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Abstract

This study reveals educators’ journey through a change process as an innovation was being infused throughout their instructional practices. Traditional professional learning is not fashioned to address the ongoing concerns teachers have and the structure to sustain change. There is evidence to suggest that teachers are resistance to change due to the lack of attention placed on individualized change. This research investigates the topics of organizational change, individual change, evolution of professional development, teacher resistance, and individual coaching to lead to a deep understanding of the structural components of teacher support in order for change to transpire. This research is positioned to support teachers with individualized coaching through change in instructional practices, address teacher concerns identified through the Stages of Concern Questionnaire survey and individual interview responses, and provide a model for change initiatives that can be emulated by other institutions. Chapter one provides background to the study, the researcher’s personal connection with the topic and research site, the purpose and significance of the study, research questions, definitions of the key terms, as well as a description highlighting the organization of the dissertation. Chapter two of this study emphasizes the review of literature for this research including the topical research issues and the theoretical framework that support the research. Chapter three contains detailed descriptions of the methodology conducted for this study. The findings of this research are ascribed in chapter four. Chapter five pronounces discussions, implications, and conclusions for the research.
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Without change, results will remain the same. Regardless of how much intelligence one may possess, room for change is evident (Dweck, 2006). According to the Nation’s Report Card (2017), scores for the 2017 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) for fourth and eighth grade students in the subject areas of reading and mathematics were released, and state-level results indicated that there were no significant score changes compared to 2015 for most states. NAEP is the largest nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America's students know and can do in various subject areas. Scores decreased in 10 states in fourth grade mathematics and in three states in eighth grade mathematics. In fourth grade reading, average scores did not increase in any state, and scores decreased in nine states (Nation’s Report Card, 2017). Ujifusa (2012) reported that standardized-testing programs cost states about $1.7 billion a year overall. Little to no improvement in scores is disheartening for many. Due to the importance and determination for growth and change to occur, goals for improvement are documented and refined annually through an individual school’s improvement plan. The improvement plan outlines a school’s targeted work to enhance achievement and is the driving force behind the theory of change in a district’s tactical framework.

Woodrow Wilson once said, “If you want to make enemies, try to change something.” Change is a process, an evolution and transpiration of moving from one point of reference to another. Districts are continuing to spend millions of dollars with the intent to change a practice for the better with very few tangible results. Layton (2015) referred to a study released by The New Teacher Project (TNTP) that much money was being spent on professional development
and the amount being spent was not equating to successful outcomes. TNTP (2015) examined the professional development programs at three large school districts and one charter school. The study concluded that the school districts spent an average of $18,000 per teacher annually on professional development. It was estimated that the 50 largest school districts spent an estimated $8 billion on professional development (TNTP, 2015). Along with the monetary strain for districts was the time out of class teachers spent while receiving professional development. TNTP (2015) reported that based on 10,000 teachers surveyed in the study, 19 school days a year are spent in professional development. This is time out of the classroom, time away from instructing students. Based on teacher evaluations, one-third of the teachers improved after participating in professional development training while 20 percent declined (TNTP, 2015). One cannot assume that effective change will occur immediately upon some sort of designated training whether it is a multiple day workshop or a community-based learning project. Most changes in education take three to five years to be implemented with proficiency (Hall & Hord, 2015).

When implementing an innovation that requires change in practice and mindset, it is important to identify the roles of those involved. As a school leader, it was essential for me to understand my role during the course of this study. The role of a school leader is vital when implementing an innovation and monitoring the change process. Good leaders are able to lay out the expectations and maintain focus on the vision of the change initiative. Effective leadership is not about governing from an office, but rather getting involved and getting the staff involved in meaningful organizational decisions (Donaldson, 2006). Developing and offering opportunities for others to lead is essential throughout the change process. School administrators have the ability to either encourage or discourage teacher initiatives, and inviting others to help lead the
process is one way to encourage teacher involvement (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Principals are to segment their command and become co-learners with teacher leaders (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). If the expectation is for teachers to become active in the learning community, then administrators should lead by example. Rather than simply instructing and delegating from a distance, a sense of community is formed when the administrator is participating and working alongside teachers.

School administrators must change first in order to maintain the transformation within the school, which will then increase the willingness and confidence for others to change (Gulcan, 2012). When an innovation is being implemented and change is taking place, the ability to effectively manage people, data, and processes helps create a culture for sustainability. Mendels (2012) noted leaders who are effective hire proficient teachers and know how to retain them as high performers. Effective administrators seek ways to offer teachers the support needed in order to thrive with confidence and security while minimizing levels of concern.

The school’s staff and leaders can make or break any change effort (Hall & Hord, 2015). The change process, as well as the individuals involved in the process, should be continually fostered and monitored. The Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ) offers a way to assess teacher concerns about innovations or strategies introduced in the school (George, Hall, & Stiegelbauer, 2006). The SoCQ is a survey that helps identify stages individuals tend to go through as they learn about a new innovation and then progress through the implementation of the innovation. The SoCQ provides educational leaders the opportunity to foster the change process by identifying and clarifying the concerns of individuals throughout the change process. The stages in the survey range from little to no concern towards personal concerns, to concerns about time management and the task of implementing the innovation. Once the innovation is
adopted and implemented, individuals often find themselves at Stage 6, which is refocusing their efforts to refine and improve the innovation. Individuals’ Stages of Concern (SoC) will depend on their perceptions of the innovation as well as the school culture and setting. Identifying the teachers’ concern level provides the change facilitator the opportunity to address the concern and therefore differentiate the change process as needed for the individuals involved. This is important because it allowed individualized attention to be given to each participant involved in the study based on the individual levels of concern identified from the SoCQ results.

As an administrator at the research site, I conducted qualitative participatory action research to address and foster teachers through an innovation implementation. The innovation was to support teachers through individualized coaching while they were charged with changing their instructional delivery from traditional isolated content delivery to integrating English-Language Arts within social studies, science, and math content which was an area of need within the study site. A desire to investigate best practices and research literature that supported, as well as challenged, the implementation informed the study and methodology.

**Statement of the Problem**

Educators who remain in the field of education become dispirited with the numerous changes by those outside the classroom (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). For change to transpire, it is imperative for teachers to have a voice in their learning and development. In order for change to be sustainable within the educational realm, the inclusion of teachers in leading the implementation of innovations is essential. According to Kotter (2012), people who experience unpleasant involvements through change initiatives may be more resistant to new ideas and suggestions because of their previous experiences. Teachers’ faith in educational leadership or management may be weak due to past experiences with ineffective change. A glimpse of hope
must be present for those who are resistant and withdrawn from doing something new. In order for change to occur, teachers need to feel empowered (Kotter, 2012). Empowering teachers during the course of the change process may lead to a more clear understanding of the mission and vision of the school. Once such understanding is achieved, and teacher concerns are addressed, the chance for sustainable change increases significantly (Hord, 2015).

Training is essential in order to keep up with the frequency of changes. Teachers should be prepared and supported for today’s classroom challenges. Preparation can be epitomized in the learning and development of teachers. Well organized and intentional planning should be developed based on the needs of the individuals involved in the change process. A strategic plan for growth should be mapped out allowing the thoughts of all involved to be heard. It is important to note that teachers will create their own styles of change as they attempt to implement the innovation if school leaders give conflicting signals (Hall & Hord, 2015). Therefore, training must be well-planned and supported in order for the change to be sustainable.

Schools and other educational institutions continuously pursue change. In fact, change for many institutions is the norm and is the one thing that is constant. According to Hall and Hord (2015), “The road to success is always under construction,” (p. 306). Just as a teacher supports his or her students during transitional periods, the same should be reciprocated in order to support teachers during times of transition. In order for desired change to be successful and sustainable, time and continuous support are required of all stakeholders.

**Personal Connection with the Research Topic**

I have been in education for 21 years. Of the 21 years, I was a classroom teacher for 17. The remaining years, I have been a principal of a combined middle and high school. During my time of service, I have been charged with the changes in technology, curriculum, accountability
and assessment measures, embracing diversity within the special education realm, and best practices to name a few. The buy-in acceptance levels for these changes differ from teacher to teacher. My realization is that some teachers will intake and produce while other teachers will choose to close the door and resume as usual. Throughout my years of being in education, I have had hands-on administrators and those who simply spoke from the sidelines. Between the two, I have chosen to be the administrator who leads change and fosters teacher development. In my experience, resistance is prevalent when an innovation is unsupported and the purpose is absent.

Through this research, I have identified and established personal, practical, and intellectual goals that have shaped my interest in this topic (Maxwell, 2013). As a school administrator, my personal goal is to build a community that embraces change. I want to make authentic, relevant, and meaningful change happen in my school. I desire to build a support system to ensure that newly gained knowledge has the potential to impact instructional practice. On a practical level, my aspiration is to create a model that can be emulated school-wide. This model will support teachers through innovations that could be state-mandated, school-driven, or simply an innovation based on teacher desire. Finally, my intellectual goal is to attain knowledge and have a deep understanding of literature established in the topical research content of effective leadership in leading change, organizational change, individual change, professional development, and resistance in learning. Furthermore, my intellectual goal in this study is to glean what it takes to support teachers through an initiative, and to be able to instate the application of addressing individual needs in order to sustain change.

**Personal Connection with Research Site**

The study occurred in a public charter school in a rural school district located in the Piedmont region of Georgia (hereafter referred to as Rural Charter School). Rural Charter
School hosted its first kindergarten class of eleven students in 2007. Since then, it has evolved into a prekindergarten-grade 12 campus with an enrollment of over nine hundred students. I was hired for a teaching position in 2008 and am currently serving a fourth year administrative role as the Upper School Director at the study site. There are 90 staff members employed, three of whom are administrators (Chief Executive Officer, Lower School Director, and Upper School Director). Historically, Rural Charter School has performed very well on state administered assessments, and has received numerous accolades and accreditations since its inauguration. Continuity and consistency in staffing and leadership greatly contribute to the establishment’s success. Teacher attrition has not been problematic. Over eighty percent of the staff are also parents of students who are enrolled at Rural Charter School. The teachers at Rural Charter School are devoted to creating a school culture of prosperity and proficiency.

What attracted me to Rural Charter School was the fact that the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is not afraid of change. The school was a thriving school and was forced to change due to rapid growth. The driving force of Rural Charter School is to become better even in the areas that are already good. The goal is always to be better. Rural Charter School does many things to be instructionally and professionally effective, but the mindset overall is to strive toward more successful ways to demonstrate continuous improvement and growth. Dweck (2006) epitomized Rural Charter School’s perspective of change by stating, “Even when you change, the old beliefs aren’t just removed like a worn-out hip or knee and replaced with better ones. Instead, the new beliefs take the place alongside the old ones, and as they become stronger, they give you a different way to think, feel, and act” (p. 214).

I was charged by the CEO to identify an area of instructional practice within the campus in which I could join forces to make a good practice even better. Throughout the qualitative
participatory action research, I partnered with a team of second-grade teachers. We came together as a unit to better understand how something works best (Stake, 2010). We targeted the area of instructional delivery for the integration of English-Language Arts within social studies, science, and math content. Based on the participants’ needs identified according to the Stages of Concerns Questionnaire as well the participants’ concerns highlighted in interviews, I was able to administer individualized coaching. The end goal was to support the participants through individualized coaching in order to sustain change.

**Purpose and Significance of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to monitor the change process of a group of second-grade teachers as an innovation was being used to transform their current instructional practices. Traditionally, teachers are expected to teach English-Language Arts, social studies, science, and mathematics independently of one another to their assigned group of students. This study was completed through a qualitative participatory action research design which sought to integrate English-Language Arts within social studies, science, and math content. Teacher learning was designed in the contextual framework of differentiation through varied professional development opportunities based on the results from the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (George et al., 2006). The central phenomena being explored through this study examined the effects of leader support through teacher change with a focus on the levels of concern. The significance of this study was threefold.

1. Support teachers with individualized coaching through change in instructional practices.
2. Address teacher concerns identified through the SoCQ survey results and individual interview responses during the course of the innovation implementation.
3. Provide a model for change initiatives that can be emulated by other institutions.
Even though the purpose of this study was not to address student achievement, research supports the theory that through effective teacher change, student achievement will increase (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). According to a status report of teacher development in the United States and abroad, “Rigorous research suggests that sustained and intensive professional learning for teachers is related to student achievement gains” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009, p. 9). Individualizing the needs, and meeting the teachers’ concerns are essential when implementing professional learning. The learning should be meaningful and applicable.

**Research Questions**

This research focused on supporting teachers by offering individualized coaching through a change process as they learned to implement an integrated curriculum model. I, as the researcher and co-facilitator of the initiative, created professional learning communities for a team of second-grade teachers as they embarked on the innovation for the integration of English-Language Arts within social studies, science, and math content. Through this study, I closely followed the professional development and curriculum integration journey of a second-grade team while monitoring their concern levels as identified by the SoCQ results. Two research questions guided the investigation:

**Research question 1.** How do participants’ concerns change over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation?

**Research question 2.** What do teachers attribute to their ability to change their practice over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation?
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework is the overarching arrangement for the study, including why it is worth doing and how it should be done (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017). According to Ravitch and Riggan (2017), the conceptual framework grounds the study and provides purpose of the study’s importance and rigor. They also pose questions the researcher should consider as a way to focus the study which are: what, why, to whom, and how. What do you want to study and why does it matter? To whom is the focus of the study? How do the research questions align to the topic? How do the methods address the research questions? The conceptual framework outlined my ideas and beliefs about the study and how the study challenged those ideas and beliefs and explains the main topics of the study. This framework was the theoretical base from which this study evolved. It included the basic, historical, and theoretical background of sustaining change through individualized coaching. The purpose of the theoretical framework was to provide the researcher with explanations and considerations about the study (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017). While the topical research identifies the ‘what’, the theoretical framework identifies the ‘why’ and ‘how’.

Figure 1 shows a graphic representation of the conceptual framework. It was a representation of the overarching argument for my study. It served as the superstructure for the study (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017). In order to shape this study in sustaining change through individualized coaching, I selected specific topics in order to gain knowledge and expertise from those who have researched and studied similar works as I cultivated my own knowledge and understanding. I chose to research the works to include seminal work as well as more recent findings in order to include historical context. Areas of topical research that situated the study included effective leadership and leading change, organizational change, individual change,
resistance in learning, as well as professional learning highlighting individualized coaching. The theoretical framework was guided by the adult learning theory, social constructivism, and Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM). The selection of adult learning theory specifically andragogy was appropriate for the study because of the recognition for how to best lead adults (Knowles, 1984). The selection of social constructivism was appropriate for the study because of the recognition that knowledge is co-constructed (Vygotsky, 1978). The selection of CBAM (George, Hall, & Stiegelbauer, 2006) was appropriate for the study because of the utilization of the survey tool to assess the participants’ stages of concern throughout innovation implementation. The research design was qualitative participatory action research using a survey and interview protocol as the data sources.

*Figure 1. Conceptual Framework.* This figure is a visual representation of the topical research and theoretical framework for this study.
The review of literature in chapter two proposes that the relationship between adult learning theory, social constructivism, and the CBAM provide a solid foundation to support the topical research as identified in the conceptual framework as it relates to addressing individual needs in order to sustain change through individualized coaching.

**Definition of Key Terms**

**Andragogy.** Andragogy is defined as the educating of adults (Knowles, 1984).

**Charter School.** A charter school is a public school of choice that operates under the terms of a charter, or contract, with an authorizer, such as the state and local boards of education (Georgia Department of Education, 2018).

**Change.** Change is defined as learning (Hall & Hord, 2015).

**Conceptual Framework.** A conceptual framework is defined as an argument as to the value of the topic of a study and the importance theoretical and methodological tools for conducting the research are meaningful and appropriate (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017).

**Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM).** CBAM is a research framework developed at the University of Texas in the 1970s that focuses on strategies for measuring, interpreting, and facilitating affective and behavioral change as instructors learn and apply educational innovations (George et al., 2006).

**Job Embedded.** Job Embedded is defined as professional development that takes place in the day-to-day teaching profession to ensure that learning is related to the practice (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009).

**Instructional Coaching.** Instructional coaching is referred to as the one-on-one process of helping to guide and facilitate teachers’ instructional practice (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017).
Learning Communities. Learning communities is referred to as the expansion of professional development to include the entire school (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009).

Participatory Action Research. Participatory action research is research that emphasizes collaboration and change within an organization (Creswell, 2012).

Professional Development. Professional development is a continuum of opportunities to train and engage educators in the latest educational reforms and innovations (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009).

Resistance. Resistance is referred to as a natural part of change (Hall & Hord, 2015).

Rural. Rural is defined as relating to the country, not city (Merriam-Webster, 2018).

Social Constructivism. Social constructivism is a sociological theory that states knowledge occurs through collaboration in which learners are integrated into a community of knowledge (Vygotsky, 1978).

Stages of Concern (SoC). SoC is one of three components that make up the diagnostic dimensions of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model. The SoC is critical to address the concerns of the people charged with implementing an innovation (George et al., 2006).

Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ). The SoCQ is one of the survey instruments used in CBAM that identifies an individual’s stages of concern throughout the change process. (George et al., 2006).

