers had a high sense of efficacy within their daily practice. The average score of each function was way above the mean of 5 in a nine-point scale.
Table 5.

*Teacher Perceptions of Efficacy (Behaviors)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 3**

1. Does instructional leadership have an impact on teacher efficacy?

   Research Question Three was answered using Multiple Regression Analysis of the correlations between the teachers’ total average perception and the principals’ total average perception minimizing the impact of the teachers’ years of experience and their highest degrees earned on teachers’ perception. For comparative purpose, a Simple Correlation Analysis was performed to examine the relationship between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ perceptions.

   Table 6 provides the results of the Pearson Correlation Analysis and the significance of the correlation between the teachers’ total average perceptions and the principals’ total average perceptions.
Correlation Matrix – Teachers’ Perceptions and Principals’ Perceptions

As a result of the Pearson Correlation Analysis, the coefficient (r) between teachers’ perceptions and the principals’ perceptions of principals’ instructional practices impacting teacher efficacy was found to be .188. The coefficient was too small to be significant (p = .179) at the .05 level. Therefore, no significant relationship was found between the principals’ perception of instructional practice and teacher perceived efficacy.

Then, a Multiple Regression Analysis was performed to analyze the impact of principals’ perceptions of their instructional practices on the teachers’ perceptions of efficacy. The dependent variable was the teachers’ efficacy and the independent variables were principals’ perceptions, teachers’ years of experience and their highest degrees earned. Teachers’ years of experience and their highest degrees earned were brought in as control variables to minimize their possible effects on teachers’ efficacy. Results of the analysis were displayed in Tables 7, 8 and 9.
Table 7.

*Model Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.364&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model summary shows that only 14.7% of the variation (R Square = .147) can be explained by the differences in the independent variables: principals’ perception of instructional practices, years of experience and highest degrees earned. These variables have very little impact on teacher efficacy.

Table 8.

*ANOVA*

<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>Regression</td>
<td>1.891</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.952</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.843</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 displays all the statistics of ANOVA as part of the Multiple Regression analysis. Results of the analysis indicated that there was no significant linear regression relationship found (F = 1.266; p = .310).
Table 9 displays the coefficients of the independent variables and the dependent variable: .234 between principal perception and teacher efficacy; -.321 between teachers’ years of experience and teacher efficacy; -.042 between teachers’ highest degree earned and teacher efficacy. None of these regression coefficients were significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the prediction formula of this Multiple Regression analysis will not be constructed.

As a result of the Multiple Regression analysis, the regression equation was not significant ($F (3, 22) = 1.266, p > .05$) with an R Square of .147. Neither principals’ perceived instructional practices, nor teachers’ years of experience and teachers’ highest earned degree is a significant predictor of teacher perceived efficacy.

The overall results of the Simple Correlation analysis and the Multiple Regression analysis have shown that there was no significant relationship between principals’ perception of instructional practices and teacher perceived efficacy. In the case of Multiple Regression, even though the effect of teacher years’ of experiences and their highest earned degree were statistically controlled, no significant regression relationship was detected.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

Two open-ended questions were added to the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale and the Teachers Self-Efficacy Scale in order to verify the outcomes of the quantitative
data analysis. These questions allowed the researcher to gather data that answer questions with a more personal perspective. Providing analysis of this qualitative data allows for an interpretation of what instructional leadership practices influence teacher efficacy.

**Questions**

What principal instructional practice effects teacher efficacy the most? Why?

**Principals**

The principal responses indicated that the most effective principal instructional practice that impacts teacher efficacy was visibility. Other effective practices include principal-teacher collaboration, praise and recognition.

The principals expressed that the significance of principal visibility to teachers impacted teacher efficacy. One principal stated that “Visibility allows teachers to know it is important….and that you are involved in what is going on in the classroom consistently.” (P1) Another principal said clearly that “being visible and accessible to teachers is highly effective” (P2).

Another principal thought that being visible really facilitated teachers’ jobs as he/she explained that “Teachers are extremely busy and if the principal is visible and available for them their questions can get answered in a timely manner.” (P3)

Some principals were direct in saying that “being visible and providing helpful feedback impacts teacher efficacy” (P4) and “visibility and discussion are important to a teacher’s efficacy.” (P5)

**Teachers**
Teacher responses indicated that the most effective principal instructional practice that impacted teacher efficacy was supporting instructional differentiation. Other effective practices were school culture and classroom management.

One teacher respondent clearly stated, “I feel that (principal supported) differentiated instruction has the greatest effect on teacher efficacy.” (T2) Another teacher claimed, “Differentiating lessons has the most impact on teacher efficacy.” (T5) One teacher believes, “the ability to effectively differentiate instruction impacts teacher efficacy the most.” (T8)

Several teachers expressed that differentiation was important to their efficacy in terms of what it meant for students. Principals’ effective support of differentiated instruction has indirect impact on student learning. One teacher stated, “Through the use of differentiation, teachers can address lessons, examples, practice, and support to address all students.” (T1) Another teacher expressed that, “Effective instructional strategies help support students of all abilities and allow for teachers to be able to differentiate and meet the needs of all learners.” (T4) “Differentiating lessons to meet the needs of each student by ongoing assessments, formal and informal” (T12) was important to efficacy as expressed by one teacher.

Other teachers claimed that principals’ initiation of differentiated instruction was the most important indicator for teacher efficacy in terms of the teachers’ actions or control. One teacher stated, “Differentiating instruction is directly in control of the teacher.” (T9) Another claimed, “The (leadership) instructional practice that I believe effects teacher efficacy the most is the belief that all students are capable of learning and the teacher has to use differentiation to find what works best for that child.” (T14) Additional teachers had similar responses, “I need to meet each child where they are in their learning” (T13) and “Meeting the students at their level will make them feel successful and challenging at the same time.” (T16) Another teacher believes,
“Differentiation is so important because learners come to your classroom with such a range of abilities and strengths.” (T11)

One teacher stated, “You can differentiate the strategy or process for teaching as well as the materials.” (T3) Another believes that, “Teachers need their own differentiation by working with a variety students from different backgrounds at different levels to experience a better understand a child's needs.” (T6) Another response was that, “(Principal supported) differentiated curriculum within the classroom is important to teacher efficacy.” (T7)

Finally, two teachers were direct in saying, “I think that being able to differentiate your teaching to fit the needs of the students is the most important thing to remember as a teacher” (T10) A teacher that is able to see the benefits of providing differentiated instruction has the potential to experience the value of what they do on a daily basis.” (T15)