Summary

As defined by Hall and Hord (2015), change is learning. Change has been the constant in educational institutions. The focus of this study was situated around sustaining change through individualized coaching. After identifying an area of practice within my school campus, which I could target and improve, I collaborated with a team of second-grade teachers. We concentrated
on instructional delivery for the integration of English-Language Arts within social studies, science, and math content. Based on the participants’ needs identified through the SoCQ, as well as the concerns shared by the participants in individual interviews, I was able to administer individualized coaching.

The purpose of the study was to monitor the change process of a group of teachers as they participated in a change in their instructional practice. The significance of this study was threefold: (1) support teachers with individualized coaching through change in instructional practices, (2) address teacher concerns identified through the SoCQ survey results and individual interview responses during the course of the innovation implementation, and (3) provide a model for change initiatives that can be emulated by other institutions.

This study was positioned upon theories and concepts connected with the exploration of the central phenomenon, teacher change. Although the implementation of the innovation was a portion of the study, my main focus concentrated on the change process rather than the innovation itself. The components of the conceptual framework supporting the study were based on Vygotsky’s (1978) social constructivism, adult learning theory (Knowles, 1984), and CBAM (George et al., 2006), which provided a foundation in sustaining change through individualized coaching. Through qualitative participatory action research (Stake, 2010), the study shared the professional development and curriculum experience of the second-grade teachers. This study was significant because the outcomes provided a model for change initiatives to be emulated by the research site as well as other institutions.

**Organization of Dissertation**

In chapter two, I expound on the literature reviewed on the topical research depicted in the study’s conceptual framework highlighting the areas of effective leadership in leading change
among teachers, organizational change, individual change, resistance in learning, professional learning, effective individualized coaching, and sustaining change. Chapter two further investigates how theories such as the adult learning theory, social constructivism, and CBAM have shaped and guided the research as it related to the topical research elements. I concluded chapter two with the implications of addressing individual needs through means of individual coaching as a means to sustaining change. In chapter three, I define and detail the methodology used to collect and analyze the qualitative participatory action research aspects of the study. Correspondingly, I describe the research design as well as the participants and setting in which the research took place. In chapter four, I present the findings from the data collected and the analysis of the SoCQ. Themes that emerged from the interviews are also highlighted and expounded. The final chapter is comprised of discussion, implications, and conclusion of the study. I discuss the findings as they pertain to each research question including the impact of the research, as well as the individuals involved throughout the course of this research. Limitations of findings and researcher comments are highlighted in chapter five. Furthermore, the relationship of my findings to the literature is outlined. In summation, implications for future practice as well as implications for future research are identified.
Chapter 2

A Review of Related Literature

Introduction

This study was positioned to monitor the change process of a team of second-grade teachers as an innovation was being integrated into their instructional practice. The implemented instructional change was the integration of English-Language Arts within social studies, science, and math content. Knight (2009) posed the idea that rather than asking teachers why they resist change, leaders need to ask teachers what can be done to make it easier to implement new practices. A factor that affects student learning and achievement is the quality of teaching (Fullan & Hargreaves, 2016). Investing and equipping teachers with best practices are essential. In order to attain new teaching outcomes, instructional staff must change their teaching, but adjusting to a new way of teaching is not an easy task (Hall & Hord, 2015).

The core of the literature that fashioned this study consists of empirical and theoretical studies on sustaining change and variables which can impact an educator’s ability or even the willingness to change while undergoing innovation adoption. The key words and terms that were used to search for relevant literature included the following: effective leadership, teacher development, individualized coaching, Concerns-Based Adoption Model, job-embedded professional development, teacher resistance to change, leading change, content integration, and teacher leadership. A range of literature was reviewed to include seminal work on the topic using historical to current implications. It was through the range of literature that the identification of the gap in knowledge surfaced. The gap in knowledge grounded the study’s problem and purpose.
The purpose of this literature review was to examine what previous researchers, experts, and theorists have established regarding the topical research and theoretical framework supporting the research topic. In order to have a better understanding of the research problem, the review of literature includes the following topics: (a) effective leadership and leading change, (b) organizational change, (c) individual change, (d) resistance in learning, (e) professional development for teachers, (f) effective professional development for teachers, (g) effective individualized coaching, and (h) sustaining change. Furthermore, the literature review investigated and epitomized the theories of adult learning, social constructivism, and the CBAM as they relate to the topical areas of the study. The literature review concludes with the identification of the gap in knowledge in sustaining change, and a preview of the remaining dissertation chapters.

**Effective Leadership and Leading Change**

Fullan (2017) equated leadership to helping people find meaning. Effective leaders have the ability to make people feel that even the most arduous problems can be managed productively (Fullan, 2001). He continued to describe effective leaders as being hopeful, optimistic, and portraying an attitude of tenacity for stick-to-itiveness (Fullan, 2001).

The school administrator is vital to educational change in schools (Hall & Hord, 1984). When change necessitates, effective leaders have the aptitude to portray a vision that encompasses buy-in from all stakeholders involved. An effective vision clarifies the direction of change (Kotter, 2012). The clarity in direction is essential because lack of vision creates contradiction, perplexity, and indecision as to whether the proposed change is even necessary. Kotter (2012) defined characteristics of an effective vision as being one that is imaginable, desirable, feasible, focused, flexible, and communicable. He communicated that the leader not
only creates the vision, but also provides the strategies for achieving the vision. Further, he described the strategies as being logical to attain the vision. An imaginable vision is one that allows the stakeholders to see what is in store for the future. The desirable vision is appealing while the feasible vision is realistic. A focused and flexible vision provides guidance but also provides for modifications when needed. The last characteristic of an effective vision is that it must be communicable. According to Kotter (2012), failure to communicate a vision equates to a vision lost in clutter. Without strategies, the vision remains unfulfilled; a null transformation.

According to Fullan (2001), a leader must possess and work on improving his moral purpose. The author described moral purpose as being about both ends and means (Fullan, 2001). An example of an end as it pertains to school is to make an impact in the lives of students and staff. How one achieves the end is referred to as the mean. For example, Fullan (2001) stated, “If you don’t treat others (for example, teachers) well and fairly, you will be a leader without followers” (p. 13). Effective school leaders desire impactful opportunities in order to better the school environment. A bond is secured between a committed stakeholder and an effective leader when the sense of commitment develops and the leader is portrayed as one who has the stakeholder’s best interest at the forefront. Fullan (2001) further asserted that commitment develops through relationships, and relationships and moral purpose are closely interrelated. It is important to identify not only the purpose and intent of a strong relationship amongst leader and staff as they pertain to an educational institutional setting, but the roles each perform in the process. The role of leadership is to create what Fullan (2001) referred to as a greater capacity in order to attain better results. Hall and Hord (1984) asserted that ongoing support from the principal is essential. When teachers perceive that a principal is supportive, outcomes fare far better than when they feel a lack of support (Hall & Hord, 1984).
An effective leader will ensure the institution’s growth by fostering and supporting collaboration amongst teachers. Fullan and Hargreaves (1996) reinforced the importance of collaboration in that it gives teachers a voice, and leaders who support it create an environment that is committed to change and improvement. Effective leaders promote and support collaborative cultures in order to develop and increase teacher confidence (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996). Knight (2011) presented a partnership as an approach to collaboration. He shared seven partnership principles as a means to provide a conceptual language that can be used to describe how effective leadership strives to collaborate with teachers. The partnership principles are: equality, choice, voice, reflection, dialogue, praxis, and reciprocity. Knight (2011) asserted that equality is exhibited when both administrator and teacher collectively make decisions. An effective leader empowers the teacher as the final decision-maker through the partnership principle of choice. Voice is portrayed as opinions are welcomed by the administrator are viewed as non-threatening. An effective administrator encourages individual teacher thoughts through reflection. The author noted there is no dominance in a one-sided agenda. He promoted the importance of dialogue as being two way discussions. Effective leaders foster praxis, which is the action for applying new knowledge to daily practice. Finally, the author contended the importance for reciprocity. He claimed that the administrator and the teachers are seen as equals and should view each other with value and respect.

Finally, an effective leader who is leading change (change facilitator) has a game plan (Hall & Hord, 1984; Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987). In order to manage and lead change more efficiently, a plan should be implemented (Hall & Hord, 1984). The authors noted an effective plan will first develop supportive organizational arrangements. The organizational arrangements included the identification of the staff involved, the schedule, funds,
and resources to be used. The second component included in the plan to lead change is to provide training. Training should incorporate modeling and demonstrating the innovation. Along with modeling and demonstrating, appropriate training contains feedback, with provision and misconception clarifications made for the participants. The third factor a plan should include is consultation and reinforcement. During consultation and reinforcement, a leader will hold one-on-one meetings with the participants and provide useful and applicable assistance. Reinforcement should consist of constructive criticism as well as success celebration. Monitoring is the fourth component for an effective plan. The monitoring element includes data gathering, analyzing, and information interpretation. After data is interpreted, outcomes should be reported to those directly involved in the change process. Not only should the plan include reporting results to those involved, but also the fifth component for an effective plan which calls for external communication. External communication includes describing and reporting the innovation to other stakeholders in order to gain support. The final component for an effective plan is dissemination. This element involves encouragement for others to adopt the innovation through marketing and demonstrating the innovation. An effective leader should adjust the game plan as the change process matures because without a game plan, continuity does not exist (Hall & Hord, 1984).

Organizational Change

Determining an institutions’ organizational culture is important. Organizational culture determines the climate and is the vital ingredient in governing the level of success to implement change in an institution (Belias & Koustelios, 2014). Dufour and Fullan (2013) revealed that cultural change is both doable and undoubtedly difficult. The authors identified five factors that contribute to the difficulty in cultural change. The first contributing factor was the belief that
change disrupts traditional practices. Complacency and tradition become unsettled when opposed by something new. Another contributing factor to the difficulty in cultural change is it can create conflict. The interruption to a practicing method can certainly cause disdain and dissension. A third factor the authors noted was that cultural change is multifaceted. Those leading change provide attention on various aspects versus singular aspects. A fourth factor that contributes to the difficulty in cultural change noted was the process of trial and error. The complex process of change lies in the discovery of what is working and what is not working. The final contributing factor highlighted was the realization that cultural change is never-ending. Once a leader is committed to change, the process is inherent. Despite the contributing factors, schools will be able to meet the challenges confronted if leaders endeavor to change the culture of the institution (Dufour & Fullan, 2013).

**Six Functions to Facilitate Change and Minimize Difficulty**

Hall and Hord (2015) accentuated six functions when facilitating change while minimizing the difficulty in change regardless of the contributing factors outlined by Dufour and Fullan (2013). The first function is to develop and communicate a shared vision. The communicated and shared vision can alleviate the difficulty in cultural change by promoting constant engagement in moving all those involved towards a common goal and target. The second function identified by the authors is planning and providing resources. The authors noted that planning is not a one-time event. Planning must be flexible and adapted in order to meet the immediate needs. Investing in professional learning is the third function when facilitating change while minimizing the difficulty in change regardless of the contributing factors. Depending on the innovation, professional learning should be concerns-based and focused on the desired change. Professional learning should be implemented at the beginning, middle, as well
as the end of the change effort. The fourth function to consider when facilitating change is checking progress. Due to change being a process rather than a single event, it is important for constant progress assessment to occur. Checking progress consists of inventions such as interviews, observations, and feedback with those who are engaged with the change process.

The fifth function is providing continuous assistance. Assistance is being present in the daily routine. Addressing concerns is palpable with continuous assistance. Providing follow-up and responding to individuals’ needs are vital and aid in minimizing the difficulty of change. The final function the authors note is creating a context supportive of change. By creating a context supportive of change, those involved in the change process feel included rather than isolated. Positive relationships are created and fostered when change is supported. The six functions have been continuously reviewed and revised as a means for successful implementation for organizational change (Hall & Hord, 2015).

**Understanding the Depth of an Organization**

Fostering sustainable change and the differing roles contributing to the efforts for promoting change is priority. Individual teacher learning is not solely based on the development of the teacher alone, but it is influenced by the involvement and culture of the school community. The school community includes the immersion of the teacher and positions such as the curriculum coordinator, content coaches, students, and school administrators. An equity partnership between teacher and administrator is a necessity (Knight, 2011). When embarking on organizational change, it is essential to focus on understanding the effect on individuals (Belias & Kouveliotou, 2014). The need for collaboration is important in order to disband the tension and anxiety within the school community for those participants who may not have completely bought into the idea of a new innovation (Fullan, 2004). Research by Dufour and
Fullan (2013) supported the above-mentioned researchers by contending the importance for assigning people into meaningful teams and allotting intentional time for collaboration. Hall and Hord (1984) asserted that during the course of organizational change, there must be strong support from the top administrator. Furthermore, for the change to be sustained, the continuity of the administrator is essential (Hall & Hord, 1984).

Fullan (2001) stated, “Leading in a culture of change means creating a culture (not just a structure) of change” (p. 44). Change does not mean that an organization constantly adopts innovation after innovation; it means establishing a culture that embraces transformation. Reculturing an organization takes time and learning never ends. Hall and Hord (2015) asserted that change does not occur by having a one-time declaration by the leader, followed by a couple days of training, and accompanied with a few resources. Change is not a one-time event, it is a process that grows and matures as people and organizations progressively learn. An organization’s staff and leaders will either play the part of enhancement or deterrence in a change effort. Hall and Hord (2015) affirmed that change is complex and no single organization is likely to have all the capability and means needed to succeed in creating a sustainable change. Spillane (2009) affirmed that while aspects of an organization might be changed, not everything will change at once.

Sharing the responsibility in an organizational change is critical. Approaching change within an organizational should be done through a democratic process. Hall and Hord (2015) stressed the positional leader accepts and upholds responsibility but operationally is less visible. All staff contributes concepts and designs for change. A democratic approach allows and creates an atmosphere of buy-in and support for all.
Sustaining Organizational Change

Fullan (2008) asserted six ways a leader can sustain organizational change.

**Love your employee.** The employee is to be valued and viewed as an integral foundational component of the school’s culture. Value should be placed on teachers more so than individual student achievement. In order for a school system to sustain high quality, premium educators must be present. A system will only be as good as those involved and loving the employee will help to preserve the high quality educators needed. In the school setting, teachers’ opinions and beliefs should be regarded by the administration. Day after day teachers instruct students despite various challenges. Knight (2009) asserted teachers should be treated with respect. Administrators can show love towards teachers by listening to them. Allowing teachers to offer suggestions for change and then validating their suggestions by offering support extends value (Knight, 2009).

**Connect peers with purpose.** Peer interaction within the culture of the school is essential. Leaders should be vested and viewed as collaborators. An establishment of equal partnership between teacher and administrator will promote a deeper commitment to the organization. In the school setting, connecting peers with purpose demonstrates that everyone is involved, where autonomy and cohesion coexist (Fullan & Hargreaves, 2016). It is essential in the school atmosphere for administrators and teachers to work as one. Scheduled meetings with a purposeful agenda where dialogue occurs are one way administrators and teachers connect.

**Capacity building prevails.** It is easy to find fault and identify weaknesses. However, when the focus is on capacity building, the attitude shifts from fault finding to strength enhancing. Hard work and determination becomes the focus of cultural attainment. In the school setting, it is essential to work as a team. Those involved will be empowered to make
meaningful decisions, offer needed support, and learn from one another (Dufour & Fullan, 2013). Working as a team takes the individual out of the equation and place emphasis on capacity building.

Learning is the work. Organized learning takes place within the confinement of one’s surroundings. Learning communities are not a separate entity but rather an integration of daily practices. In the school setting, effective learning is engaging and experiential. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) asserted that learning is active and is based on experiences. Daily school routines consist of teaching and learning. Active learning is more than sitting-and-listening. Active learning consists of collaboration, coaching, feedback, and reflection (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Croft et al. (2010) asserted that a teacher’s opportunity to learn is greatly impacted by the school’s professional culture. The school environment must be one that fosters continuous learning and teamwork. Teamwork within a school is attainable through grade level committees and continuous conversations between teachers and school leaders.

Transparency rules. Organizations accept successes as well as failures in unity. Being transparent is making the commitment to be open and willing to recognize problems and collectively create solutions. An example of transparency rules in relation to the school setting is exemplified through not blaming teachers when efforts to improve student achievement fail (Knight, 2009). Rather than blaming teachers for failures, administrators should be committed and open to teachers and engage them in conversations in order to create solutions. School leaders should establish open-door policies within the academic institution (Croft et al., 2010). An open-door policy cultivates the willingness and acceptance for teachers to communicate with one another as well as with the administration.
Systems learn. Learning never ceases nor is learning sustained with the focus being on any one leader. The focus for systems learn is enhanced by the creation of developing and fostering a culture of school leaders. An organization of leaders promotes a continuity of growth and development within the establishment (Croft et al., 2010). An example of systems learn in relation to the school setting can be established by identifying leaders within the institution. Fullan and Hargreaves (2016) stated teachers are leaders. The authors further asserted that collective autonomy should exist. Collective autonomy occurs when teachers are entrusted to lead and work independently with unnecessary bureaucratic interference (Fullan & Hargreaves, 2016). Another example of systems learn in relation to the school setting is enhanced through team collaboration. Croft et al. (2010) asserted team collaboration is an effective way to support teachers.

Covey (1989) paralleled Fullan’s first assertion for Love Your Employee through what he has coined production and production capability balance. The author compared production to what an employer would want accomplished and production capability to the one’s accomplishing the task, the employees. Failure to respect the production and production capability balance in an institution will decrease organizational effectiveness (Covey, 1989). It is essential for an administrator to esteem teachers as valuable assets. Too much focus on the production will undermine the wellbeing for the ones accomplishing the task (Covey, 1989). Fullan (2008) asserted loving your employees (teachers) will result in impressive outcomes. Hence, creating the perfect balance in order to receive desired results. Creating the environment for one to thrive is one of the ways you love your employees (Fullan, 2008).

Researching and conceptualizing this notion of focusing on the employee led to an investigation of the literature on individuals within an organization.
Individual Change

Hall and Hord (2015) contend that until every member changes, an institution as a whole does not change. “Successful change starts and ends at the individual level” (Hall & Hord, 2015, p. 12); however, it is the individuals who often minimize their ability to change things (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996). Kotter (2012) suggested people who experience unpleasant involvements in change processes may be more reluctant to new ideas and motives. Teachers need to feel a sense of ownership, which can be accomplished when teachers feel they can contribute their ideas for change (Hall & Hord, 2015). With empowerment, comes the understanding of the mission and vision of the establishment. Once understanding is achieved, the opportunity for change increases. Learning new things and developing new ideas create change necessary for improved teaching and student achievement.

Offering support that constructs a positive relationship with teachers is vital for individual change to occur. Support is offered through community learning groups, administration support, teacher leader involvement, and coaches. According to Donaldson (2006), the most important job of a teacher leader is growing strong relationships with colleagues. Donaldson (2006) stated, “As ‘one of us’ their opinions, proposals, and practices can carry unusual power with colleagues” (p. 120). A teacher leader is one who can build relationships amongst colleagues help to ensure that change and development occur. Strong relationships extinguish negative energy and highlight positive energy (Covey, 1984). Likewise, Donaldson (2006) depicted educational institutions as being places for strong working relationships. Productive action occurs when educators are involved in strong professional working relationships within their respected institutions (Donaldson, 2006). Katzenmeyer and Moller (2009) suggested that positive outcomes are a result of strong relationships within and
outside the school. Just as offering support is necessary in order to attain individual change, so is understanding the individual. Covey (1984) asserted that one of the most important things an individual can do is to seek understanding of another person.

Responding to and implementing change occurs at varying levels for individuals. Some individuals grasp and run with new concepts; whereas others may be a little more reluctant and hesitant. Signs of resistance and hesitancy do not always equate to an individual’s despondency and disregard for intentions. Factors such as support and sustenance are essential for the development of individual change. Other factors that influence change have to do with the mindsets of the individuals. Dweck (2006) affirmed that individuals have one of two mindsets: the fixed mindset or the growth mindset. The fixed mindset is the belief that one’s qualities are set, nonnegotiable. Dweck (2006) stated some individuals are trained at an early age with the fixed mindset. The growth mindset is based on what one believes is attainable through effort. The notion that everyone can mature and change through experience and exposure is viewed as being the growth mindset.

The rate of learning to make a change and the evolving of skill and proficiency in using it varies greatly among individuals (Hall & Hord, 2015). Individuals who are excited and confident about an innovation are more willing to accept it versus individuals who regard the innovation as an uncertainty. Hall and Hord (2015) sorted the individual perceptions into concerns which will be explained later in this chapter. Researching levels for individual change led to the study of resistance in learning why one might refuse or resist learning.

**Resistance in Learning**

As schools strive to better the educational journey for students, the hesitancy for teachers to change, or for leaders to collaboratively change with their teachers, will ultimately cause
continued failure within schools (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996). The constant emphasis on school reforms and new practices being placed on educators today has created a sense of resistance in learning for teachers to embrace change (Terhart, 2013). Terhart (2013) asserted school reformers assume that schools, administrators, and teachers cannot wait to learn new practices and concepts. The reciprocation for new practices and teachings are disappointing when the innovation is not welcomed. It becomes a battle between those who want a change and those who have to carry out the change (Terhart, 2013). Hargreaves and Fullan (2009) called this a change war while Terhart (2013) depicted it as a war in disguise. “The bosses want to change, but those who will have to carry out the work lower down do not want change” (Terhart, 2013, p. 488). Terhart (2013) identified three triggers of resistance as follows:

- **Argument**: Why change things? Argument surfaces when those involved doubt change is needed.
- **Operation**: How will that work? Operation encompasses the uncertainty that the innovation is attainable.
- **Effect**: What is in it for me? Effect questions personal benefits of change.

A team fails when members do not feel a sense of connectivity. Donaldson (2006) asserted resistance develops from a “me and you” mentality rather than an “us” mentality. Fullan (2017) contended the lack of leader involvement in participating as a learner causes resistance to surface. In order to attain the antithesis of resistance, relationships must be formed between all those involved.

The lack of confidence in an innovation or implementation is another reason why teachers resist change (Fullan, 2017). The lack of confidence could be a result of one not being able to envision the differing components of the innovation or implementation. Fullan (2017)
remedied the lack of confidence with deep leadership. Those who possess deep leadership skills have the ability to take others to innovated places, while reshaping confidence levels (Fullan, 2017). Along with lack of confidence, the failure to be inclusive will result in teacher resistance. Neglecting to include teachers in leading the implementation of innovations will result in resistance to change (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Less resistance occurs when teachers are involved in identifying the needs and managing the methods for change.

Furthermore, resistance is prevalent when teachers are asked to change in ways that are unproductive, indisposed, and far from do-able. Knight (2009) asserted teachers are more willing to implement an innovation that appears worthwhile and sure to make a positive difference. Teachers will rebut a petition for change that is not followed up with adequate support from those requesting the implementation (Knight, 2009). Hall and Hord (2015) affirmed the importance of assisting and supporting those going through a change process. Hall and Hord (2015) alluded that efforts fail due to lack of assistance extending to all members. Terhart (2013) referred to the lack of support as the ‘two worlds’ argument. Implementation is birthed by administrators or educational researchers who are detached from the classroom. Terhart (2013) argued that teachers are resistant because “a lot of things concocted by the higher instances do not work in practice” (Terhart, 2013, p.495).

Teachers desire change to be an easy transformation (Knight, 2009). Hall and Hord (2015) attested transformations are easy when change facilitators have clear expectations and utilize appropriate resources to guide the implementation. The adage, seeing is believing, holds truth to teacher resistance. Knight (2009) expressed a teacher will buy-in and believe the change to be of worth, once value of the program is established. Teachers desire to know the personal benefit of an implementation rather than it seeming to be simply more work added to the day
(Terhart, 2013). Addressing teachers’ personal concerns will demise and alleviate the concern of an implementation being a waste of time (Hall and Hord, 2015).

Listening more than speaking is vital when an innovation is implemented. Self-concerns are intense at the inception of a change initiative (Hall and Hord, 2015). Communication between the change facilitator and the innovation stakeholders is crucial. A change facilitator should not assume that everyone involved understands the innovation and is equipped to make it. Proportional details and information must be disseminated appropriately and thoroughly (Hall & Hord, 2015).

As detailed, resistance comes from varying perspectives. Lack of knowledge, information, guidance, and personal connection can all influence resistance tendencies. How a change facilitator approaches and responds to resistance is crucial. In summation, “You cannot accomplish school reform against the will of teachers, but only with the teachers!” (Terhart, 2013, p. 487).

**Professional Development for Teachers**

Research has shown that professional development has yielded little to no effectiveness with teachers in sustaining changes in educational practices and student advancement (Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017). The lack of support, feedback, and partnership has left teachers with little confidence in transferring newly gained information into instructional practice (Hall & Hord, 2015). Historically, professional development has centered on improving student learning and improving instructional practices; however, with the absence of support, the value placed in professional development has diminished (Knight, 2009). Although, the intent of educators is to improve student learning, the reality of professional development shows that a need for change is present.
Evolution of Professional Development

Teacher development has transformed with changes in educational reform. Within the text, authors Katzenmeyer and Moller (2009) presented historical context of teacher development illustrated in Figure 2, referred to as the parallel development. The illustration shows the progression of professional development beginning with the 1970s and climbing to the 2000s. Throughout the evolution, the authors argued the necessity of professional learning for teachers in order to move from the old to new. The authors described the old theory for learning as being built through practice and rewards in comparison to the new theory for learning as being constructing and understanding own meaning and thinking based on prior knowledge (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Old theory for teaching is fractured with subjects broken into progressive modules, skills and drills, multiple testing, and with nominal connections (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). New theory for teaching is prescribed as aiding students with assembling meaning and gained knowledge (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). The emphasis echoes the need for pertinent teacher development in order to create and maintain sustainability for effective teaching.

The 1970s and 1980s. In the 1970s, the setting for training teachers was provided in insulated workshops (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). These workshops consisted of segments of a designated growth subject. Upon completion of the workshop, teachers returned to the classroom with no follow-up or feedback to prove or disprove whether merit existed in the training received (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Teachers’ concerns about the curriculum were not heard and therefore they did not implement the curriculum with fidelity.

Next, the evolution ladder exhibits expert training in the early 1980s. The trainers of these workshops were not educators to a classroom of students but rather outside trainers whose
top priority was to inform teachers that they needed to improve (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Teachers were not taught strategies. This method was problematic for teachers due to neglect in relevancy (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) asserted effective professional development should provide teachers with hands-on development in areas that are applicable to their teaching. Past forms of professional development are described as the following: top down decision making, “fix it” approach, prescribed, little or no follow-up, one-size-fits all, fixed delivery methods, and lacking in follow-up evaluation (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). These traditional methods leave teachers feeling disconnected between the delivery of information and the implementation of practices in their classrooms. Teachers begin to lose confidence in the concept of professional development, thus adopting the phrase, \textit{this too shall pass} (Knight, 2009).

In the mid-1980’s, school reform began to gravitate towards schools inviting outside consultants to provide organizational development. The ineffectiveness of this approach stemmed from the lack of participation from all leaders (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). The consultant came into the school to meet directly with the problem area and essentially provide a packaged \textit{fix}, but all members were not on board with this approach. Staff buy-in was nonexistent. This ultimately led to continued failure in the development provided for educators. Hall and Hord (2015) challenged this notion by attesting the importance of involvement and contribution from all staff members.

\textbf{The 1990s.} In the 1990s, student performance outcomes were birthed in the form of learning communities. The focus turned from outside-the-school-wall consultants to internal usage of staff. The focus shifted to the educators. Teachers began to engage with other staff in a collaborative environment with the improvement of student learning as center target. Although
this concept seemed to be geared at the right level, the failure flared due to weak leadership and time constraints (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Regardless, teachers were given the opportunity to collaborate with one another, but still few changes were sustained in the application of the development sessions into teaching and learning (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Katzenmeyer and Moller (2009) contributed the unsustainable changes to the lack of attention to student needs, absence of shared peer responsibility, time constraints, and failure in monitoring outcomes.

The 2000s. Learning communities evolved into job-embedded learning in the 2000s (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). As defined by Croft, et al. (2010), job-embedded learning takes teacher development and blends it into the daily functions of the teacher. Job-embedded professional development is a culmination of trainings that afford teachers collaborative learning, assessment and curriculum links, learning that contains new depth of knowledge with feedback, and learning that is stretched over a period of time. Rather than isolated workshops or pull-out sessions, teachers now function according to individualized plans for professional development (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Job-embedded professional development is the antithesis of the one-shot workshops which Darling-Hammond, et al. (2009) equated as being shortcomings. Katzenmeyer and Moller (2009) affirmed job-embedded professional learning takes the place of typical after school workshops and meetings scheduled during the course of the school day which in turn focuses more on the individual. Like Darling-Hammond et al. (2009), Cooper (n.d.) referred to the ineffective after school workshops and school day sessions as being ‘one-shot’ sessions. Professional development that is extended over time ensures success (Cooper, n.d.). Croft et al. (2010) supported Katzenmeyer and Moller’s (2009) assertion by stating job-embedded professional learning is effective, powerful, and practical.
Effective Professional Development for Teachers

Professional development must be planned at the school level to ensure specific needs are based on individual concerns (Cooper, n.d.). Preparation can be epitomized in the learning and development of teachers. Cooper (n.d.) asserted four critical components to assist teachers to learn new strategies and skills: (a) theory, (b) demonstration, (c) practice and feedback, and (d) coaching and follow-up. He stressed theory as one critical component used to assist teachers in learning new strategies and skills. Professional development should be researched-based and supported by theory. The second component used to assist teachers in learning new strategies and skills is demonstration. Demonstration is described as modeling concepts which are taught by teachers. Practice and feedback is the third component. Through practice and feedback, participants are to practice the newly taught strategies and skills and the facilitators are to
provide immediate feedback. The final component the author described is coaching and follow-up. Through coaching and follow-up, the expectation is for the coach to maintain a relationship with the participant which includes peer observations and constant discussions. Research conveys that professional development must be on-going, practical, supportive, teacher acceptance, and applicable (Cooper, n.d.).

Croft et al. (2010) asserted job-embedded professional development provides opportunities for teachers to learn. Job-embedded professional development will be as effective as the support provided by the institution. Peer observations, matching curriculums, operative day schedule, and a supportive organizational culture are instrumental in cultivating and sustaining an atmosphere of effective job-embedded development (Croft et al., 2010). Before effective professional development begins, student and teacher needs should be analyzed (Croft et al., 2010). Learning goals formed to guide the professional development can be established based on a needs analysis. Job-embedded professional development is best accomplished when it is infused as a problem of practice (Croft et al., 2010). Best practices are exercised when teachers are encouraged to collaborate and analyze their instructional practice. While collaboration and practice analysis occur, professional development facilitators may offer encouragement by modeling lessons and supporting team collaboration (Croft et al., 2010). Just as educators model expectations for students, leaders must model expected learning outcomes as well. Teachers need to see facilitators going through the same change process (Hall & Hord, 2015).

Due to complex skills students must attain in order to be prepared for further education, teachers need professional development. According to Darling-Hammond et al. (2017), the following are seven features for effective professional development that prepare teachers to work in the 21st century:
1. Is content focused
2. Incorporates active learning
3. Supports collaboration
4. Uses models and modeling
5. Provides coaching and expert support
6. Offers feedback and reflection
7. Is of sustained duration

**Content focused.** Content focused professional development affords teachers the advantage to examine the work of their students, sample new curriculum with their students, and investigate specific element of pedagogy in the content area (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Gulamhussein (2013) asserted content focused professional development is well-received by teachers. Archibald, Coggshall, Croft, and Goe (2011) stated that content focused professional development produces positive changes.

**Active learning.** How teachers learn and what teachers learn are two essential points professional development experiences should address (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Engage teachers in professional development rather than traditional lecture workshops. Teachers have experiences and expertise which should be utilized as resources for new knowledge. Active learning incorporates elements of coaching, collaboration, teacher reflection, and feedback (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Modeling is incorporated in active learning. Archibald et al. (2011) concurred that active learning results in greater changes within teacher instructional practices.

**Collaboration.** Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) affirmed collaboration is an important feature of professional development. Different avenues for collaboration exist. Examples
include: teacher to teacher, grade levels, department levels, school levels, and even district levels. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) referred to collaboration as being a force, one created by teachers for improved instruction. Collaboration results in teacher empowerment (Dufour & Fullan, 2013). In order for true collaboration to be effective, an environment of trust must be provided (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Fullan and Hargreaves (2016) asserted collaboration without a well-designed professional development is a waste of time. Clear intentions and expectations for outcomes should be stated. Archibald et al. (2011) stated in order to foster high-quality professional learning, the infusion of collaboration should be present.

**Models and modeling.** An effective way to relay the vision of practice is to incorporate instructional models and model instruction (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Various kinds of modeling include video teaching, demonstration of lessons, creation of lesson plans, observation of peers, sample assessments, and student work samples (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Modeling can be implemented by colleagues, coaches, or professional development facilitators (Croft et al., 2010). Research by Archibald et al. (2011) discovered that it is critical for coaches to choose instructional practices to model for teachers. Professional development that implements modeling has resulted in student achievement gains (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

**Coaching and expert support.** Coaching should be a part of professional development. New curricula, resources, and best practices are implemented most effective when supported by a coach or other expert support (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Coaches are esteemed to be highly effective in assisting teachers (Gulamhussein, 2013). Teachers who receive assistance from coaches are more likely to approve and apply learned teaching practices in the classroom (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Knight (2009) asserted providing a quality coach will have a significant impact and increase the chances that teachers will adopt and implement best practices.

Sustained duration. Even though research has not provided an exact timeframe for effective professional development models, it is acclaimed that effective professional development does not occur in the traditional fragmented approaches like the insulated workshops described by Katzenmeyer and Moller (2009). Multiple opportunities for teachers to engage in focused concepts and meaningful practices increase the chance for sustainability (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) afforded sustained professional development to paving the way for teachers continued education outside the initial planned professional development course.