Summary of Qualitative Data

The qualitative data suggest that principals and teachers see the same issue from different perspectives. Principal and teacher data had similar themes in response to the open-ended questions. Those themes included: classroom observations, school culture, vision, support and feedback, visibility of administration, and collaboration. However, principals perceived visibility to be the single most influential practice of instructional leadership while teachers believed that principals in support of differentiated instruction was more influential to teacher efficacy.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine how school principals perceive the effectiveness of their instructional leadership, how teachers perceive their efficacy in teaching, and the impact of instructional leadership on teacher efficacy. The study centered on responses
on two perception surveys. For school principals the survey used was the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale and for teachers the survey used was the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale. The findings of the research indicated that principals rated their effectiveness in using instructional leadership practices highly. In turn, teachers also perceived themselves to have a high level of efficacy in their daily performance. However, results of data analysis also indicated that the instructional practices of principals had little effect on teacher efficacy. Principals considered visibility as a factor that impact teacher efficacy most while teachers thought that principals advocating differentiated instruction effectively impacted teacher efficacy.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

This chapter will examine the results of the findings in Chapter 4. There will be a summary of the research, discussion of the findings, additional findings, implications, further studies, and conclusions. The purpose of this study was to determine how school principals perceive the effectiveness of their instructional leadership, how teachers perceive their efficacy in teaching, and the impact of instructional leadership practices on teacher efficacy.

Research Questions and Answers

The study included elementary school principals and teachers in a metropolitan school district of the south. The study centered on responses on two perception surveys. For school principals the survey used was the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (Hallinger, 1982) and for teachers the survey used was the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Results of the data analysis found that principals rated their effectiveness in using instructional leadership practices highly. In turn, teachers also perceived themselves to have a high level of efficacy among themselves. The findings of the research also indicated that the instructional practices of principals had little effect on teacher efficacy.

Research Question #1

How do school principals perceive the effectiveness of their instructional leadership?

In analyzing the quantitative data regarding principals, the study revealed framing the school goals resulted in having the highest mean (M=4.666, SD=.359). Maintaining visibility yielded the lowest mean (M=3.896, SD=.730). Supervising and evaluating instruction
(M=4.500, SD=.367) and promoting professional development (M=4.482, SD=.464) had the next highest mean scores amongst the indicators. Monitoring student progress (M=4.096, SD=.536), communicating the school goals (M=4.069, SD=.603) and providing incentives for teachers (M=4.013, SD=.819) held similar means ranking these three indicators closely together. Although on the lower end of mean scores, monitoring student progress (M=4.096, SD=.536) and providing incentives for learning (M=3.951, SD=.666) also held scores close together. These responses indicated that principals exercised a high sense of effectiveness in using instructional leadership behaviors in their daily practice as a school leader.

These ratings were then combined into three domains. Defining the school’s mission ranked as the highest domain amongst the principals (M=4.381, SD=.406). Managing the instructional program was the next highest rated domain (M=4.304, SD=.396) with little difference between the two. Following closely was the third ranked domain of positive school climate (M=4.093, SD=.466). Principals rated themselves as having a high sense of effectiveness across the domains of instructional leadership.

The qualitative analysis provided original responses directly from the participating principals. The themes that developed through their thoughts were visibility, principal-teacher collaboration and praise and recognition. Visibility was referenced more times than any other indicator as the instructional practice having the most impact on teacher efficacy.

Research Question #2

How do teachers perceive their efficacy in teaching?

In analyzing the quantitative data regarding teachers’ perception of their efficacy, the researcher found that Instructional Strategies resulted in the highest mean (M=7.810, SD=.7868) of all the efficacy categories. Classroom management yielded the next highest mean score
(M=7.724, SD=.942). Student Engagement yielded the lowest mean (M=7.332, SD=.9519). These responses indicated that teachers had a high sense of efficacy within their daily practice. These responses also indicated that the mean scores were closely aligned with little difference between the significance of each domain. Teachers rated each of the indicators as having similar importance.

The qualitative data analysis provided responses originating directly from the participating teachers. The themes that developed through their thoughts were principals’ supporting instructional differentiation, school culture and classroom management. Instructional differentiation was referenced more times than any other indicator as the instructional practice having the most impact on teacher efficacy.

**Research Question #3**

Does instructional leadership have an impact on teacher efficacy?

Teachers’ perceptions of efficacy and the principals’ perceptions of their instructional practices were first analyzed by Simple Correlation Analysis. Pearson coefficient (r) was found to be .188. The coefficient was too small to be significant (p = .179) at the .05 level. Therefore, no significant relationship was found between the principals’ perception of instructional practices and teacher perceived efficacy.

The Multiple Regression Analysis was used to examine the impact of the independent variables of principals’ perceptions, teachers’ years of experience and their highest degrees earned on the dependent variable of teacher efficacy. The model summary showed that only 14.7% of the variation (R Square = .147) could be explained by the differences in the independent variables. Therefore, these independent variables had very little impact on teacher efficacy. In addition, the results of the analysis indicated that there was no significant linear
regression relationship found ($F = 1.266; p = .310$). Similarly, none of the regression coefficients were significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the prediction formula of the Multiple Regression Analysis was not constructed.

The regression equation was not significant ($F (3, 22) = 1.266, p > .05$) with an R Square of .147. Neither principals’ perceived instructional practices, nor teachers’ years of experience and teachers’ highest earned degree is a significant predictor of teacher perceived efficacy. The overall results of the Simple Correlation analysis and the Multiple Regression analysis have shown that there was no significant relationship between principals’ perception of instructional practices and teacher perceived efficacy. In the case of Multiple Regression, even though the effect of teachers’ years’ of experiences and their highest earned degree were statistically controlled, no significant regression relationship was detected.

The qualitative results, when compared between principals’ and teachers’ perceptions, indicated that they viewed the effects of leadership behaviors on teacher efficacy differently. The principals’ indicated visibility to be the most significant leadership behavior that impacted teacher efficacy while the teachers viewed instructional differentiation as the indicator with the most impact on teacher efficacy. Neither the qualitative nor the quantitative results indicate a correlation between instructional leadership behaviors and teacher efficacy.

**Discussion**

Educational leaders continuously seek to understand what behaviors they exhibit that impact teacher efficacy. Therefore, this study was designed to examine specific instructional behaviors of leaders in order to determine if those behaviors would impact teacher efficacy. Although the findings of this study did not confirm that instructional leadership behaviors had a significant impact on teacher efficacy, some interesting points are worthy of discussion. The
following points bearing examination are: (1) principals have a high sense of effectiveness across the domains of instructional leadership; (2) teachers have a high sense of efficacy within their daily practice; (3) a correlation between instructional leadership behaviors and teacher efficacy was not found in this study; and (4) comparison of results with literature cited in this study.

The responses of the principal participants on the Principals Instructional Management Rating Scale clearly indicated a high sense of effectiveness within the daily practice of those principals. It suggested that the principals felt confident in their instructional leadership skills and that they had a clear direction for their schools especially in regard to the instructional setting. Even the instructional leadership behaviors with the lowest ratings indicate a reasonable sense of accomplishment in those areas.