Effective Individualized Coaching

Individualized coaching is seen as a valuable resource to teachers and should be a part of all professional learning (Knight, 2011). Knight (2011) stated that teachers should collaborate with a coach when implementing new practices. The author continued to assert that effective coaching makes it easier for teachers to learn and implement new ideas. A part of a coach’s responsibility is to meet one-on-one with teachers to talk about how they can support professional learning (Knight, 2011). During this process, it is essential for the coach to ask questions and explain practices for clarity. If a practice cannot be explained clearly then one should not expect teachers to implement it effectively (Knight, 2011). Most professional
development will have little effect without individualized coaching (Archibald et al., 2011; Croft et al., 2010; Fullan & Hargreaves, 2016; Knight, 2011; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

Knight (2011) described the actions of effective coaches. The author noted that an effective coach will temporarily relinquish the need to be in a position of power. This void of power is replaced with choice. Coaches who choose partnership over power engage in the following practices:

- Enrolling teachers: assistance is offered rather than forced;
- identifying teachers’ goals: leaders and teachers collectively identify goals based on collected data;
- listening: conversations focus on teacher concerns;
- asking questions: there are no prescribed answers to questions a leader asks a teacher; questions are not asked to persuade the teacher;
- explaining teaching practices: expectations and outcomes are clear and concise while taking into account the teachers’ thoughts and ideas on how to make the practice personal;
- providing feedback: leader and teacher cooperatively explore and interpret results

In accordance with Knight (2011), Hall and Hord (2015) also negated the use of top-down power, in favor of shared responsibilities. Effective coaches share responsibilities with other staff members. They are not only collaborators, but also delegators who recognize and employ available human resources (Hord, Rutherford, Hiling-Austin, & Hall, 1987). Donaldson (2006) defined those delegated as being formally appointed leaders and informal leaders. Formally appointed leaders are regarded as department chairs, team leaders, and committee
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chairs while informal leaders are teachers who stand out among their colleagues and are esteemed with respect and trust.

Individualized coaching takes many forms. Croft et al. (2010) described a coach as being one who provides ongoing follow-up by means of demonstrations, observations, and conversations with the teachers as they implement a new strategy in practice. In addition to Knight’s (2011) actions of effective coaches, the author further claimed that individualized coaching consisted of creating a safe and comfortable setting for teachers to share their concerns. It is essential for coaches to focus on the teachers’ concerns in order for coaches to hear the real truth. Archibald et al. (2011) asserted another import form of individualized coaching is modeling. Modeling lessons provide concrete examples for teachers to emulate. Lastly, Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) emphasized another form of individualized coaching involves coaches sharing their expertise about content and best practices. Individualized coaching is defined as an effective professional development strategy that supports implementation of innovations by teachers and furthers the likelihood for sustainability (Darling-Hammond, 2017; Knight, 2009).

**Sustaining Change**

Once educational institutions declare a vision for change and implement effective professional development, the question becomes how is change maintained and sustained? Historically, researchers have provided steps for managing and sustaining change. Table 1 depicts comparisons of past models for managing and sustaining change. The models compared are Lewin’s (1947) Three-Stage Process of Change model, Kanter, Stein, and Jick’s (1992) Ten Commandments for Executing Change, and Kotter’s (2012) Eight-Stage Process for Successful Organizational Transformation. Regardless of the additional steps depicted in Kanter et al.’s
(1992) *Ten Commandments* and Kotter’s (1996) *Eight-Stage Process*, the three stages listed in Lewin’s (1947) *Process of Change* are included in all models of change. Creating the need for change, transitioning to a new method, and sustaining the new method are common stages represented in all three models.

Table 1

*Comparison of Three Models of Change Processes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unfreeze (creating the need for change)</td>
<td>1. Analyze organization and identify need for change</td>
<td>1. Establish a sense of urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Move (transitioning from the old method to new method)</td>
<td>2. Establish a shared vision and a common direction</td>
<td>2. Create a guiding coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Re-Freeze (sustaining and supporting the new method)</td>
<td>3. Separate from the past</td>
<td>3. Develop a vision and strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Create a sense of urgency</td>
<td>4. Communicate the change vision</td>
<td>4. Empower broad-based action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support a strong leader role</td>
<td>5. Arrange political sponsorship</td>
<td>5. Generate short-term wins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Communicate, involve people and be honest</td>
<td>7. Anchor new approaches in the culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reinforce an institutional change</td>
<td>8. Anchor new approaches in the culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first step in dealing with change centers on knowing and understanding the impact on those involved (Belias & Koustelios, 2014; Dufour & Fullan, 2013; Fullan, 2001; Fullan, 2017; Hall & Hord, 2015). Kotter (2012) alluded that culture is not something that can be managed and changed easily rather it is changed once the actions of people have altered with success. Change begins to resonate and manifest with self-reflection and assessment of one’s own strengths and weaknesses. The challenge rests in the teacher’s desire to change their mindset in order to assimilate to the culture of growth and achievement (Dweck, 2006). Administrators of schools are challenged to seek out and hire those teachers who are similar in mindset of growth through development, and it is the effective leaders who hire well and have the ability to retain these teachers (Mendels, 2012).

Hall and Hord (2015) equated positive changes in outcomes to a successful change implementation. The authors symbolize the implementation as a bridge connecting new policy, practice, and programs to student outcomes (Hall & Hord, 2015). The implementation is how the new policy, practice, and programs are conveyed, the interventions that have been put in place to support the stakeholders who are expected to adopt the new policy, practice, and programs, and how those implementing will ensure sustainability transpires on the other side of the bridge. Change management and sustainment will only be as effective as the implementation (Hall & Hord, 2015). Monitoring and providing interventions while undergoing change is crucial (Hall & Hord, 2015). Hall and Hord (2015) promoted that confusion and conflicting signals will lead one to create his or her own version for understanding. This allowance can disband unity and the promotion for a sustainable change. No steps, program, leader, or teacher sustains change alone; it is the continuity and commitment to success that sustains transformation (Dufour & Fullan, 2013; Hall & Hord, 2015).
Theoretical Framework

The theoretical frameworks that served as the foundation of the conceptual framework were Knowles’s (1984) adult learning theory and self-directed learning, Vygotsky’s (1978) social constructivism, and Hord’s, Rutherford’s, Huling-Austin’s, and Hall’s (1987) CBAM. The selection of adult learning theory was appropriate for the study because of the organization and methods for teaching adults. The selection for social constructivism was appropriate for the study because of the acknowledgement of the role of a change facilitator and those undergoing the change initiative. The selection for CBAM was appropriate because it provided the framework for identifying participants’ concerns throughout the innovation implementation. These theories and model provided theoretical bases to the understanding of how to sustain change through individualized coaching when teachers are undergoing innovation adoption and implementation.

Adult Learning Theory

Adult learning theories give insight into how adults learn. As is true with many learning theories, there is not one theory of learning that applies to all adults (Teaching Excellence in Adult Literacy, 2011). Understanding how adults learn and the perceptions often regarded make Adult Learning Theory an integral part to the research. Knowles (1984) promoted the concept of andragogy. Andragogy is the educating of adults, while pedagogy is the educating of children. Knowles established assumptions about adult learners. The author made the assumption that adults have the know how to self-direct their own learning. Adults have the ability to guide and own their education. Due to life experiences, adult learners have the ability to reflect and draw from prior knowledge. As roles are established, adult learners have the ability to self-initiate learning. The author has made the assumption that adult learners’ desire to
apply new learning immediately to establish purpose. Lastly, there is the assumption that adult learners are motivated by internal factors such as reasoning and personal fulfillment rather than external factors such as a paycheck (Teaching Excellence in Adult Literacy, 2011). Knowles (1984) implied that adult learning in the classroom should foster a cooperative climate. Adults should sense awareness that they are on an even playing field with the instructor. One way to achieve and foster a cooperative climate is for resources to be selected in a collaborative manner. When teaching adults, the specific needs and interests should be assessed. The learning objectives should be developed based on the needs, interests, and skill levels. In order to meet the objectives, sequential activities should be designed. The author further implies that when working with adults, a cycle of evaluation and adjustments in the learning experience must be ongoing (Teaching Excellence in Adult Literacy, 2011).

Hall and Hord’s (2015) peer strategies support Knowles’s implications for how adults learn when facilitating implementation. Table 2 disseminates correlations between Hall and Hord’s (2015) peer participation strategies to Knowles’s (1984) implications for practice.
Table 2

*Similarities of Hall and Hord’s (2015) Peer Participation Strategies in Comparison with Knowles’s (1984) Implications for Adult Practice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Participation Strategies (Hall &amp; Hord, 2015)</th>
<th>Implications for Practice (Knowles, 1984)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a shared vision</td>
<td>Specific needs and interests should be assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and provide resources</td>
<td>Learning objects are to be developed and based on the learner’s needs, interests, and skill levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in professional learning</td>
<td>Sequential activities should be designed in order to meet the objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check progress</td>
<td>A cycle of assessing, evaluating, and adjusting the learning experience must be ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide continuous assistance</td>
<td>Methods, materials, and resources should be selected in a collaborative manner with the learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a context conducive to change</td>
<td>Learning in the classroom should foster a cooperative climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In supporting teachers with individualized coaching through change in instructional practices, possessing a firm foundation and applying key components of andragogy was deemed essential. In relation to this current study, correlations in the assumptions for the adult learner and implications for adult educators paved a way for implementing effective individualized coaching based on the concern levels for the participants involved in the study.

**Self-directed Learning**

An adult learning theory which helped guide the study is self-directed learning. Self-directed learning is the process in which the learning is self-initiated without the help of others. Through this process, learners establish their own goals based on results from diagnosing needs as a result of their own work (Manning, 2007). Strategies for facilitating Self-directed learning
include (a) conducting a self-assessment of skill levels and needs assessment in order to deem learning objectives, (b) identifying starting points for projects, (c) matching resources to the learning goal, (d) establishing a learning contract that contains goals, strategies, and evaluation, (e) identifying decision-making and self-evaluation of work strategies, (f) promoting positive attitudes, and (g) performing constant reflections on learning (Teaching in Excellence in Adult Literacy, 2011).

Understanding that self-directed learning is included in one’s daily routine is seen as a benefit (Teaching Excellence in Adult Literacy, 2011). This is a benefit teachers reap every day in the classroom. Applying the strategies for self-directed learning were pivotal in addressing teacher concerns and supporting teachers throughout the study. The selection of self-directed learning is appropriate to the current study because it embossed the path for better understanding how to assist the participants through a change process.

Social Constructivism

Vygotsky (1978), a prominent theorist among the social constructivists, believed that intellectual outcomes of social interactions are a process by which learners are integrated into a community of knowledge. Vygotsky also believed that knowledge is co-constructed. Learning through the lens of social constructivism is professed as active not a passive process in which knowledge is assembled. Creswell (2013) asserted knowledge created is based on personal experiences rather than others’ experiences and testimonies which lend to different interpretation and construction of the knowledge process. Furthermore, Creswell (2013) implored the researcher to pay attention to what others are saying in order to address methods of interaction among individuals.
Social constructivism further emphasizes the significance on the collaborative nature of learning. Importance is placed on the cultural and social context of the learning environment. Social constructivists believe that all perceptive functions can be explained as products of social interactions. Constructivism supports that learning is more than the gathering of new knowledge by learners but rather the process of understanding that learning is a collaborative process.

Social Constructivism is the incubation of community where research rests on the participants’ views of the condition (Creswell, 2013). Learners are encouraged to debate and prove opinions supported with content. The importance of teacher learning and development become a cultural learning change not only individualistic but as a community. Constructivist researchers address the developments of collaboration among individuals.

Social Constructivism was appropriate to this study because I, as the change facilitator, provided a team of teachers the opportunity to inquire and assess their own understandings based on an innovation. In theory, the role of the facilitator is to take into account the background knowledge and prior experiences the teachers offer to the study. The facilitator guides inquiry and discovery rather than dictates whole-group outcomes. Contrary to independent learning, the role of the constructivist is to encourage and foster collaboration in building knowledge and assist in a way that promotes sustainability rather than insupportability. The social constructivist theory shapes the research by providing the framework in which the teacher learner takes the role of the student and the leader takes the role of the change facilitator.

**Concerns Based Adoption Model**

The Stages of Concern (SoC) was developed as one of the three analytical dimensions of the CBAM (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987) that evolved from a study in response to the improvement focus method to educational change by a team of researchers at the
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin in the 1970s and 1980s. CBAM initially evolved from the early works of Fuller, who in the 1960s conducted a series of studies of teachers’ concerns. CBAM is a conceptual structure that defines, clarifies, and predicts likely behaviors throughout the change process (George, Hall, & Stiegelbauer, 2006). The SoC process is comprised of three data collection methods which identify the concerns of those involved in a change process. The data collection methods include the Stages of Concern Questionnaire, interviews, and open-ended statements. The SoCQ is a 35-item Likert scale questionnaire users take to rate their level to which they agree with statements related to an innovation. The results from the SoCQ offer a way to assess teacher concerns about programs or strategies introduced in the school. The questionnaire is used to identify where individuals are throughout the stages. The interview allows the change facilitator to hear the thoughts and feelings the learners have about an innovation. Lastly, the open-ended written statements provide more in-depth information about the concerns. The effectiveness of the learner surfaces when a framework exists for fostering change. Regardless of what the school reform is, someone still has to change (George et al., 2006).

The SoCQ has been used in research studies for numerous educational innovations (George et al., 2006). Along with being used in the educational realm, the SoCQ has also been used in the industrial setting. Concerns with change vary. Depending on the level of personal involvement, the intensity of concern can be determined. Perceptions generate and create apprehensions. The amount of knowledge about a reform and experience will also intensify concerns. Hall and Hord (2015) pointed out that change efforts do not succeed when adequate support and attention to individual concerns are not provided.
The SoC about innovation ranges from little to no concern towards personal concerns, to concerns about the task of implementing the innovation, and concludes to concerns about the impact of the innovation. George et al. (2006) asserted that development of higher-level concerns cannot simply be orchestrated by anything other than the individual. The level of concern will depend on the perceptions of the innovation as well as the environmental setting. When answering the SoCQ, the participants are encouraged to respond to the questions in terms of their present concern about their involvement with the innovation. Answering the questionnaire with fidelity offers the facilitator a clearer understanding of the individual concern levels.

The Stages of Concern about an innovation are illustrated in Table 3. The SoC ranges from stage 0 where the learner is unconcerned about the innovation to stage 6 where the learner has some thoughts and ideas on how to make the innovation work better. SoC levels 0-2 focus on Self. The learner may or may not be concerned with the innovation; they want to know more details about the innovation; or they are concerned with personal conflicts with the innovation. Level 3 focuses on the Task portion of the innovation. The concern at level 3 is how the learner will be able to manage the tasks involved with implementation of the innovation. Levels 4-6 relate the Impact of the innovation. The learner at these levels is concerned with the innovation’s impact on the students; concern with how others are implementing the innovation; and the engagement of entertaining better ways of implementing the innovation. Self and Task concerns must be addressed and nurtured before Impact concerns can begin to surface and mature.
Table 3

*Stages of Concern About an Innovation, George, Hall, & Stiegelbauer, 2006*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>CONCERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Refocusing</td>
<td>The individual focuses on exploring ways to reap more universal benefits from the innovation, including the possibility of making major changes to it or replacing it with a more powerful alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>The individual focuses on coordinating and cooperating with others regarding use of the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>The individual focuses on the innovation’s impact on students in his or her immediate sphere of influence. Considerations include the relevance of the innovation for students; the evaluation of student outcomes, including performance and competencies; and the changes needed to improve student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>The individual focuses on the processes and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. Issues related to efficiency, organizing, managing, and scheduling dominate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>The individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation, his or her adequacy to meet those demands, and/or his or her role with the innovation. The individual is analyzing his or her relationship to the reward structure of the organization, determining his or her part in decision making, and considering potential conflicts with existing structures or personal commitment. Concerns also might involve the financial or status implications of the program for the individual and his or her colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>The individual indicates a general awareness of the innovation and interest in learning more details about it. The individual does not seem to be worried about himself or herself in relation to the innovation. Any interest is in impersonal, substantive aspects of the innovation, such as its general characteristics, effects, and requirements for use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unconcerned</td>
<td>The individual indicates little concern about or involvement with the innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SoC was a driving force for the study in creating the foundation for academic coaching. Results from the SoCQ were used to address teacher concerns during the innovation implementation. Furthermore, results from the SoC determined the individualized coaching in supporting teachers through change in instructional practices. Teacher learning was developed in
the contextual framework of differentiation through intentional and specific professional
development based from the individual results of the SoC.

Summary

The experiences and perceptions of teachers as they participate in innovation
implementation are influenced by several factors, which include the effectiveness of the leader
who is leading the change, the culture of the organization in which the innovation is being
implemented, resistance towards change, the effectiveness of the professional development
offered, and individualized coaching. The concept of blaming teachers for failed learning needs
to be replaced by an understanding why resistance might be present and how effective leaders
can meet the teachers’ needs in order to overcome the wrongly identified rebellion (Knight,
2009). Hall and Hord (2015) recognized even though change leaders are critical in leading an
organizational change, they do not control all portions of the process. Creating a culture that
embraces change while providing individualized coaching through an innovation implementation
minimizes resistance and allows growth and change to occur (Hall & Hord, 2015; Knight, 2011).
Without organizational change, the sustainability for individual change through an innovation is
minimized. Developing an atmosphere of democracy and consensus aids in the fundamental
process for establishing a sustainable change within an organization (Hall & Hord, 2015;

Individual change occurs when leader support exists (Donaldson, 2006). The gap in
literature that was identified is sustaining change through individualized coaching. Attention and
response to the concerns of those involved through individualized coaching is central when
implementing an innovation and expecting a sustainable change as a result. Equipping teachers
with the necessary sustenance will enhance teacher buy-in and support (Dufour & Fullan, 2013).
Furthermore, providing individuals a tool to assess and track their concerns about an innovation has proved to be essential in sustaining change. The SoC is a vital component change facilitators can use to meet the individual concern levels for those involved (Hall & Hord, 1984, 2015; Hord et al. 1987). The gap in literature was addressed by monitoring the change process of a group of second-grade teachers as an innovation was being infused throughout their instructional practices. Contrary to the traditional approach to teaching core content in isolation, the team of teachers integrated English-Language Arts within the social studies, science, and math content. The results of this study lead to the exploration of literature on adult learning theory and social constructivism in order to present a solid foundation for leading adults in the best learning environment. The research on andragogy provided the framework for examining and addressing concern levels in order to provide individual coaching.

Educational institutions are consistently evaluating ways to sustain change. The evolution for educational advances is a never ending pendulum that swings from side to side. The challenge is not knowing that change must be made, but knowing how to approach change in a way that it will sustain a desired successful outcome (Fullan, 2001). Hall and Hord (2015) stated candidly that when engaged in a change process, the path to success is always under construction. How one approaches and addresses change should be done with an understanding in the accompaniment of the structure in an organizational change along with an individual change.

In chapter three, the methodology used to collect and analyze the qualitative participatory action research aspects of the study is defined and detailed. A description of the research design as well as the participants and setting in which the research took place is provided. In chapter four, findings from the data collected and the analysis of the SoCQ are presented. Central
themes that emerged from the interview protocols are discussed. Chapter five includes discussions, implications, and a conclusion of the study. Findings related to each research question including the impact of the research are discussed. Also included in chapter five are the limitations of findings, researcher comments, relationship of findings to previous literature, implications for future practices, as well as implications for future research.
Chapter 3
Research Design and Methodology

Introduction

Teachers should be equipped and supported for educational challenges. Far too often, teachers are blamed when efforts to improve student learning do not come to fruition (Knight, 2009). This mentality creates a culture of resistance rather than a culture of cooperation and collaboration. A culture of change is most effective when supported by leaders who are purposeful in understanding the change process and focused on building relationships amongst stakeholders involved in the transformation (Fullan, 2001). Furthermore, resistance to change stems from lack of attention to organizational and individual concerns, and the implementation of ineffective professional development. The purpose of the study was to sustain change in instructional practice through individualized coaching. In this study, the participants and I engaged in an action agenda designed to transition a traditional teaching practice to a sustainable integrated approach to instructional implementation (Creswell, 2014). The significance of the study was threefold: (1) support teachers through individualized coaching, (2) address teacher concerns expressed and identified through the SoCQ survey results and interview protocol, and (3) provide a model for sustainable change initiatives that can be emulated by other institutions.

Through qualitative participatory action research, this study shared the curriculum integration journey of a team of second-grade teachers. The participants’ concern levels through this change process were highlighted as identified by the SoCQ results, and personal experiences were shared through individual interviews which were coded for themes to provide thick description to the study (Stake, 2010). These experiences revealed how addressing individual
needs through individual coaching sustains change. Specifically, this research investigated and answered the following research questions:

1. How do participants’ concerns change over the course of their participation throughout innovation implementation?

2. What do teachers attribute to their ability to change their practice over the course of their participation throughout innovation implementation?

The focus of this chapter is the methodological approach used to examine the research questions. The chapter is organized into sections which include the following: (a) worldview, (b) research goals, (c) research methodology, (d) role of the researcher, (e) description of setting and participants, (f) data collection, (g) data analysis, (h) trustworthiness, and (i) ethical considerations. A summary of the participants, data collection, and data analysis concludes the chapter.

**Worldview**

My worldview for this study is closely aligned with a transformative worldview. Employing the transformative worldview allows me as the researcher to embrace and understand the participants’ perspectives throughout the change process. The transformative worldview is constructed on two basic kinds of learning which are instrumental and communicative (Mezirow, 1994). Instrumental learning hones in on task-based problem solving and determination of cause and effect relationships, while communicative learning involves the process in which individuals communicate their feelings, needs, and desires (Mezirow, 1994). To foster communicative learning, the participants took a survey that identified their concerns about the innovation. Through the survey results, as well as the interviews conducted, I was able to identify specific individual needs and concerns which provided an opportunity for participants’ voices to be
heard. The abundant, interconnected details shared by the participants’ experiences added richness to the study (Stake, 2010).

**Research Goals**

Maxwell (2013) described three types of goals associated with a qualitative study. They are: personal, practical, and intellectual goals. These three goals were the driving and motivating factors in this research. My personal goal throughout the study was to create a school culture that embraces change. As a school administrator, I am motivated to build a community within the institution that espouses change. One factor that is constant in the world of education is change. Whether the change is mandated at a national, state, or local level, it must be embraced with constancy. I am driven to create a school culture that faces change with fidelity and confidence. On a practical level, as a school administrator, I was motivated to create a model that can be emulated school-wide to support teachers through a change process. This model, created for sustaining organizational change, may be applied to implementation of any innovation. Support for teachers throughout innovation implementation was established in my model based on Knowles’s (1984) assumptions about adult learners, the implications for practice, as well as Hall and Hord’s (2015) peer strategies when facilitating an innovation implementation. My intellectual goals were twofold: (1) to attain a deep understanding of literature in the topical areas of effective leadership leading change, organizational change, individual change, resistance in learning, and professional development highlighting individualized coaching, and (2) to address individual needs by offering the necessary support to teachers throughout initiative adoption in order to sustain change. The participants’ individual needs were addressed based on results indicated by the SoC (George et al., 2006) as well as the participants’ needs expressed in the interview protocol.
Research Methodology

This study was qualitative in nature and followed a participatory action research method. The approach to this study was to explore and understand not only individual teachers, but also the teachers collectively within a group as they implemented an instructional change into their daily classroom routine (Creswell, 2014). Qualitative research is participant focused not researcher focused. Even though I engaged with the participants throughout the research, the emphasis was not on me, it was on the participants and their engagement with the study. Qualitative research is used to examine problems or conflicts participants may have with particular issues (Creswell, 2013). Throughout this research, I studied the process of change the participants experienced as they implemented content integration in their teaching. According to Stake (2010), qualitative inquiry places an emphasis on multiple perspectives, recognizing differences, variances in explanations, and alternate ways of changing things. Qualitative research was appropriate for this study because I relied on the participants’ understanding of the innovation and their perceptions throughout the change process.

The intent of this study was to work collaboratively with each participant and inspire change by stimulating a climate that situated teachers as learners through the involvement of professional learning communities (Creswell, 2012). The central phenomenon explored was identifying teacher concerns while implementing an instructional change in order to individualize coaching. Furthermore, the intent was that not only would the study provide best practices for the research site, but would provide a model for best practices to be emulated by other institutions implementing a change in practice.

According to Creswell (2013), qualitative participatory action research is inquiry achieved ‘with’ others rather than ‘to’ others. Throughout the study, I engaged with the team of
second-grade teachers rather than employing an impersonal investigation. Participatory action research allowed me to concentrate on the concerns and specific challenges within my school (Stake, 2010). The purpose was to promote sustainable change by improving specific institutional issues. Through participatory action research, my focus was on helping others (Creswell, 2013). The use of a qualitative participatory action research promoted a deeper understanding of the problem and how best to structure a solution.

**Role of the Researcher**

As an educator for 21 years, I have a great passion for education. In fact, 17 of my 21 years in education were as a classroom teacher. As a classroom teacher, my desire was to implement best practices daily as I instructed students. For the past four years, I have been a school administrator. As an administrator, I not only have a responsibility to oversee that teachers are prepared and equipped to implement engaging, rigorous, and research-based lessons, but also, I have a desire and responsibility to ensure students have the opportunity to receive quality instruction. I personally believe that content integration is an effective approach to teaching English-Language Arts and sought to study teachers implementing that innovation into their own classrooms.

Throughout the study, the participants and I worked as active collaborators (Creswell, 2013). I collaborated with the participants in order to promote positive variations within the development of change. I was responsible for disseminating and collecting the SoCQ surveys, conducting both individual interviews, implementing individualized coaching, and performing data analysis.
Description of the Setting and Participants

The study took place at Rural Charter School located in the Piedmont region of Georgia. Rural Charter School is comprised of kindergarten through twelfth grade students, all located on one campus. Over 900 students are enrolled at Rural Charter School with an employment of over 90 staff members. The context of the study occurred on campus during school hours. The study began July, 2016 upon approval of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the university (see Appendix A) and approval by the Board of Governors of Rural Charter School (see Appendix B). The study concluded December, 2016.

The participants were selected through a purposive sampling (Creswell, 2013). The participants were eight second-grade teachers. The criteria for the study were: (a) teachers who were teaching second grade, (b) teachers who were employed at Rural Charter School, and (c) teachers who were undergoing the implementation of content integration, all at the time of data collection. The selection of these participants allowed the study to provide useful information to the research site and gave a voice to the participants (Creswell, 2012). The participants’ teaching experience ranged from 2 to 22 years of experience. The youngest participant was 25 years of age and the oldest was 55 years of age, resulting in mean age of 36 years old. Three of the 8 participants had been at the research site for at least 5 years. All of the teachers with the exception of 1 have an advanced degree. The experience and background of the participants included early childhood, special education, leadership, curriculum and instruction, counseling, and instructional technology. The majority of their teaching experience was in prekindergarten through third-grade students; however, three teachers had teaching experience within the fourth to eighth grade range. All content areas (math, English-Language Arts, science, and social studies) had been taught by all participants.
At the beginning of the study, I met with the participants and obtained consent for voluntary participation (see Appendix C). The purpose for obtaining consent for voluntary participation was to provide the participants key information about the study. I made it clear to the participants that their participation in the study entailed no risks, and they were able to back out at any time. Furthermore, the participants were made aware that the results from the study would be confidential. Once they chose to participate in the study, I provided each teacher with a four-page Stages of Concern packet which consisted of a cover letter defining the purpose of the questionnaire, directions for completing the survey, the 35-item Likert Scale questionnaire, and the demographics page (see Appendix D).

Data Collection

Qualitative researchers identify data that represents personal experiences in specific situations (Stake, 2010). Data collection techniques effective for action research consist of questionnaires, observations, and interviews. Questionnaires are one of the most common types of data gathering instruments used in action research (Glanz, 2003). For the purpose of this study, two modes of data were collected in order to gather information regarding teachers’ perceptions of change while implementing the innovation. Data was collected from the SoCQ survey as well as interview protocols. Each participant completed two SoCQ surveys, one at the beginning of the study and one at the conclusion of the study. In addition to the SoCQ data collection, participants were interviewed twice throughout the implementation process.

Data collection started with the participants’ completion of a pre-SoCQ survey. I met with the participants as a group and hand delivered the survey. The participants selected their responses from a Likert scale of zero through seven for each statement which represents concern levels: 0 (Irrelevant), 1-2 (Not true of me now), 3-5 (Somewhat true of me now), and 6-7 (Very
true of me now) (George, Hall, & Stiegelbauer, 2006). The responses were completed individually as individual concerns were the primary focus rather than consensus group concerns. All eight participants returned the completed survey within one week. Along with the data collection of the SoCQ, data was also gathered from an interview protocol. The interview protocol was administered to the team of teachers during the course of the study to offer insight and individual perceptions throughout the implementation. The interview responses enabled me to see the point of view and understand the experiences and perspectives of the participants (Glanz, 2003). All interviews were conducted face-to-face with participants individually in a private setting. During the interview process, it was important to allow the participants to speak without interruptions (Glanz, 2003). Each interview lasted approximately 20 to 30 minutes. In order to gain an understanding of teachers’ perceptions towards change, qualitative questions were designed to be non-leading (Creswell, 2012). Questions used to focus the interview protocol were:

1. What do you see as your strengths through this process?
2. What do you see as your weaknesses through this process?
3. What is your target area?
4. What is one area of change you have made? Is there more than one area?
5. How are the students responding to the changes being made within your content delivery?

The SoCQ results as well as the responses from the interview protocol served as the tool that helped me develop and administer individualized coaching. The individualized coaching consisted of observing and modeling lessons, providing resources, and conducting follow-up meetings. Observations were a way for me to get a first-hand look and enter into the participant’s
environment (Stake, 2010). I chose written descriptions, referred to as field notes, to record information based on my observations rather than utilize the checklist technique (Glanz, 2003). The field notes provided thick descriptions to the research because they depicted direct connections to theory and knowledge (Stake, 2010). I was careful to avoid bias and subjectivity in my field notes. All observations were planned collaboratively with the participants. I took the role as a complete participant. I was fully engaged with the participants from the beginning of the study to the end (Creswell, 2013) by being accessible to them whether this entailed individual meetings, whole-group meetings, modeling lessons, observing lessons, or providing resources in order to meet their concerns. After each observation, I met with the individual participant for the purpose of sharing my field notes. This provided the opportunity for the participants and me to share perceptions, ask questions, and alleviate any misconceptions that may have transpired from the observation. Along with classroom observations, I modeled lessons. During this time, the participant would observe my teaching. Darling-Hammond, Hyler, and Gardiner (2017) assert modeling of instruction assists teachers to attain a vision of practice and improve their learning and growth. Modeling provides teachers support and lends the opportunity to observe a powerful practice (Knight, 2009). Through participatory collaboration with the participants, along with their individual needs and desires based on the SoCQ and interview protocol, I modeled specific lessons. Following every modeled lesson, the participant and I would meet to disaggregate her observation based on my teaching. It was during this time teachers would share their perceptions. After every modeled lesson, the participant would then teach the same lesson to her next class, and I would then serve as the observer. This became a cyclical process. The purpose of this cycle was to give the participant the opportunity see the innovation in practice and then to fine-tune her own implementation of the innovation.
At the conclusion of the study, a post-SoCQ was given to the participants. Following the same protocol as with the initial SoCQ distribution, I met with the participants as a group and hand delivered a copy of the questionnaire. The participants completed the survey separate from one another and returned the completed survey within one week. In addition to the post-SoCQ, a second interview protocol was conducted. The same interview questions were used for both interviews.

Data was triangulated by comparing and contrasting the findings from the participants’ SoCQ results and interviews. To enhance the credibility of the study, as the participants were interviewed, perspectives were confirmed through member checking in order to capture accurate information and circumvent any misconceptions and perceptions (Stake, 2010). Member checking was accomplished by reviewing the field notes taken during the interview with the participants upon the conclusion of each interview. In order to minimize any bias and distortion in data interpretation, both interviews were individually recorded and uploaded in an audio file.

Data Analysis

Even though the analysis of the qualitative data was arduous and time-consuming, it was also exciting to see the results (Glanz, 2003). Analyzing the data involved organizing the collection of data, coding for themes, and establishing an interpretation (Creswell, 2013). Data analysis from the SoCQ as well as the interviews were crucial components in gaining insight on how individuals’ concerns changed over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation and what individuals attributed to their ability to change their practice over the course of their participation in this change initiative.

The SoCQ has been proven to be a reliable survey. It has been used in a variety of educational innovations and has been used in many doctoral dissertations (George et al., 2006).
Researchers have measured the survey for reliability and validity since it was developed. The first SoCQ structure was developed in 1973. Before deciding the final SoCQ structure, several formats and methodologies were explored (George et al., 2006). The final SoCQ structure was tested for estimates of reliability, internal consistency, and validity with multiple samples and 11 innovations (George et al., 2006). The test-retest correlations on the SoCQ results range from .65 to .86, and the alpha coefficients of internal reliability range from .64 to .83 (George et al., 2006).

Data collected from the SoCQ were analyzed using the Stages of Concern Quick Scoring Device (see Appendix E) (George et al., 2006). Using the raw score total, I was able to attain a percentile score for each of the stages as noted on the SoC: Stage 0 - awareness, Stage 1 - informational, Stage 2 - personal, Stage 3 - management, Stage 4 - consequence, Stage 5 - collaboration, and Stage 6 - refocusing. In plotting data points using the chart on the Stages of Concern Quick Scoring Device, a graph of the relative intensity in comparison to the SoC Stages was created. This provided a visual representation of each participant’s concern levels about the implementation for integrating curriculum content. The greater the mean scores were in each stage, the higher the concern levels were. Along with identifying individual concerns, raw scores were averaged to attain collective concern levels. The collective concern levels provided an opportunity to also look at levels as a whole group and how the group’s concerns changed over the course of the study.