Similarly, teachers expressed a high sense of efficacy in their daily teaching. The responses of the participants on the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale indicated that they perceived themselves as having high levels of efficacy. Teachers felt most confident in their instructional strategies and classroom management skills leading them to feel successful in their teaching practice.

Despite the fact that there was no correlation between instructional leadership behaviors and teacher efficacy, the data of the research raised further questions related to the impact of instructional leadership on efficacy. This study provides a springboard for further research and studies with specific implications, recommendations, and suggestions for further studies.

When the results of this study were compared to results of the studies cited in the literature review there were some similarities amongst them. One such study was conducted by Rew (2013). His findings confirm that goals and supervision have statistically significant impact on teacher efficacy beliefs, and one instructional leadership practice significantly moderates the
relation between teacher collaboration and teacher self-efficacy (i.e., Instruction) (p. 81). These research findings positively support the hypothesis that instructional leadership practices influence teacher efficacy. This particular study found a statistically significant result, while the current study did not. However; the finding that goals and supervision were the significant indicators is in alignment with the results of this study.

Horton (2013) found that principal leadership behaviors do impact teacher self-efficacy in high poverty schools. Given the influence of teacher self-efficacy on student achievement outcomes this finding is significant (p. 92). This study found the principal behaviors of framing school goals and communicating school goals were significant predictors of teacher efficacy (p. 93). The significant principal behaviors were found to be framing school goals which is consistent with this study.

Sallee (2014) found that “The qualitative results revealed five themes that principals could utilize to promote high-quality relationships and enhance teacher efficacy. Those themes include: communication, support and encouragement, visible involvement, professionalism and respect, and promoting teachers as professionals” (p. 65). These findings are consistent with this study in that visibility was the factor with the highest importance for principals within the qualitative responses.

The findings of this study differed from some of the other literature cited. For instance, McFarland (2013) found, “Participants selected the following three behaviors as the most influential on their own efficacy levels: provides a supportive work environment, articulates a shared mission and vision, and communicates high levels of expectations” (p. 133). These instructional behaviors were examined but not as highly rated in this study.
Another study that differed from this one was conducted by Çalik, Sezgin, Kavgaci, & Kilinç, (2012). The results of this study showed that the highest level of impact was between the evaluation of teacher process and students, a dimension of instructional leadership, and teachers’ self-efficacy for using instructional strategies.

The findings of Duyar, Gumus, and Bellibas (2013) also yielded differing results than this study. They found that among all independent and control variables, teachers’ collaboration appeared to be the strongest predictor of both teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction” (p. 700). “Select principal leadership actions played moderate yet significant roles on levels of teacher self-efficacy beliefs and job satisfaction” (pg. 713). The leadership actions fall into the category of direct supervision of instruction; specifically, observing classrooms, monitoring students’ work, and providing instructional suggestions.

In 2009, Walker found that the three principal behaviors were found to significantly impact teacher efficacy amongst the entire group: modeling instructional expectations, communication, and providing contingent rewards. While these indicators were reflected in the results of this study, they were not ranked as highly as the framing of school goals.

The findings of a study by Marshall (2005) indicated, “The principal behavior that received the highest percentage rate of almost always from principals and identified as most important in influencing instructional practices was recognizes students who do superior academic work with formal rewards such as the honor roll or mention in the principals newsletter; as identified in Item 68 of the PIMRS” (p. 82). These results also differ from the current study in which framing the school goals was rated most influential.
Chester and Beaudin (1996) pointed out in their study that besides “the timing and frequency of feedback, the focus of the feedback is also an important aspect of the findings regarding supervisor observations” (Chester & Beaudin, 1996, p. 252).

Finally, the design of this study did not replicate any of the other studies cited in terms of participants or analysis. This study was unique in the fact that it only focused on principals and teachers at the elementary level. In addition it was conducted on a smaller scale with only 33 schools represented. The analysis differed from other studies in that it did not have a focus on one particular demographic such as schools with high rates of socioeconomic status or student achievement.

**Additional Findings**

Additional findings occurred through the analysis of the demographic data. The gender and years of experience of the participants, both teachers and principals, gave insight about the respondents but raised questions as to the significance of the demographics. Could the data have yielded different results if the years of experience of the respondents been more similar? Could the data have yielded different results if there had been more male participants? (See Figures 1 and 2).
Figure 1 Percent of respondents’ years of experience

Figure 2 Percent of respondents’ gender
Implications

The focus of this study was to investigate the effects of instructional leadership practices on teacher efficacy. The quantitative data explored whether the actions of the principal had any bearing on the efficacy of the teacher. The data showed that while the principals and the teachers held a high sense of effectiveness there was not a significant relationship between the effects of leadership on efficacy. Although no significance was found, there still exists a relationship between instructional leaders and teachers and the factors that impact that relationship. Principals and teachers will continue to work closely for the education of the children.

The qualitative data garnered similar themes and patterns with a difference in significance. The participants all agreed that visibility and differentiation were important, but with a different perception in terms of how important these issues were to them. The nature of these responses indicates that the perceptions between teachers and principals have some common characteristics.

Even though the data did not confirm a significant impact of instructional behaviors of principals on teacher efficacy, the results of the study provided information on the indicators that were prominent in impacting the sense of effectiveness in principals and teachers. Framing the school goals was a behavior that held the highest impact on the perception of principals. For teachers, differentiated instructional strategies and classroom management were the indicators having the highest impact on the efficacy of teachers. Understanding the instructional behaviors that affect the perception of both principals and teachers provides insight on what aspects of instructional leadership to focus on.
Recommendations

Since Bandura began his work with efficacy in the 70’s, educators have sought to understand what impacts efficacy and the specific behaviors that could be taught and replicated to improve how teachers feel about the work that they do. In addition, researchers also continue to examine the behaviors of leaders to improve teacher efficacy and school environments. The behaviors that are examined in the Principals Instructional Management Rating Scale and the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale are effective tools for examining the indicators that contribute to the perceptions of leadership instructional practices and teacher efficacy. The use of these scales will continue to confirm and refine the practices that are most impactful on teacher efficacy.

Efficacy in education continues to be an increasingly popular topic in the fields of psychology and education. A number of studies have contributed to the effects of principals’ behaviors on teacher perception of efficacy. This study confirms some significant behaviors, but fails to link the behaviors to efficacy. Further studies are recommended to examine this relationship with different parameters.

For education programs in colleges and universities, the indicators and behaviors revealed through this study should be examined and considered as tools in teacher preparation. For school districts and departments of education, these indicators and behaviors should be considered as components of evaluation instruments. For leaders and teachers, these indicators and behaviors should be used as strategies to impact and improve their craft.

Further Studies

Through the completion of this study and the examination of the results, several suggestions for further studies have emerged. The study of efficacy should be assessed on a larger scale. The number of principals and teachers that are included in the study should be
increased and could possibly include participants from a larger geographical area. In addition, principals and teachers from all levels (elementary, middle, and high school) could be included.

This study was comprised of two survey instruments. In further studies, perhaps a single instrument tool should be created in order to ensure an exact match between the indicators and behaviors examined for both teachers and principals. It could also be used to inform future educators about the indicators and behaviors that they commonly believe have an impact on teacher efficacy.

To study the individual long-term change in the participants, a longitudinal study could generate data that describes how teachers’ perception of efficacy changes over time. Looking into individual perception of efficacy changes over time would support the impact of the instructional behaviors of principals. It is up to individual teachers to determine their own efficacy, but if a leader could contribute to their feelings of efficacy the ultimate result could effect student achievement.

**Conclusions**

This study was purposeful and sought to examine the effects of instructional leadership behaviors on teacher efficacy. As stated in Chapter One, it is school leaders, such as principals, who by the nature of their positions perhaps have the greatest influence upon teacher efficacy, and the levels of confidence exhibited by faculty (Clark, 2009, p. 6). Only a handful of studies examine, either exclusively or as part of a larger analysis, the influence of the school principal (including the use of instructional leadership practices) on the efficacy of teachers (Hoy & Tarter, 2011). The results of this study actually open up many possibilities of promoting research in leadership instructional practices and teacher efficacy.
The findings of this study should add new dimensions to the educational research on instructional leadership and teacher efficacy. It should serve as an impetus for educators to examine their practice and craft with respect to instructional behaviors and their effects on efficacy. It should increase the reflection of leaders on their impact on teacher efficacy.

A significant finding of this study was shown by the qualitative questions included on the two survey instruments. The teachers and principals had strong feelings on the behaviors that impacted efficacy the most. They held beliefs about why these behaviors and actions were significant to teachers’ efficacy.

A unique contribution of this study is that the findings point to the fact that, despite perception differences between principals and teachers in instructional practices that impact teacher efficacy, principals and teachers have had a great common goal in educating students entrusted under their care. Through the outcomes of this study, principals and teachers are in a better position to understand the perspectives of each other. This will eventually lead to enhanced teacher efficacy to improve student achievement.
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Principal Form 2.1
THE PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT RATING SCALE

PART I: Please provide the following information if instructed to do so by the person administering the instrument:

(A) District Name: ________________________________

(B) Your School’s Name: __________________________

(C) Number of school years you have been principal at this school:
   ___ 1 ___ 5-9 ___ more than 15
   ___ 2-4 ___ 10-15

(D) Years, at the end of this school year, that you have been a principal:
   ___ 1 ___ 5-9 ___ more than 15
   ___ 2-4 ___ 10-15

(E) Gender: ___ Male ___ Female

PART II: This questionnaire is designed to provide a profile of your leadership. It consists of 50 behavioral statements that describe principal job practices and behaviors. You are asked to consider each question in terms of your leadership over the past school year.

Read each statement carefully. Then circle the number that best fits the specific job behavior or practice as you conducted it during the past school year. For the response to each statement:

5 represents Almost Always
4 represents Frequently
3 represents Sometimes
2 represents Seldom
1 represents Almost Never

In some cases, these responses may seem awkward; use your judgement in selecting the most appropriate response to such questions. Please circle only one number per question. Try to answer every question.

Thank you.
**To what extent do you . . . ?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. COMMUNICATE THE SCHOOL GOALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school (e.g., posters or bulletin boards emphasizing academic progress)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Refer to the school's goals or mission in forums with students (e.g., in assemblies or discussions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III. SUPERVISE & EVALUATE INSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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13. Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis (informal observations are unscheduled, last at least 5 minutes, and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Point out specific strengths in teacher’s instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Point out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. COORDINATE THE CURRICULUM**

16. Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Monitor the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school’s curricular objectives  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Assess the overlap between the school’s curricular objectives and the school’s achievement tests  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Participate actively in the review of curricular materials  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**V. MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS**

21. Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Discuss academic performance results with the faculty to identify curricular strengths and weaknesses  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALMOST NEVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Inform teachers of the school's performance results in written form (e.g., in a memo or newsletter)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Inform students of school's academic progress</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. PROTECT INSTRUCTIONAL TIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Limit interruptions of instructional time by public address announcements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Limit the intrusion of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII. MAINTAIN HIGH VISIBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Cover classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Tutor students or provide direct instruction to classes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIII. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR TEACHERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Reinforce superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38. Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
39. Reward special efforts by teachers with opportunities for professional recognition
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
40. Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**IX. PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

41. Ensure that inservice activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
42. Actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during inservice training
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
43. Obtain the participation of the whole staff in important inservice activities
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
44. Lead or attend teacher inservice activities concerned with instruction
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
45. Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from inservice activities
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**X. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR LEARNING**

46. Recognize students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honor roll or mention in the principal's newsletter
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
47. Use assemblies to honor students for academic accomplishments or for behavior or citizenship
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
48. Recognize superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
49. Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
50. Support teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and accomplishments in class
   | ALMOST NEVER | ALMOST ALWAYS |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
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### Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (long form)

**Teacher Beliefs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Almost Great</th>
<th>Great</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much can you do to help your students value learning?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How well can you respond to defiant students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directions for Scoring the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale

Developers: Megan Tschannen-Moran, College of William and Mary
Anita Woolfolk Hoy, the Ohio State University.

Construct Validity

For information the construct validity of the Teachers' Sense of Teacher efficacy Scale, see:


Factor Analysis

It is important to conduct a factor analysis to determine how your participants respond to the questions. We have consistently found three moderately correlated factors: Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Practices, and Efficacy in Classroom Management, but at times the make up of the scales varies slightly. With preservice teachers we recommend that the full 24-item scale (or 12-item short form) be used, because the factor structure often is less distinct for these respondents.

Subscale Scores

To determine the Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Practices, and Efficacy in Classroom Management subscale scores, we compute unweighted means of the items that load on each factor. Generally these groupings are:

**Long Form**
- Efficacy in Student Engagement: Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 12, 14, 22
- Efficacy in Instructional Strategies: Items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24
- Efficacy in Classroom Management: Items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21

**Short Form**
- Efficacy in Student Engagement: Items 2, 3, 4, 11
- Efficacy in Instructional Strategies: Items 5, 9, 10, 12
- Efficacy in Classroom Management: Items 1, 6, 7, 8

Reliabilities

In leechanen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct Teaching and Teacher Education, 17, 783-805, the following were found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long Form</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Short Form</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSTES</strong></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Because this instrument was developed at the Ohio State University, it is sometimes referred to as the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale. We prefer the name, Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale.
Appendix G

Qualitative Data Coding Sheet

Principals – Visibility is identified as the most effective instructional practice.