The interview protocol was analyzed using ATLAS.ti. ATLAS.ti is a computer software program used for qualitative data analysis. For this study, ATLAS.ti was used to disaggregate the interview data in order to identify common themes of the participants’ feelings based on the
concerns throughout the implementation of the study. Table 4 provides a description of the various concepts of ATLAS.ti and applicability to the study.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATLAS.ti concepts</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Applicability to the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary documents</td>
<td>Data added to ATLAS.ti</td>
<td>Individual transcriptions of interviews were uploaded to ATLAS.ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotations</td>
<td>Segments of a document that are interesting or important; worthy of noting</td>
<td>Specific comments from the interviews were noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>Short pieces of text relating to other pieces of text</td>
<td>Codes were identified through the disaggregating of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>Text which captures a thought</td>
<td>Memos were used to reinforce codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Diagram that connects sets of similar elements</td>
<td>Created a conceptual map of overlaps and commonalities of interview responses and codes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I followed the general steps for analyzing data input using ATLAS.ti. The first step consisted of creating a project. The current study project encompassed data, codes, quotations, and memos. The next step was to upload the recordings from the interviews on the ATLAS.ti software. After uploading the files, groups were created to organize the documents, memos, and codes. Once the groups were established, I listened to the timeline of the audio files and identified comments of interest (quotations) and assigned them to a code. Seven codes (themes) consistently surfaced throughout the recorded interviews. The codes (themes) were as follows: (1) Becoming a facilitator, (2) Collaborative planning time, (3) Effect on student achievement, (4) Evidence of change, (5) Instructional resources, (6) Relevance to instruction, and (7)
Scheduling and logistics. Lastly, networks were created to provide a conceptual structure by connecting similar elements together in a visual representation. The interconnectedness of the data added layers and depth to the study by conceptualizing the perceptions of the participants as they embarked on the change process.

The analysis of data was performed by the results from the SoCQ surveys and the transcriptions of the interviews coded to develop themes. The Stages of Concern Quick Scoring Device detailed the relative intensity of each participant and the use of ATLAS.ti allowed me to more efficiently disaggregate, analyze, and organize data collected from the interview protocol. The interpretation of the findings was accomplished by integrating the results from the analysis of the SoCQ and interview protocols. The analysis of the SoCQ in conjunction with the interview protocol served as a guide to the individualized coaching each participant received.

**Trustworthiness**

I addressed the following four criteria proposed by Guba (1981) to ensure the study’s trustworthiness: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. To ensure the study was credible, I developed a strong rapport with each of the participants. I was oriented to their specific situations and had a great respect for each participant. Furthermore to ensure credibility, I reviewed interview responses with the participants in order to member-check my perceptions and responses for any misconceptions and misunderstandings. Transferability is established when other researchers are able to mimic the study and apply the findings to other situations and contexts provided ample evidence is provided (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The experiences of the participants were conveyed in detail. Thick descriptions (Creswell, 2013) allow conclusions to be taken from one study and applied to another. Dependability was ensured by offering the participants the prerogative to read and summarize findings. This allowed
participants the opportunity to share perspectives and clear up any misconceptions. To ensure the confirmability of the study, triangulation of multiple methods, theories, and datasets were established to enhance and make the study comprehensive. Additionally, to ensure confirmability, interviews were recorded and coded for themes without any biases or partialities.

**Ethical Considerations**

Throughout this study, I was careful to maintain confidentiality and respect for the participants’ opinions and emotions. Supportive and respectful relationships were developed between and amongst the participants and me. Furthermore, I was intentional in making sure the participants’ voices and thoughts were conveyed thoughtfully and correctly through member checking (Stake, 2010).

**Disclosure and consent.** At the beginning of the study, I met with the participants to discuss the purpose, benefits, procedures, and liability of the study. The participants were given the opportunity to ask questions and share concerns about the study. My intentions and responses were transparent throughout the research. Participants signed a consent stating an agreement to the following: purpose, benefits, procedures, and liability of the study.

**Voluntariness.** Participation in the study was voluntary and did not extend beyond the normal solicitation of teacher input and opinions in the regular educational setting. The entire study, including all data collection, took place at the research site. There was no peril if a teacher decided not to participate.

**Confidentiality.** Pseudonyms were used to preserve the identity of the participants and out of respect for the individuals who participated in the study. Furthermore, confidentiality was used to build trust between the participants and researcher. All data and documents collected are stored in a locked cabinet at the research site and will be destroyed three years after the
conclusion of the study. All data in digital form is password protected and will be deleted three years after the research conclusion.

**Institutional review.** An application for study was submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Kennesaw State University’s (KSU) Institutional Review Board (IRB).

**Site permission.** Permission was granted by the research site’s Board of Governors for Study#16-344 once the IRB was approved.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to sustain change in instructional practice through individualized coaching. The significance of the study was the individualized support teachers received, which was determined by the needs expressed by the participants in the SOCQ and interviews. Further, it was my goal to provide a model for sustainable change in schools that can be emulated by other institutions.

The context of the action research was a Rural Charter School. The change initiative was the integration of English-Language Arts within social studies, science, and math. The participants were a team of eight second-grade teachers that were selected through a purposeful sampling (Creswell, 2013). Data sources came from the SoCQ survey as well as an interview protocol. Data collected from the SoCQ was analyzed using the Stages of Concern Quick Scoring Device where percentile scores for each stage were attained to provide both individual concern levels for each participant and collective concern levels for the whole group. Data collected from the interviews was analyzed using ATLAS.ti. The data was analyzed as a means to providing individualized professional development and as a means to investigating concerns of participants throughout the change process.
Chapter 4

Findings

The purpose of this qualitative action research was to monitor the change process of a second-grade team of teachers as a new teaching strategy was implemented into their instructional practices. Rather than teaching content in isolation, the team was charged with integrating English-Language Arts into social studies, science, and math content. The study utilized a questionnaire and interview protocol to better understand and monitor the change process at Rural Charter School. The data brought meaning and application to the research questions that guided the study. The questions that focused the investigation were:

1. How do participants’ concerns change over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation?

2. What do teachers attribute to their ability to change their practice over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation?

Chapter 4 begins with the collective findings from the study. Descriptions for each theme that emerged through the analysis of the interview protocol are detailed. The themes are: (1) instructional resources, (2) scheduling and logistics, (3) relevance to instruction, (4) collaborative planning time, (5) effect on student achievement, (6) becoming a facilitator, and (7) evidence of change. The emergence of the seven themes among the participants helped provide an understanding of how the concerns changed over the course of the teachers’ participation throughout the instructional implementation. Additionally, the collective SoCQ outcomes were analyzed and are presented to show comparisons between pre- and post-SoCQ results.

Following collective findings, detailed participant demographics are shared, as well as individual findings and individual SoCQ results. The individual results reveal the emotions and concerns
the participants experienced throughout the implementation process. Additionally, the individual coaching each participant received is detailed. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

**Collective Findings**

While analyzing the interview protocol using ATLAS.ti, themes consistently emerged through whole group analysis. These themes were noted as key issues affecting the change process. A network for each theme was created using ATLAS.ti (Appendices F-L) to highlight the participants’ perspectives shared in interview protocols conducted at the beginning of the study and again at the end of the study. These themes are highlighted in the interview protocol in the individual findings. Additionally, the SoCQ was analyzed to gain insight on how individuals’ concerns changed collectively over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation. SoCQ results were analyzed collectively as well as per participant, and are included in the individual findings.

There were identifiable similarities between the seven themes that emerged from the data analysis and the seven stages on the SoCQ. As I synthesized the themes that emerged with the SoCQ, it evolved into how I saw my two data sources work together. Table 5 depicts an emergence of how the Stages of Concern and themes established from the interview protocol compare based on the common language of both data sources.
Table 5

Emergence of Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Concern About an Innovation</th>
<th>Interview Protocol Themes</th>
<th>Common Language of Both Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Refocusing</td>
<td>7 Evidence of Change</td>
<td>Attention to change and redirection of the innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration</td>
<td>4 Collaborative Planning Time</td>
<td>Focus on coordinating and cooperating with others involved in the innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Consequence</td>
<td>5 Effect on Student Achievement</td>
<td>Considering risks involved and outcomes of the innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Management</td>
<td>2 Scheduling and Logistics</td>
<td>Focus is on fulfilling the innovation utilizing best resources; managing time constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Personal</td>
<td>1 Instructional Resources</td>
<td>Adequacy to meet the demands of the innovation; conflicts in meeting demands of the innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Informational</td>
<td>3 Relevance to Instruction</td>
<td>General characteristics, requirements, and pertinence to the innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Unconcerned</td>
<td>6 Becoming a Facilitator</td>
<td>Extent of involvement with the innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Themes

The themes that emerged throughout the interviews were: (1) instructional resources, (2) scheduling and logistics, (3) relevance to instruction, (4) collaborative planning time, (5) effect on student achievement, (6) becoming a facilitator, and (7) evidence of change. These themes are used to emphasize the participants’ feelings based on the concerns they expressed throughout the study.
Theme 1: Instructional resources. Having adequate resources in order to implement key concepts was essential in order to provide effective instruction. Lack of resources to effectively implement the instructional model proposed to the team of teachers caused concern amongst the participants. In fact, having resources which were grade level appropriate was a concern, which was shared by one participant. The team of teachers needed suitable resources so that they could integrate English-Language Arts into core content classes. These resources consisted of literary texts such as books and reading passages that were applicable to the content that was being taught in the classrooms. Some sample resource topics provided for the teachers were simple machines (science), Trail of Tears (social studies), states of matter (science), place value (math), and the solar system (social studies). Depending on the specific concerns and needs, teachers were provided with fiction as well as non-fiction texts in the forms of books as well as reading passages to aid in the implementation of integrating literacy into content areas. A resource bank of online resources was created through various online sites, saved on a Google drive, and shared with the participants. By the end of the study, teachers had various literary resources from which they could utilize to integrate and enhance classroom instruction. A total of 13 specific quotations were coded to support the participants’ need for appropriate instructional resources in order to implement content integration effectively and with fidelity.

Theme 2: Scheduling and logistics. During the course of the study, some of the participants were concerned about integrating literacy in the content areas, specifically in regard to the set parameters of their daily schedule. To some extent, there was a set schedule in which the teachers had to adjust their instructional time. There were four classes which rotated to each teacher throughout the day. Each teacher had a prescribed schedule in which time was dedicated to teach each class. The students rotated from teacher to teacher for a 75-minute class period.
The daily schedule included set times for lunch and special classes such as art, physical education, Spanish, and music. The participants were concerned about teaching with fidelity and dedicating the necessary time to the content. Routine and continuity to their daily instruction was desired by the participants. A participant admitted that she “thrived on structure and routine.” The team of teachers questioned and shared their concerns on how the foundational skills would be taught using an integrated approach. There were 21 quotations coded to support the theme scheduling and logistics.

**Theme 3: Relevance to instruction.** Teachers wanted to know how the implementation was pertinent to their practice. They questioned the connection of the implementation to teacher and practice. They wanted to be assured that this study was not a waste of their time, and more importantly that the students’ academic time would not be wasted and void. It was important for me to consistently share with the participants the purpose of the study, and provide encouragement throughout. One participant shared that that her goal was to integrate the content where it actually fit and was purposeful. I perused the second-grade state standards with individual participants and assisted in matching the standards between English-Language Arts and the other content courses. One of the teachers identified a weakness in “…taking the ELA standards and integrating into the science content.” By correlating the standards, the participants began to see value and relevancy. By the end of the study, one of the participants identified integrating the standards as a target area, stating that she, “desire[d] to integrate more of the ELA standards in science.” Some of the participants felt isolated with the instructional initiative in their subject area. The feeling of isolation was most prevalent in mathematics in comparison to the other core content classes. The math teacher questioned the feasibility and practicality of integrating English-Language Arts standards into mathematical concepts. Throughout the study,
it was important for me to listen to the participants’ questions and concerns. The participants simply wanted to understand the relevancy of content integration. Collectively, there were 21 quotations coded to the theme relevance to instruction.

**Theme 4: Collaborative planning time.** The implementation required scheduled time for collaboration. The team shared concerns for needed common planning. When the study began, there was no scheduled common planning time, so time after school along with working lunch meetings were scheduled. However, even the after school meetings did not encompass the entire second-grade staff due to one of the teacher’s coaching responsibilities at the high school. One participant, who is the high school cheerleading coach, shared her frustration by stating, “I coach in the afternoons and y’all meet as a grade level. I do not get to meet with y’all.” She was only able to meet during lunch and the after school meetings that did not conflict with her coaching commitment. Teachers desired to know how the implementation was being utilized by their teammates. What did other teachers know? How was the implementation being used? One participant stated, “I want to ask questions related to other content, but I do not know what they [speaking about her teammates] are teaching.” The second-grade team was divided into four classes in which the students rotated. Even though they communally taught all of the same children, there was no common time during the school day for the team to gather and discuss. Throughout the study, it was important to address the concern for lack of collaboration. Collaboration was a common theme the participants repeatedly referred to as being important. Collectively, there were a total of 13 quotations coded to support the need for a collaborative planning time amongst the participants during the implementation of content integration.

**Theme 5: Effect on student achievement.** Historically, Rural Charter School has been an academically successful school. As a whole, students have scored very well on state
administered assessments. Rural Charter School has been awarded a National Blue Ribbon and many other accolades. Teachers were concerned about how the implementation would affect student learning. What risks, if any were being afforded with the content integration implementation? Would test scores decrease? The participants wondered if the students would master the content with new integration of content implementation. Some of the participants needed to see data to prove that students were responding to the instructional delivery approach. As one participant expressed, “Not knowing the end product is a challenge.” She wanted to see data before she could be satisfied that this approach to instructional delivery was in the best interest for the students. Doubt from some of the participants surfaced in questioning whether students were receiving quality instruction compared to the traditional teaching method of teaching content in isolation. Through various classroom and online assessments, teachers began to collect data that analyzed student growth in the content area for reading. Together, there were 26 quotations coded to support teachers’ concerns about the effect on student achievement.

Theme 6: Becoming a facilitator. The teachers’ confidence levels throughout the innovation varied. For some of the participants, this style of teaching in comparison to the traditional way of teaching removed them from their comfort zone. They were all facilitating the instructional implementation, but were not all confident in their ability to do so with assurance. Becoming a facilitator meant that the teacher would gain the confidence to manage and implement this new instructional approach to teaching with self-assurance and self-reliance. Half of the participants had over ten years of experience teaching their content in isolation. Being asked to integrate English-Language Arts throughout content delivery was not common practice for this group of teachers. One of the participants expressed that she had “…never taught this way before.” The participants were accustomed to facilitating an academic environment of
traditional instructional methods. In the beginning of the study, the participants were dependent in many areas; such as gathering resources, implementing lessons, providing feedback, organizing meetings, and creating assessments. A participant expressed that her challenge was in “…trying to incorporate foundational reading skills into social studies.” Collectively, 14 quotations were coded to support the participants’ perceptions for becoming a facilitator.

Theme 7: Evidence of change. Throughout the study, participants experienced change. These changes were perceived through individual experiences, collective experiences, as well as student experiences. The changes were evident by participants’ comments that, “The students love it,” and that, “The way we are teaching the standards is a change.” Teachers asserted their personal experiences as evidence of change, which attributed to their ability to change their practice over the course of the instructional implementation. As the participants became confident with the content integration, their concern levels about the implementation began to decrease in certain areas. In fact, they shared that they thought “…this model is fabulous.” Collectively, there were 20 quotations coded to support evidence of change which attributed to the participants’ ability to change their practice over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation.

SoCQ

![Figure 3. Collective Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results](image-url)
As illustrated in Figure 3, the collective Pre-SoCQ revealed a high relative intensity at stage 1 (informational). The second highest concern in the Pre-SoCQ was at stage 5, (collaboration). The team of teachers not only wanted more information about content integration but they also desired to learn from what others on the team knew about the innovation (George et al., 2006). The high intensity at stage 1 (information) was indicative of the overall group. They appeared to have an interest in content integration; however, they wanted to know as much as they could about the implementation. As a whole, the second-grade team was an attentive group of teachers. Collectively, they appeared to be a close working team. The implication that the participants were a close working team was evident in their positive demeanor towards one another. The teachers who were already employed at Rural Charter School were welcoming and accepting to the newly staffed teachers. It was important for the team to have a scheduled time in which they could meet (collaboration, stage 5) and discuss the implementation.