- Visibility allows teachers to know it is important….and that you are involved in what is going on in the classroom consistently. (P1)
- Being visible and accessible to teachers is highly effective. (P2)
- Teachers are extremely busy and if the principal is visible and available for them their questions can get answered in a timely manner. (P3)
- Being visible and providing helpful feedback impacts teacher efficacy. (P4)
- Visibility and discussion are important to a teacher’s efficacy. (P5)

Teachers - Supporting instructional differentiation is identified as the instructional practice that most impacts teacher efficacy.

- Through the use of differentiation, teachers can address lessons, examples, practice, and support to address all students. (T1)
- I feel that differentiated instruction has the greatest effect on teacher efficacy. (T2)
- You can differentiate the strategy or process for teaching as well as the materials. (T3)
- Effective instructional strategies help support students of all abilities and allow for teachers to be able to differentiate and meet the needs of all learners. (T4)
- Differentiating lessons has the most impact on teacher efficacy. (T5)
- Teachers need their own differentiation by working with a variety students from different backgrounds at different levels to experience a better understand a child's needs. (T6)
- Differentiated Curriculum within the classroom is important to teacher efficacy. (T7)
- I believe that the ability to effectively differentiate instruction impacts teacher efficacy the most. (T8)
- Differentiating instruction is directly in control of the teacher. (T9)
• I think that being able to differentiate your teaching to fit the needs of the students is the most important thing to remember as a teacher. (T10)

• Differentiation is so important because learners come to your classroom with such a range of abilities and strengths. (T11)

• Differentiating lessons to meet the needs of each student by ongoing assessments, formal and informal. (T12)

• I need to meet each child where they are in their learning. (T13)

• The instructional practice that I believe effects teacher efficacy the most is the belief that all students are capable of learning and the teacher has to use differentiation to find what works best for that child. (T14)

• A teacher that is able to see the benefits of providing differentiated instruction has the potential to experience the value of what they do on a daily basis. (T15)

• Meeting the students at their level will make them feel successful and challenging at the same time. (T16)
## APPENDIX H

### PIRMS Qualitative Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What instructional principal practice influences teacher efficacy the most?</th>
<th>Why?</th>
<th>Category/# of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration in planning and implementation</td>
<td>During this time, principals can discuss expectations so teachers have a clear direction of where they are going. They can collaborate with grade level or team members to develop plans that will be effective in implementation. so that all teachers have an understanding of what is happening</td>
<td>collaboration - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear communication feedback and encouragement</td>
<td>teachers like to be recognized</td>
<td>communication - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that being an active participant during collaboration and planning sessions with grade level teachers has an influence on teacher efficacy. I also feel that principal visibility in the classrooms has a great impact.</td>
<td>When the principal is visible and serves as an active participant (meetings, plannings, collaboration, RtI, etc.) teachers will sense (and believe) that educating children is a group effort. There is also a sense of accountability (in a positive way) when &quot;group effort&quot; is a common practice and expectation within a school.</td>
<td>principal visibility - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Professional learning opportunities. Administrative presence, visibility, and participation.</td>
<td>Helps them improve and become better teachers as well as gain confidence.</td>
<td>differentiated professional learning - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Because it sends the message of investment by all in the instructional process. Being an instructional leader affords the opportunity to improve teaching and learning...daily!</td>
<td>instructional leadership - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Instruction Keeping a clear focus on your goals and recognizing their accomplishments and hard work.</td>
<td>If you see strengths, you can celebrate and have other teachers observe. If there are deficits, then you can support the teachers. Teachers need to know that you have a plan and that your walk matches your talk. Further, they need to feel that their hard work and extra hours are noticed and appreciated.</td>
<td>vision/focus on goals - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transformational leader - 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transformational leader
Set vision and goals, discuss often. Provide needed resources. Provide effective professional learning to support goals. Visibility and accessibility. Supportive attitude. Open to new ideas. Encourage and allow teacher input.

Improving teachers skills and strategies. Recognizing good instruction, positive attitude and willing to lead team work.

Conversations about student progress. Praise and recognition. Hearing their voice, listening.

Observation and specific feedback providing in a 1-1 conference. Communicating the purpose and "The Why" of new practices or procedures.

Being a strong principal takes several components/practices to be most effective. It is important to have a clear vision, monitor, and maintain focus for your school with ongoing input from teachers. Also, it is key to be a strong instructional leader along with a transformational one to ensure teachers are have the necessary PD. The PD needs to be ongoing and job embedded to be most meaningful and beneficial. The last component needed is the need to be a servant leader to support your teachers, students, and parents for everyone to reach their potential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive attitude - 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set vision and goals, discuss often. Provide needed resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide effective professional learning to support goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility and accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to new ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and allow teacher input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teachers skills and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing good instruction, positive attitude and willing to lead team work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations about student progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise and recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing their voice, listening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Praise & recognition - 3 | |
|---|
| Observation and specific feedback providing in a 1-1 conference. |
| Communicating the purpose and "The Why" of new practices or procedures. |

| Classroom observation - 2 | |
|---|
| Increasing student achievement begins with improving teachers' skills. |
| I believe this helps teachers feel valued and important and more willing to take on additional duties and responsibilities that ultimately reflect positively for the school. |

| School culture - 1 | |
|---|
| They feel valued. |
| When issues are addressed whole group everyone thinks it is not them. When you conference with a teacher you can reinforce what you want them to continue and then work on areas for improvement. It helps you understand them as a teacher and you can truly see their desire for growth and improvement. |
| Clarifies the reasons for putting a new procedures into place and ensures that what we are doing is for the students benefit. |
procedures. Also, making student directed decisions...

Visibility and discussion

Because they then know it is important to you and that you are involved in what is going on in the classroom consistently.

Being visible and providing helpful feedback.

Teachers will grow if they know what you expect and you recognize them for what they are doing well and provide specific feedback that will help them improve student learning.

Teachers are motivated to maintain professionalism and high level of instruction when they are valued as professionals.

Positive school culture

I believe that making sure that the teachers know that they are appreciated and that I notice the good things that they are doing by complimenting them either in person or in an email or note.

Recognizing teachers when they work toward or reach school goals or their personal goals for students.

Everyone thrives on getting a pat on the back now and then, and when that happens, they (the teachers) see that they are making a difference in their students’ lives.

Being visible and accessible to teachers is highly effective.

It helps teachers to take ownership of the school and all students.

Teachers are extremely busy and if the principal is visible and available for them their questions can get answered in a timely manner.

So that I can give purposeful and supportive feedback to teachers on their instructional practices and can better monitor implementation of expected or new practices. This occurs during meetings, walks and observations and often informs my decision about future professional development and which teachers need more support or who could lead instructional initiatives.

Being actively involved in RTI, data teams, and all professional development.

So that I can give purposeful and supportive feedback to teachers on their instructional practices and can better monitor implementation of expected or new practices. This occurs during meetings, walks and observations and often informs my decision about future professional development and which teachers need more support or who could lead instructional initiatives.
### APPENDIX I

**TSES Qualitative Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What principal instructional practice effects teacher efficacy the most?</th>
<th>Why?</th>
<th>Category/# of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure, pacing, and consistency.</strong></td>
<td>As a music teacher, I only see each class approx. 30 times per school year. This requires my lessons to be structured and paced in such a way that not one minute is lost. The entire class period must be purposeful-including transitions. In order to minimize negative behavioral distractions- the expectations must by modeled and enforced with consistency. So to must the rewards (extrinsic or intrinsic) as children (or humans in general) achieve more with positive reinforcement.</td>
<td>Structure/Organization 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Clarity When a teacher begins a new unit of study or project with students, she clarifies the purpose and learning goals, and provides explicit criteria on how students can be successful. It's ideal to also present models or examples to students so they can see what the end product looks like</td>
<td>Students need clear directions and good visual examples. Making parents aware of school expectations and what material is being covered in class so that it can be reviewed at home. Update parents on student progress. Parents and teachers working together will help foster student success. Teachers can address lessons, examples, practice, and support to address all students. If students understand that you have and they have goals set for themselves, it offers a way to connect and a way to interact</td>
<td>Clarity 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Teacher Communication</strong></td>
<td>Parent Teacher Communication 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differentiation</strong></td>
<td>Differentiation 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal setting</strong></td>
<td>Goal setting 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organization of the work load
Through teacher and surveys and observations. Then provide workshops that address those needs.

positively with that student to reach those goals. Goals set should be personal and academic. There are so many things teachers do daily. Being unorganized will effect productivity the most.

teacher- surveys/observations 1

In order to address real-time needs of the teachers.

When you focus on individual students, you are able to meet them where they are academically and behaviorally. Our goal is to teach each student based on their learning style and at their level. When students feel like their needs are being met, it makes it easier for them to function within the classroom. There is so much that teachers can do to help students learn and make progress.

Differentiation allows you to truly know each student and monitor their growth throughout the year.

The reason I think that classroom discussion effects teacher efficacy most is because through discussion, the teacher can get a sense of the student's feelings, beliefs, and needs that, in turn, can be addressed in order to promote student learning and success.

Because to be an effective teacher you must be able to adapt and be flexible about revising your instructional practices to meet the needs of the students.

If you build community, you really get to know your students. Everything else builds on this.

Truly understanding standards

love of children & learning 1
eliminates wasting valuable instructional and planning time. There is less searching on TPT and more thinking through where you want your students to be. The principal determines what learning should look like in the school and articulates it to the staff. Their decisions impact how much control and freedom teachers have inside the classrooms. Principals need to stay aware of the needs and best practices for each specific grade level. They also need to listen to the teachers' concerns and beliefs regarding their classes and visit the classrooms to truly understand how to help the students.

Instructional Leadership “The leader fosters success of all students by facilitating the development, communication, implementation, and evaluation of a shared vision of teaching and learning that leads to school improvement.”

Creating a positive climate.

Creating an environment in which teachers and students feel safe, comfortable, valued and have the ability to work collaboratively with their peers, helps to guide and improve instructional practices. The teacher will be more efficient in their classroom performance if they have a good management of their classroom with rules and expectations posted and know.

Individual conferencing 1

Classroom management

The principal instructional practice that provides me with a level of confidence to promote learning is the ability to manage children and to have the support by admin and my team to aid in this management. It is not a single teachers' job to handle students who are consistently disruptive, defiant, and lack the desire to work hard. I feel that is a collaborative team efforts to ensure a child's success.

I feel that is a collaborative team efforts to ensure a child’s success.

Differentiation for students.

You can differentiate the strategy or process for teaching as well as the materials. You can use data to drive instruction 1

Using data to drive instruction 1

Use of rubrics 1

Use of rubrics 1

Quality instruction & knowledge of curriculum 3

Quality instruction & knowledge of curriculum 3

Resources 2

Resources 2
also reach different learning styles. Students feel success on their level and this encourages them to keep learning.

Training - knowing your craft
Experience - Time to learn classroom management
Support from Administration - Tools & Approachability

Because you'll try many different strategies to make sure that every child succeeds. Conferencing provides time for the teacher to differentiate the academic, emotional, and behavioral needs of a specific student. It helps a teacher develop trust and a special bond with each student. I know that the more I am emotionally connected with my students, the more I feel I can make a difference in their learning.

visibility of administration 1

I believe individual conferencing with students effects teacher efficacy. Because you'll try many different strategies to make sure that every child succeeds.

Effective instructional strategies help support students of all abilities and allow for teachers to be able to differentiate and meet the needs of all learners. Teachers have to create 25 different versions of one lesson. It takes a lot of time to do that for every subject!

Differentiating lessons

Ss can see their targets, and they can use the rubrics to evaluate their progress toward a goal.

the use of rubrics

This helps me see how the students are doing in each content area. It helps highlight their weaknesses so I can provide them with extra support in those areas to push them towards success.

Using data to drive instruction.

Our principal works to provide a culture that allows for teachers to express questions and concerns easily and without judgment. We also have

previous knowledge 1

support from home 1

This keeps teachers individually and as a whole on the same track for meeting grade level and school wide goals.

being consistent 2
Monday meetings that keep everyone on the same page and is a great time to collaborate with the team and the administration.
Helping teachers get access to tools like iReady that help teachers pinpoint areas of strengths and weaknesses in individual students.

This helps us to use the data to drive our instruction.

I feel that teachers are most efficient when they have principals who are supportive and provide a positive environment for teachers to grow and build their confidence.

When teachers are confident in their instruction students will learn and grow into the leaders they are reaching to be.

They have varying strengths and weaknesses in learning styles and this practice helps reach students using visual images to cement what they are hearing orally.

I feel that the most beneficial principal instructional practice that effects teacher efficacy most is positive support and feedback.

As a special education teacher I would say using nonlinguistic representations of concepts is most effective in reaching my students.

My principal is very visible for students, staff, and parents. Her presence makes all of the difference.

Students, staff and parents know that she truly cares about the students.

During my first year of teaching I was assigned a mentor who did little more than introduce themselves to me at the beginning of the school year. I asked for, but received no assistance from school administration and school counselors to assist me with instructing a class of students in which the majority was behind academically. I basically was left to sink or swim during my first year. For the next ten years, I worked at 2 different schools and received little to no teacher training at either school. I began feeling less confident in my mastery experiences during the first year of teaching and ongoing training in the most recent research based practices.
abilities as a teacher and "burnt out". However, I am a successful teacher because I had taken it upon myself to check out and study teacher instructional materials from the public library and purchase teacher resource books to do personal book studies. After all these years, I still receive very little training at school in research based practices and continue to do personal book studies to further improve myself as a teacher.