In contrast to high intensity results, low intensity remained at stage 4 (consequence) in both Pre- and Post-SoCQ results. This suggested that the group had minimal concerns about the effects of the instructional implementation on the students (George et al., 2006). The higher intensity at stage 1 (information) than in stage 2 (personal) suggested the team was open to and interested in the implementation. The participants as a whole were eager to learn and were trusting in the implementation and considered it best practice. They were supportive and excited about the integration of the curriculum. The increase intensity at stage 5 (collaboration) between the Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results and the somewhat relative intensity at stage 1 (information) suggested the team had a desire to learn from what other teachers were doing in relation to the implementation. The team of teachers continuously saw importance and value in working with their teammates. The implication that members of the
team developed ways to improve the implementation was evident by the conclusion of the study as they continued to meet throughout the duration of the study and even after the completion of the study. The Post-SoCQ revealed a decrease in the relative intensity at stages, 0-3. As teachers worked through the process of adjusting their approach for instructional delivery, they began to self-direct and facilitate their own ideas for implementing lessons effectively.

**Individual Findings**

The following findings provide an analysis of the interview protocol and Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ. The data analysis for each participant’s SoCQ results was synthesized to provide an overview of the participant’s concern levels and a comparison of how the concern levels changed throughout the instructional implementation. The participants’ perceptions were voiced in the interview protocol and categorized into the seven themes: (1) instructional resources, (2) scheduling and logistics, (3) relevance to instruction, (4) collaborative planning time, (5) effect on student achievement, (6) becoming a facilitator, and (7) evidence of change. Based on the needs revealed in the questionnaire survey and perceptions voiced in the interviews, individualized coaching was determined and implemented. Teacher learning as designed in the contextual framework of differentiation through individualized coaching based on the results from the SoCQ and focus interview protocols are described specifically to the individual needs for each participant. Each depiction unveils the participant’s journey and feelings during the instructional implementation from beginning to end.

The eight participants were given pseudonyms (Tiffany, Wendy, Cynthia, Robin, Pyra, Juli, Denise, and Ginger) so their individual experiences could be shared confidentially. Table 6 displays relevant demographic information for the participants involved in the study. The participants are listed in the order in which they will be discussed within this chapter.
### Table 6

**Participant Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Role at Rural Charter School</th>
<th>Total Years Experience</th>
<th>Total Years at Rural Charter School</th>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Areas of Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Lead Teacher-Science</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Early Childhood Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Media Specialist</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Early Childhood Instructional Technology Library Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Lead Teacher-Inquiry Hub</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ed.S.</td>
<td>Early Childhood Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Lower School Director</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyra</td>
<td>Resource Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Special Education Adaptive Special Education Early Childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juli</td>
<td>Lead Teacher-Social Studies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Early Childhood Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Lead Teacher-Math</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Teacher Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Early Childhood School Counseling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tiffany**

Tiffany has 19 total years of teaching experience in first thru fifth grades and in all core content courses. She holds a Master’s Degree, and her areas of certification include early
childhood and special education. Tiffany’s primary core content focus is in the content area of science with the integration of English-Language Arts. She has been employed at Rural Charter School for 4 years.

From the beginning, Tiffany saw her strengths as being flexible and being an effective collaborator. She believed that she was able to think outside of the box. Tiffany was receptive and willing to engage in the study. She was dedicated and committed to the implementation from the beginning. Tiffany was willing to try something new even though she had 19 years’ worth of teaching experience and training. Tiffany’s primary core focus was in the area of science, so she was responsible for the integration of English-Language Art standards into science curriculum.

*Interview Protocol.*

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tiffany’s quotations coded using ATLAS.ti for specific themes</th>
<th>Initial Interview</th>
<th>Second Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Logistics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to Instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Planning Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Student Achievement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a Facilitator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in Table 7, Tiffany spoke most directly to the themes of relevance to instruction, becoming a facilitator, effect on student achievement, and scheduling and logistics. From the very beginning, Tiffany noted “being able to be the facilitator” as her weakness
(Interview 1). Tiffany desired to be more of a facilitator of student-led instruction rather than solely teacher focused. She wanted to allow her students to explore. Even though Tiffany had the most classroom experience, she stated, “Taking the ELA standards and integrating them with just the science content was a big change” (Interview 1). She admitted to being more accustomed to a traditional approach to teaching the same group of students and all core content however, her teaching role the previous year had changed. She served in the capacity of a student resource teacher where she pushed-in to the other classes to reinforce teacher-led instruction. Frequently, Tiffany compared the year to her experience the previous year. “Last year, I had planning time with former teachers because I was the teacher who transitioned between classes. Now I am isolated to science with the infusion of ELA and support teachers transition to me,” (Interview 1). Tiffany was relatively happy and content with her role on the team. She stated, “I like to have a focus; given an ability to focus on specific content,” (Interview 1).

SoCQ.

![Stages of Concern Questionnaire Graphs](image)

*Figure 4. Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results for Tiffany*

As depicted in the pre-administration graph (Figure 4), Tiffany’s greatest concern was at stage 2 (personal). She wanted to know how she would be affected by the implementation
outcome. This does not mean that Tiffany resisted the innovation in anyway. It simply means that she was concerned about how the change would affect her and her teaching. From the beginning, Tiffany exhibited an open mind towards the study. She presented an open door policy for the co-researcher and me to enter at any point, announced as well as unannounced. In addition to Tiffany’s personal concerns (stage 2), she wanted to know more about the implementation (stage 1, informational) and had concerns with the logistics of the actual integration of curriculum (stage 3, management).

The most significant difference in Tiffany’s pre-SoCQ and post-SoCQ illustrated in Figure 4 is the increase in relative intensity at stage 5 (collaboration). This suggests that as the support and implementation progressed, Tiffany’s concern shifted from a focus on her personal consequences to a greater focus in wanting to know more about working with others in relation to her use of the innovation. According to George et al. (2006), an individual who scores high on stage 5 (collaboration) and low on all other stages indicates that the individual is an administrator or a team leader and coordinating with others is a priority. Even though Tiffany did not hold an administrative title, she was viewed by her teammates as a leader. Regularly scheduled group meetings in order to talk about the implementation were important to Tiffany, and not having a set time daily where the team could collaborate other than a lunch meeting or an occasional after school meeting was reflected in her high stage 5. In meetings, the other participants listened attentively to Tiffany when she spoke. By the end of the study, she was using the resources provided as well as locating resources on her own and implementing them with ease and self-assurance that her instructional delivery was effective.

**Individualized Coaching.** Considering Tiffany’s pre-SoCQ and interview responses, we sought to know more about and to attain an understanding of how the integration of curriculum
would ultimately impact her personally. It was essential to establish expectations for the implementation in order to address Tiffany’s personal concerns. I, along with my co-researcher, met with Tiffany to provide resources that would complement the integration of English-Language Arts into the science curriculum. A resource bank was created for Tiffany as a convenient way to access pertinent resources. Within the resource bank, the co-researchers uploaded content specific reading passages. Examples of content specific passages included simple machines and states of matter. These resources were grade level appropriate reading passages pertaining to the science curriculum. Tiffany also expressed concerns for content delivery. Along with provisions of resources, I modeled integrated lessons for her. Specifically, I modeled a content integrated lesson on the Stages of Matter. It was during this lesson that I focused on English-Language Arts standards such as context clues, types of sentences, synonyms, parts of speech, and sequencing. While I modeled the lesson, my co-researcher assisted Tiffany during the observation. Following the lesson, we debriefed the lesson before Tiffany retaught the same lesson to another rotating class of second-graders. While Tiffany taught the same lesson that I had just modeled, my co-researcher and I observed. Upon completion of the lesson, we provided encouragement as well as reinforced personal adequacy. On another occasion, my co-researcher and I met with Tiffany to discuss assessing the integrated curriculum. It was during this meeting that we reviewed assessments, shared resources, and discussed integration of English-Language Arts standards with science topics.

Tiffany’s initial concerns of stages 1 (informational), 2 (personal), and 3 (management) on the pre-SoCQ, decreased as the study progressed. By the end of the study, coordinating with others (stage 5, collaboration) became a priority for Tiffany. She announced that this was her
“…favorite year,” (Interview 1). Furthermore, Tiffany stated, “I feel there is excitement and a love of learning,” (Interview 2).

Wendy

Wendy has 22 years of teaching experience and has been at Rural Charter School for eight years. Throughout her 22 years of experience, she has taught grades kindergarten, first, third, and fifth, as well as operated and managed the kindergarten through eighth grade media center. Areas of certification include early childhood and instructional technology, as well as media specialist. She has a Master’s Degree in Education. Even though Wendy was not a second-grade teacher, she was asked to be a participant in the study due to her role as the media specialist. Wendy provided knowledge in the area of available resources within Rural Charter School. She worked closely with the teachers as a whole by establishing scheduled times for students to attend the media center and check-out books. From time to time, Wendy would teach mini lessons to students during their scheduled visit to the media center.

Wendy’s strength from the beginning was her knowledge of the school’s available resources. Not only did she have the most years of employment with the institution in comparison to the other participants, but also she had the most years of experience in the field of education as well. In her role as the Media Specialist, at Rural Charter School, her duties and responsibilities included managing the media center as well as teaching students various lessons that coincided and enhanced classroom instruction. Furthermore, Wendy worked with teachers to gather miscellaneous resources in order to complement and supplement classroom instruction. Wendy’s commission in the study was to work collaboratively with the other participants in providing resources and other supplies to support the curriculum integration.
**Interview Protocol.**

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Initial Interview</th>
<th>Second Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Logistics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to Instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Planning Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Student Achievement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a Facilitator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As depicted in Table 8, the co-researcher and I only interviewed Wendy one time in contrast to the other participants being interviewed twice due to a misunderstanding in scheduling the initial interview. The themes of scheduling and logistics as well as collaborative planning time emerged mostly in Wendy’s voice of concern. A concern for communicating with the other team of teachers was ongoing for Wendy, “I know what’s going on in the inquiry hub, but I don’t have communication with the teachers. I don’t know what they are doing or what they need or how I can help them or supplement what they are doing.” The inquiry hub teacher, Denise, was the only teacher Wendy truly collaborated with. Wendy met frequently with Denise to plan ways to enhance and extend classroom instruction. Wendy would gather books from the media center for Denise to house in her classroom and be utilized by the students. Denise would schedule weekly visits to the media center where Wendy would teach specific lessons correlating whatever the students were studying in class. Wendy took the role of supporting the
implementation through her responsibility of being the media specialist. She consistently displayed an interest and willingness to share resources that would support the implementation.

**SoCQ.**

![Graph of Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results for Wendy](image)

*Figure 5. Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results for Wendy*

Wendy’s Pre-SoCQ exhibited relative intensity levels at stages 5 (collaboration) and 1 (information) as noted in Figure 5. This suggests that Wendy had a desire to learn from what others on the second-grade team, while also needing more information about the innovation (George et al., 2006). Throughout the study, Wendy consistently displayed a need for working with others in relation to the implementation (stage 5). Wendy had much to offer the teachers at Rural Charter School. Unfortunately, many of the teachers did not take advantage and tap into Wendy’s offerings and suggestions. I attributed this Wendy not being one to openly broadcast her knowledge and being more reserved in her demeanor. Wendy had prior classroom teaching experience along with being a media specialist. She had empathy and desire to see all students learn and experience academic success. She did however, have a close working relationship with one of the participants and they worked well together in planning activities and extending lessons. This was primarily due to the other participant seeking out Wendy rather than Wendy
seeking her. The relative high score at stage 0 (unconcerned) indicated that Wendy had no prior knowledge or involvement with content integration (George et al., 2006).

**Individualized Coaching.** Due to Wendy’s desire to collaborate more (stage 5), it was essential to provide her with opportunities to meet with the team of teachers. Involvement with Wendy consisted of four whole-group meetings and one interview. The first whole-group meeting consisted of my co-researcher and I sharing examples of how to utilize a science and social studies textbook as a reading basal. Knowing Wendy’s capabilities and resource knowledge, I prompted her with specific questions and comments to actively engage her in the group discussions. Her responses were always with little to no hesitation. She never seemed to mind sharing her opinion once prompted. Wendy was eager to gather books from the media center to coincide with these units. She seemed excited to have an active role and participation in the implementation. The teachers were responsive and appreciative of her assistance, and Wendy displayed a sense of pride in teachers welcoming her help. There were sporadic occasions where Wendy joined the other participants in their classroom, but mainly weekly scheduled trips to the media center was the extent of the participants’ involvement.

Through the implementation of joining the participants in their classroom, Wendy felt as though students’ perception of the role of the librarian evolved more into the role of a classroom teacher noting that “[Students] are seeing me more as a teacher.” As a resource provider, Wendy saw value with the implementation, noting that as a result students would make weekly visits to the media center in order to check out books. It was during these scheduled visits that Wendy saw growth and student change. The second-grade students were eager to select nonfiction books that related to what they were studying in their social studies and science classes. She
stated, “We probably check out three or four times as much nonfiction as fiction anyway, which I would tend to say is not typical.”

**Denise**

Denise has 5 years of teaching experience all of which have been at Rural Charter School. Areas of certification include early childhood along with curriculum and instruction. Denise has taught pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and second grade. Denise holds a Specialist Degree in Education and has had teaching experience in all academic content areas. She serves as a second-grade lead teacher. Denise’s primary content focus during the study was in the subject area called inquiry hub, which was an enrichment integration of all the content subject areas.

Denise portrayed herself as being one who was open-minded to change. She exemplified the tenacity to strive to do what was best no matter the work or who needed to be involved. Faithful, available, and teachable all characterize Denise’s demeanor. All of the second-grade students filtered through her classroom daily. Denise’s role in the implementation was to integrate English-Language Arts in all of the core content areas through focused use of technology and enriched writing.
Interview Protocol.

Table 9

Denise’s quotations coded using ATLAS.ti for specific themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Interview</th>
<th>Second Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Logistics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Planning Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Student Achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a Facilitator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in Table 9 over the course of both interviews, the analysis of Denise’s responses represented all themes. However, she spoke mostly towards becoming a facilitator and the importance of collaborative planning time. Denise had been a classroom teacher for five years. Within those five years, she had established a structure for teaching and had been successful with her method. She recognized that this innovation was far from the traditional approach to instruction and admitted that “my weakness is doubt, I have never taught this way before” (Interview 1). Throughout the study, Denise wanted assurance that she was implementing the integrated content model effectively. She stated, “Each day is different. It takes a lot of collaboration amongst the teachers,” (Interview 1). If there was something that needed to be tweaked or addressed, Denise wanted to know. She asserted, “I am willing to do it, even if it is more difficult on the teacher end,” (Interview 1).
Denise’s pretest concerns were highest at stage 5 (collaboration). This suggested that coordinating with others was a priority for her. This result was indicative of Denise’s demeanor as well as her role on the second-grade team which was to instruct culminating lessons of all content taught by her teammates. Denise’s priority was to work with her team in order to plan her lessons accordingly. Denise’s personality made it easy for others to be receptive to her. The participants appeared to genuinely like Denise. She was approachable and teachable. Denise wanted to know more about the instructional implementation (stage 1, information). Due to stage 1 (information) resulting in a higher relative intensity than stage 2 (personal) indicated that Denise wanted to know more information about the innovation (George et al., 2006). Denise was proactive in her approach towards learning more about integrating content. Oftentimes, she would reach out to the other participants for ideas. Denise consistently planned with Wendy and would arrange times for Wendy to join her in the classroom for a team teaching approach as well as to gather resources. In comparison, the Pre-SoCQ and the Post-SoCQ resulted with a relative intensity at stage 5 (collaboration). The high concern at stage 5 (collaboration) and lower concerns at the other stages reflected Denise’s demeanor in that she was considered a leader on
the second-grade team and coordinating with others was a priority (George et al., 2006). Meetings scheduled with the group in order to talk about the implementation were important to Denise, and not having a set time daily where the team could collaborate other than a lunch meeting or an occasional after-school meeting was reflected in her high stage 5. During whole-group meetings, she shared ideas and personal experiences about the implementation. The most significant change in her Pre- and Post-SoCQ administrations were depicted at stage 1 (information). Denise’s knowledge about the implementation increased throughout the study, thus her concern to know more about it decreased. Denise viewed the integrated method to teaching as being a best practice.

**Individualized Coaching.** Denise was open to the innovation from the very beginning. In order to address her concern for collaboration, I assisted her in establishing expectations and guidelines for a collaborative effort. We met to formulate a schedule, which allotted Denise time to collaborate and formalize a plan to become more efficient in planning her daily instruction. Denise wanted to ensure that the time students spent in her classroom was productive and efficient. She needed a schedule that would minimize waste and maximize instruction. The co-researcher and I met with Denise to review resources for integration of social studies and English-Language Arts. During another individual session, we discussed depth of knowledge when preparing lessons and assessments. For further individualized support, I observed Denise for assurance in her implementation of a science lesson through writing. Denise taught a lesson where she integrated reading into her science content which I observed. Students were engaged in active learning. After the lesson, I met with Denise to review and discuss what I observed. The point of this observation feedback meeting was to reinforce a teaching strategy for content integration. Denise thrived on immediate feedback and positive reinforcement. Another meeting
included a time when Denise, Tiffany, Pyra, Juli, and I met to discuss resources for an upcoming social studies unit on the War of 1812. The resources for this unit included reading passages, graphic organizers, and other comprehension tasks. Throughout the individualized coaching, it was important to involve Denise in discussions and decisions about the instructional implementation. Denise was involved in another meeting including Tiffany, Pyra, and Juli to discuss integrated science resources on the solar system. These specific reading resources covered English-Language Arts standards in reading comprehension, main idea, and supporting details.