Note: both schools I mentioned have high turnover rates among teachers and are among the lowest performing schools in their school districts.

Everything begins with classroom management. A classroom cannot run smoothly without proper management, and learning cannot occur. When routines, procedures, and high expectations are put into place, teachers can better differentiate, assess more easily, identify student differences, plan more engaging lessons, and push students farther with less bumps in the road.

When teaching, sometimes the students might not understand the standard at hand and need to be retaught and when that takes place you are behind in teaching the next standard and that cycle continues. Teachers need their own differentiation by working with a variety students from different backgrounds at different levels to experience a better understand a child's needs. A teacher who has a variety of experiences will better

Classroom management effects my teacher efficacy the most.

All the required tasks and the number of standards that are required to be taught whether assessed or not.
differentiate to meet the needs of his/her own students.

Meta cognitive strategies where students plan, organize and monitor their own learning. Formative and Summative assessments; Collaborative discussions and group work. All these strategies aide students to maximize their growth and learning. Taking ownership and learning to initiate their own learning.

I feel this way because they are the students that always stick out in a teacher's mind when she is planning. For me, those are the students that are my greatest challenge.

I believe this because the classroom culture is not only a reflection of the teacher but also sets the tone for how students interact with one another and their teacher. If students feel loved and supported while knowing their boundaries and expectations, they will respond appropriately and teachers will feel in control. If this isn't established, students respond negatively and a teacher will likely struggle for control of the classroom and feel unable to make a difference in their students' lives.

I believe that setting up clear and high expectations and creating a loving, supportive classroom culture from the beginning of the year is critical to teacher efficacy.

I believe that setting up clear and high expectations and creating a loving, supportive classroom culture from the beginning of the year is critical to teacher efficacy.

Differentiated Curriculum within the classroom.

Workshop model (my preference) allows teachers to meet different needs and levels as well as to appeal to students interests. This allows differentiated projects to fit learning styles and allows teachers to scaffold student learning.

It is easier to add to a student's strategies/toolbox if they can attach the new information to what they already know. New learning is recalled if attached to emotions/enjoyment/activities they enjoy or can remember.

Students who consistently have a lack of motivation and do not respond to motivation strategies by the teacher.

I feel this way because they are the students that always stick out in a teacher's mind when she is planning. For me, those are the students that are my greatest challenge.

I believe this because the classroom culture is not only a reflection of the teacher but also sets the tone for how students interact with one another and their teacher. If students feel loved and supported while knowing their boundaries and expectations, they will respond appropriately and teachers will feel in control. If this isn't established, students respond negatively and a teacher will likely struggle for control of the classroom and feel unable to make a difference in their students' lives.

Differentiated Curriculum within the classroom.

Workshop model (my preference) allows teachers to meet different needs and levels as well as to appeal to students interests. This allows differentiated projects to fit learning styles and allows teachers to scaffold student learning.

It is easier to add to a student's strategies/toolbox if they can attach the new information to what they already know. New learning is recalled if attached to emotions/enjoyment/activities they enjoy or can remember.
I believe that the ability to effectively differentiate instruction impacts teacher efficacy the most.

Differentiating instruction is directly in control of the teacher. There are numerous resources readily available to support differentiating instruction, which makes it less stressful for teachers to implement. It is easy for teachers to try in small chunks, which makes it less overwhelming to begin implementing. Most importantly, differentiating instruction impacts student performance quickly. Teachers can see the results of their efforts almost instantaneously, which gives the teacher the confidence to keep differentiating to improve student performance.

When students know they are in an environment where they can take risks, be themselves but have procedures in place it makes a huge difference. Once this positive learning environment is established, students are able to thrive.

I know that I urge my own children to read and keep up with their work at home and if there is none of that, it is hard for a student to stay self motivated. Also, it is hard to teach and for the teacher to stay motivated when I have no materials and can't find anything to support my teaching.

It teaches trust in what you say. When principals understand what is expected in classrooms (all levels) they are more inclined to support appropriately and design school plans that are specific and relevant to what teachers/students need.

Behavior management and building a positive classroom environment based on kindness and respect.

I think the combination of home support and lack of materials to use teaching effects teacher efficacy the most. Being consistent, both positive and negative.

Understanding curriculum standards and expectations.
I think the ability to teach to a standard using multiple strategies. Students are wired so differently and need to learn information and practice skills in multiple ways to increase understanding. Students need consistency in every area of their lives. They also thrive better within the proper guidelines of good management. With these two practices in place, trust, learning, respect, safety, and maybe even fun, can be fostered, thereby producing a great environment for teaching and learning. With them: learning takes place without them: less learning takes place.

I believe that both being consistent in all areas of academic teaching and maintaining good management within the classroom are the principal instructional practices that effect teacher efficacy most. Students need consistency in every area of their lives. They also thrive better within the proper guidelines of good management. With these two practices in place, trust, learning, respect, safety, and maybe even fun, can be fostered, thereby producing a great environment for teaching and learning. With them: learning takes place without them: less learning takes place.

Rituals and routines
Reflection and the ability to make small changes that are best for students. Everything we do should be to benefit students and help them grow.

Reflection and the ability to make small changes that are best for students.

Openness to new ideas and trying new methods
Every year you receive new students- even if you are teaching the same standard- you may need to teach it a new way because what worked last year may not work this year with the group of students you have. you need to sometimes thin out of your box- explore, and try new methods and ideas.

Giving teachers opportunity to collaborate and effectively work as a team to created meaningful and engaging lessons!
When we have this release time, we can really dig into the root of what our kids needs most without feeling pressured by time and other distractions.

Having clear expectations about student behavior.
I feel this is important for success because when there is consistent expectations for behavior, students will academically thrive.

Formative Assessment
I feel formative assessment effects teacher efficacy the most. Collecting and having this type of data available helps to build the confidence teachers have in themselves. You can quickly see when your instruction is having a positive impact. You can use this
data to inform your instruction and promote student learning.

I feel there are two important practices that affect teacher efficacy. One is the independence to do what is right for your specific class because what may work/sound good on paper does not always translate into the classroom environment. Second, I think that discipline support from administration should support classroom discipline initiatives. For instance, it’s very hard to hold problem students accountable when they believe nothing will happen to them once it escalates past the classroom teacher.

I believe creating a positive classroom environment/student teacher relationships affects teacher efficacy the most. When students know that your classroom is a safe place, where ideas and people are valued, respected, and held accountable, then they know you care. When a child knows you care and that they are loved by their teacher, they will work for you. They will give their best effort, they will strive to improve, and they will begin to see in themselves, what you, as their teacher, already knew. When this type of relationship is created, you can overcome any teaching challenge thrown your way.

The principal instructional practice that most affects teacher efficacy is the teacher knowing their students. Based on that they can be confident that they can teach and reach all their students. When I sit in front of my administrator or a parent, I feel confident that I can speak about my students from many angles. I can speak to their academic level, as well as about their social interactions in the classroom. This insight allows me to reach and connect with my students. I feel once I have made that connection, I am able to then
teach them where they are and work with them to get them where they need to be.

If you have high expectations for student success you will set up your classroom in a way that students will be organized and productive both independently and in groups. You will instruct students using strategies that they learn best with because you want them to reach their potential and will encourage appropriate behavior so that you and the students can concentrate on the tasks at hand rather than the drama that is caused by poor behavior choices.

I think it is hard to choose one practice that makes a teacher effective but if I had to choose I think having high expectations. Having meaningful professional development workshops where the teacher can take what they have learned back to their classrooms right away.

It's important to not be thrown too many strategies at once without being able to implement them. We don't want to be over trained and under practiced.

I am able to individualize instruction to each students personal needs. This model is required. I do see its value.

I believe this can make or break a classroom and how it runs. I have found that without a good behavior management system, all learning can be disrupted. For me, being able to teach what I want/need to teach and include all the activities that I want to use, classroom management is a MUST. Being able to manage the whole group, the small groups, and individual students definitely effects my teaching the most.

Literacy Instruction - Small group

workshop model

I believe the principal instructional practice that effects efficacy the most is classroom management (keeping students engaged, making learning fun and interesting for all students, having a behavior management plan in place for disruptions, etc.)
I think that being able to differentiate your teaching to fit the needs of the students is the most important thing to remember as a teacher. Not only with academics, but students need to be differentiated with behavior as well. Some students have interventions in place in order to limit distractions so that learning can be maximized. Differentiation is so important because learners come to your classroom with such a range of abilities and strengths. Classrooms with exceptional classroom management strategies are able to effectively provide a positive engaging learning environment to all students despite challenges. If the class is unorganized and there are negative behaviors, the entire day will be focused on that instead of instruction. Students need to be active learners, not passive. It is more important for the classroom to be student run so they have ownership of their learning. I think it is also important to provide opportunities for students to have experience with failing so they can learn how to move on and use their mistakes. I need to meet each child where they are in their learning. High achievers need to move on so boredom is avoided and low achievers need foundations to be taught before higher concepts. It establishes trust and encourages me to do my best and my students to do their best. This challenges students to think and use their background knowledge and gained knowledge to problem solve. When students lack in this area it makes for a difficult lesson and makes the teacher build...
The instructional practice that I believe effects teacher efficacy the most is the belief that all students are capable of learning and the teacher has to use differentiation to find what works best for that child.

When teachers are respectful of their students and the students believe their teachers care for them, that is when you will see students put forth effort. I am using the term "respectful" as in allowing for differences and finding methods that will work best for them as opposed to trying to force fit their learning into a method that doesn't allow for their success. When students feel secure in the support of their teachers and environment they will be more willing to attempt unfamiliar things and to step away from long held behaviors and ideas. When mistake are viewed as learning opportunities and not punitive in nature, growth will occur. Because students know when they get sent to the front office, nothing really ever happens besides being told not to do it again. So they know they can get away with whatever behavior. I’ve also heard students tell me there is nothing I can do to stop them and sadly in this day in the classroom, they are right.

There are times when students who just do not respond to strategies can be a major disruption (especially when there is no parent support). If trust is evident in a school then everyone can show greater success. Trust between administration and staff allows teachers to focus on instruction instead of proving our worth through assessments. Trust between teachers and students
allows a supportive relationship to grow, which fosters learning.

Without a positive student/teacher relationship, it is difficult for students to trust their teachers. Thus, leading to issues within the classroom such as student behavior, work effort, and student's ability to trust their teacher to answer questions and seem willing to help them.

When a teacher has confidence in her ability as a teacher, then that confidence is evident to the student.

It takes away from the flow of the lesson and the comprehension of students who want to learn.

I believe running a classroom smoothly where expectations, rituals and routines are clearly and strongly established provides both, the pupil and teacher, the ability to use each school day in the most effective possible way. When students know what is expected from them, both behavior/academics, teachers can use the school day effectively to teach each student and push each kiddo to their highest potential. With a strong and solid classroom structure, students feel welcome, safe, and eager to learn.

Well planned lessons that include variety offer more opportunities for students to take ownership of their learning and encourages/promotes student success.

MOST of the time students will only be what the teacher and their parents allow them to be. If a student knows your expectation every time they
come in they are set up for success. However, if you are not strict/consistent in your expectations students will push until they find the breaking point.

I am not sure if there is one practice that effects teacher efficacy. What may work for me to increase my self-efficacy may not work for another teacher.

Repetition of content and it presented in various ways to meet different learning styles

Finding the extra time to work with students that are on tier.

Students need repetition and can get bored if it's not presented in various ways or a way that interests them.

I have too many students on tier at one time. (10 or more)

If you are able to collect rich data on your students, you are armed with all of the tools necessary to develop an appropriate and effective instructional plan to meet the needs of the individual learner.

Data analysis

Differentiated Instruction

When teachers are able to determine the needs of their students through assessments and adjust instruction to meet the needs of individual students, the ability to contribute to the success of students increases. A teacher that is able to see the benefits of providing differentiated instruction has the potential to experience the value of what they do on a daily basis. Teachers often times judge their level of success by the improvements that their students make. The ability to tailor instruction to student needs not only increases student achievement, but also validates the educator as well. When administration is able to recognize the differences in educators and tailor their interactions with them to meet
their needs, teachers better understand their value and areas for improvement. Everyone needs to feel a sense of importance and individuality.

**Differentiation**

Meeting the students at their level will make them feel successful and challenging at the same time. This helps everyone get on board and allows us to have conversations about what is working, what is not, how to change those things, and learning from one another best practices of our field. It helps all teachers on a team to put their heads together to create great lessons. It also helps the moral of teachers to not feel like they are an island. Both practices are interesting to students of gen x and it reaches all levels of the individual learner.

**Classroom Management**

I think teachers need to use assessments to drive their instruction. Students should be able to move on to an enrichment activity or more ahead in the curriculum as they master the material. Teacher feedback is also just as important. I use feedback to help students see where they are making mistakes, to connect with them, to stretch their thinking, and to compliment and praise them.

**Assessments and Feedback**
Classroom where rules and procedures are clearly established and students feel connected to one another and teacher

Students need to know what is expected of them and feel comfortable learning and taking risks