Even though Denise shared concerns of doubt in her interviews at the beginning of the implementation, she voiced growth from students and confidence as the process continued. Denise’s encouragement and excitement stemmed from students’ responses. Her desire for student success never wavered. “They are excited [and] they inspire me. They are absorbing it and are running with it,” (Interview 1). Not only did Denise detect positive student responses, she saw a change in the other participants. Denise commented, “Change that has been made is the collaboration amongst participants,” (Interview 2). As Denise’s concerns for information (stage 1) about the innovation and personal (stage 2) apprehensions were addressed, her confidence grew. She was enthusiastic and amenable and this became infectious not only in her classroom but to other participants. In regard to her students and her teaching, Denise stated that “they are loving it and they are growing. They are making those connections. I don’t even look at the test scores, I am confident,” (Interview 2).

Robin

Robin has a total of 18 years of teaching experience. Four of the 18 years have been at Rural Charter School. Robin has a Master’s Degree in Early Childhood Education. She serves
in an administrative capacity at Rural Charter School as the Lower School Director. Robin was in her first year serving in an administrative role during the time of this study. Previously, she was a second-grade classroom teacher. Even though Robin was not a second-grade teacher, it was vital to have her as a participant due to her being the direct supervisor to the team of elementary teachers. Robin was very interested in the study and its outcome. If the study proved to be effective for the teachers and student achievement, she desired to emulate the instructional approach to other elementary grades within Rural Charter School.

Previously, Robin was a second-grade math teacher and worked with several of the participants in the study. She felt an advantage having taught second grade, and felt confident that she would be able to relate well with the teachers. As the Lower School Director and the immediate supervisor to the second-grade teachers, Robin was willing to be a part of the research. She believed there were benefits in the integration of English-Language Arts into the core content areas of social studies, science, and math. Robin’s role in the study was to attend the meetings and experience first-hand as much as she could as the team grappled with content integration. Robin was interested in extending this instructional strategy into the other elementary grades if it proved to be beneficial not only to the teachers but most importantly to the students.
Robin’s focus interview revealed effects on student achievement, relevance to instruction, and scheduling and logistics as primary themes of concern as depicted in Table 10. From the beginning, Robin was very supportive of the research, however, she proposed subtle doubt. The contrast in support and doubt was evident in her thoughts that, “…it is going to be a good change, [but] we don’t know for sure without the data,” (Interview 1). Considering that Rural Charter School had always exuded high test scores, Robin wanted assurance that this teaching method would not derail an academically successful track record. Robin identified her weakness as “…not knowing the end product,” (Interview 1). Even though Robin was serving in an administrative capacity for Rural Charter School, she remembered what it was like to be a classroom teacher. She had a sense of empathy for the work and details that went into the daily minutiae. The newly appointed administrator saw value in the instructional model for integrating English-Language Arts standards into core content and supported teachers in their subject areas rather than the traditional isolated content approach to teaching. Robin remembered as a teacher...
that she “….didn’t feel great at [teaching] all content,” (Interview 1), thus she embraced her staff and wanted them to be the best at what they were assigned to teach. Robin was willing to offer support however it would best benefit the teachers. Despite her doubt, she continued to encourage the participants. She realized the teachers were involved in an innovative teaching practice and admitted that although “there is not a blueprint to this type of teaching, I see benefits already,” (Interview 1). Oftentimes, Robin would allude that teaching is not easy. She recognized that in order to try something new, change was necessary.

SoCQ.

Figure 7. Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results for Robin

The Pre-SoCQ results, as seen in Figure 7, showed Robin’s greatest concern at stage 5 (collaboration). Robin had concerns about the team working together in relation to the content integration implementation. It was important to her for the team to work together and share ideas and thoughts. As the direct supervisor to this specific group of teachers, Robin was accustomed to scheduling and leading meetings. She knew the value in communicating and collaborating well. The high intensity of concern at stage 3 (management) was indicative of Robin’s concern about the logistics and time of the instructional implementation. An important part of an administrator’s job is to make sure things are running smoothly and as seamlessly as
possible. Since this was Robin’s first year as an administrator and my third year as an administrator, she and I worked collaboratively in creating the entire elementary schedule. She wanted to make sure that instructional time was maximized. Robin deemed the implementation important. Having been a classroom teacher, Robin was aware of needed changes and desired the curriculum to be refined. The low concern at stage 0 (unconcerned) indicated a high concern and priority for the implementation (George et al., 2006). The Post-SoCQ data in comparison to the pre-administration displayed a decrease in all stages with the exception of stage 0 (unconcerned). Even though a concern increase at stage 0 (unconcerned) was evident, the low intensity revealed in stages 1-3 indicated Robin was an experienced participant who was still actively concerned about the implementation. The low intensity at stage 4 (consequence) suggested that Robin had minimal concerns about the effects of the implementation on the students. The most significant difference in the pre and post administrations of the SoCQ was the decrease in intensity at stage 3 (management). At the beginning of the study, Robin was concerned with gathering data to prove that this form of instructional implementation was worth incorporating into the other elementary grade levels. As the study progressed, she had minimal to no concerns about managing the implementation (stage 3). Robin was confident in the participants. I attributed the confidence that Robin possessed to the working relationship she had prior to her role change when she taught with them. Robin was not only the participants’ administrator, but she was a friend, and a former teammate. There was little change in the relative intensity at stage 5 (collaboration) in both SoCQ administrations. A spike in stage 5 (collaboration) and low on all other stages suggested that the participant is an administrator who is concerned about coordinating with the others in relation to the use of the innovation (George et al., 2006).
Individually Coaching. Due to the high relative intensity at stage 3 (management) an individualized meeting was initiated to discuss specifics about the implementation of content integration. In this meeting, we discussed the second-grade English-Language Arts standards and how those standards would be integrated and addressed within the social studies, science, and math content. Robin’s concern was that some of the English-Language Arts standards might dissipate in the integration causing gaps in student achievement. During this meeting, we talked about ways to support not only students, but also teachers through the integration by reinforcing content through instruction. It was important to Robin that all participants heard the same message. She desired all participants to be cooperative individually as well as collaboratively. Based on this expressed concern, a whole-group meeting was scheduled to discuss the integration of standards. Teachers spoke about their specific content standards and ways to incorporate the English-Language Arts curriculum. Conversations about assessments, writing across curriculum, and upcoming content topics were discussed. Due to Robin being the immediate supervisor for the second-grade team, I shared individual experiences with her in order to keep her abreast of the participants’ journey.

Robin’s immediate management (stage 3) intensity lowered as the study progressed as illustrated in Figure 7. She went from being focused on the second-grade team to looking to ways to infuse the same implementation into other grade levels. Robin’s concern for logistics (stage 3) in the implementation shifted to teacher buy-in for those who were not directly involved in the study. Robin desired “…to get others on board,” (Interview 2). Robin’s “…excitement and desire to see this implemented with the contents” shifted to “…a desire to see this happen in more than one grade level,” (Interview 2). Robin’s aspiration to emulate content integration into other grade levels created a new concern. She shared that her “…weakness is
just getting it started within other grade levels and teacher motivation is a concern,” (Interview 2). Being an administrator and one who was involved directly with the implementation, Robin became supportive in promoting and guiding this implementation in a way that would become beneficial school-wide. The administrator’s concern for student achievement was satisfied. She commented on her own child who was a second-grade student experiencing this nontraditional method for instruction. “I have a child who wants to come to school every day,” (Interview 2). Robin shared that the students were engaged and seemed to enjoy learning through content integration. Robin stated that the students, “…do not know they are learning,” (Interview 2).

**Pyra**

Pyra has 2 years teaching experience, and she holds a Master’s Degree in Education. Her areas of certification include special education, adaptive special education, and early childhood education. During the course of the study, Pyra served as the special education resource teacher to the students in second grade. Pyra was newly employed at Rural Charter School at the time of this study.

While Pyra was gentle in thought, she displayed great discernment. She paid close attention to details, listened with intent, and had a desire to keep the end goal in mind. Quick to listen and slow to speak epitomized Pyra’s character. Pyra already possessed an enjoyment for incorporating reading into everyday routines. She saw great value in reading. Pyra served as an educational resource teacher for the second-grade team. She was in charge of student Individual Education Plans (IEP). Her role in the study was to work with the second-grade team and modify lessons as needed according to students’ IEP documents.


As noted in Table 11, several themes were coded as they transpired through Pyra’s voice. Collaborative planning time, effects on student achievement, instructional resources, and relevance to instruction were all noted points of concern detected in the interview protocols. Pyra’s position in the implementation was directed in making sure she complimented and adapted the instructional lessons to meet the needs of individual students. Her desire was to see students learn and be successful. Through Pyra’s involvement in the innovation, she began to, “…think how [she could] incorporate reading more,” (Interview 1). She commented further on her desire to meet her students’ needs in stating, “Trying to find the right resources, especially for the core knowledge stuff,” (Interview 1). She voiced, “I would like to have more resources for math, if possible,” (Interview 1). Throughout the implementation, Pyra was challenged. Unlike the other participants, Pyra worked with all of the teachers on the second-grade team. She was planning for all of the content areas. This was not easy for Pyra and recognized that, “…it was hard to incorporate more reading into math,” (Interview 1). Pyra acknowledged the
difficulty in meeting with all of the teachers on the team due to scheduling constraints. She expressed, “It is difficult with my schedule to know what is being taught in science and inquiry,” (Interview 2). Pyra’s gentle and concerned character for students was evident throughout the study. She admitted a weakness pertaining to student achievement by expressing the uncertainty of knowing, “…how far to push them,” (Interview 1). Pyra wanted to challenge the students. Although she was new to Rural Charter School, she recognized the expectation was to teach above grade level. She had heard the administrative team advise the teachers to differentiate during the school day and remediate after school.

**SoCQ.**

![Pre-Administration Stages of Concern Questionnaire](image1)

![Post-Administration Stages of Concern Questionnaire](image2)

*Figure 8. Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results for Pyra*

Pyra’s Pre-Administration of the SoCQ indicated relative intensity highest at stage 1 (information) as seen in Figure 8 due to her detail-oriented personality. She wanted to know more about the implementation, the process of instructing the implementation, and who would be involved in devising the implementation. The low intensity at stage 4 (consequence) indicated Pyra was not apprehensive about the implementation consequence for students. Pyra was not concerned about collaborating with others which was indicative in the low intensity at stage 5 (collaboration). In whole group sessions, she listened to the other participants more than she openly shared. In comparison to the administration results for the Pre- and Post-SoCQ results,
the levels of concern at stages 1, 2, and 3 decreased some but not significantly. Results at stage 0 (unconcerned) remained the same. From the onset of the instructional implementation, Pyra did not appear to be overly concerned or hesitant towards the instructional implementation. She was easygoing and cooperative. By the end of the study, Pyra was sharing her personal experiences about the implementation with the group (stage 5, collaboration). Pyra’s initial concern for wanting to know more about the implementation details (stage 1, informational) transpired to a concern about relating to what the other teachers were doing (stage 5, collaboration).

**Individualized Coaching.** In order to address Pyra’s concern levels in the implementation, we immediately addressed her concern to know more information (stage 1) in a whole-group meeting. The co-researcher and I clearly outlined information about the implementation. We looked at the second-grade schedule as a whole as well as individual daily schedules. It was essential for Pyra to have intentional scheduled times to meet with teachers in order to view lessons plans. This would allow Pyra the ability to adapt and modify lessons as needed. We discussed the applicability of the implementation in relation to current practices and the end goal of total content integration. We met to discuss upcoming assessments and units which were specific to social studies and science content. Pyra shared thoughts for modifying lessons and making them academically appropriate for her students who required assignment modifications. Required resources were identified that could be used to accentuate the content in social studies and science. We examined methods for implementing the content in math through various writing topics. It was in the group meetings that Pyra was able to converse with the team members and reflect on the progress of the students as they worked through content integration, and what Pyra could do to continue to support the students as well as the teachers. Meeting with the team became an established practice.
As Pyra saw the effects of the implementation, she was convinced it was worth doing. She noted towards the end of the study, “After students took their NWEA (Northwest Evaluation Association), it solidified what we are doing especially for math,” (Interview 2). Pyra ensured all students were given equal opportunity and attention. She noted, “when teaching to high expectations, it is neat to see how kids can improve,” (Interview 2). Pyra’s diligence in being precise and methodical continued to surface. It was through the established collaboration that Pyra flourished and shared, “It has been wonderful to work with Ms. Cynthia and all of the teachers to find those resources,” (Interview 1). “In a lot of schools, teachers don’t collaborate that effectively,” (Interview 1). It was evident in Pyra’s voice that she was not going to stop growing professionally in the implementation and had, “…been looking up different conferences to go to,” (Interview 1). Pyra is a lifelong learner.

**Juli**

Juli has a total of 15 years of experience with zero years of experience at Rural Charter School. She holds a Master’s Degree in Education and is certified in the areas of early childhood and educational leadership. Juli served in the capacity of a lead teacher. Her primary core content focus was in the content area of social studies with the integration of English-Language Arts. Juli has experience in teaching kindergarten, second grade, as well as third grade. She has taught all content areas.

Juli came to the team with a solid reading background. Her reading skills and strategies for classroom instruction were robust. Juli desired perfection and would not settle for anything less. She was a lead second-grade teacher. Juli was charged with integrating English-Language Arts within social studies content. Since Juli was new to Rural Charter School, not only was she adjusting to a new school environment after teaching in the same school for 15 years, but also
she was on a team undergoing an instructional implementation. Juli was experiencing many new things.

*Interview Protocol.*

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juli’s quotations coded using ATLAS.ti for specific themes</th>
<th>Initial Interview</th>
<th>Second Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Logistics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Planning Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Student Achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a Facilitator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the beginning of the study, Juli spoke mostly about effects on student achievement, instructional resources, scheduling and logistics about the implementation as noted on Table 12. Juli was a structured teacher. She wanted things organized and arranged in a manner that pursued efficiency. Juli persistently sought the need for resources. Her goal and desire was to “…build and locate resources,” and be able to “…pull things and find things,” (Interview 1). Juli further asserted the importance for “…finding things [reading passages] at an appropriate level” (Interview 1). In comparison to the other participants, Juli was very structure-focused and tenacious in the efficiency and perfection of the implementation of content integration. She “…thrive[d] on structure and routine,” (Interview 1). Coming from a school where she taught all content to the same group of students, she quickly realized that focusing on one content area might be a struggle. Even though Juli admitted a weakness for “…not having a solid social
studies background,” she did not shy away from the content integration (Interview 1). She was a hard worker and was not one to give up easily. Although everything at Rural Charter School was a new adjustment to Juli, she quickly recognized the implementation of content integration was something new and it, “…was not the style of teaching that was ingrained in me,” (Interview 1). Juli admitted, “The challenge is trying to incorporate foundational reading skills into social studies,” (Interview 2). She wanted assurance in knowing this was best practice. Juli demanded proof for validation of the integration of content by needing, “…hard data in my face,” (Interview 1).

\textit{SoCQ.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{SoCQ.png}
\caption{Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results for Juli}
\end{figure}

From the onset, Juli’s relative high intensity at stage 0 (unconcerned) indicated that there were other undertakings and responsibilities that were of more concern to her (George et al., 2006). This score was not indicative to her engagement with the implementation. Juli was overwhelmed with multi-faceted aspects to being newly employed at Rural Charter School such as adjusting to the school’s expectations, however, she was also very concerned and perhaps overwhelmed with the implementation of integrated content. Juli’s Pre-SoCQ noted in Figure 9 resulted in high intensity at stage 1 (information) and stage 2 (personal). This implied her desire to know more about the implementation and the effects the implementation would have on her.
It was important to Juli to be successful at Rural Charter School. The way she viewed success for herself was for her students to experience academic success (stage 4, consequence). At the point of the Pre-SoCQ, Juli’s responses indicated low intensity at stage 4 (consequence). A low concern for stage 4 (consequence) suggested that Juli had minimal concerns about the effects of the implementation on her students. Juli was more concerned about the effects implementation would have on her (stage 2, personal). She needed to feel a sense of comfort and confidence coming into a new workplace. In comparison to the Pre-SoCQ, Juli’s Post-SoCQ results were quite different. The greatest difference is indicated in stage 0 (unconcerned). The Post-SoCQ results for stage 0 (unconcerned) were significantly lower. This suggested that her concerns regarding the value of the innovation were resolved and that the implementation became a priority and a focal point to Juli’s thinking and work (George et al., 2006). I attributed this to Juli getting familiar and perhaps a bit more comfortable with working in a new setting. She began adjusting and gaining more confidence. A second considerable decrease in relative intensity in comparison to Juli’s Pre-SoCQ results was in stage 3 (management). The low intensity at stage 3 (management) showed her minimal concern about managing and applying the instructional implementation. Again, Juli was adjusting to the schedule and routine of Rural Charter School as a whole. She appeared to be adapting well to being the new teacher on campus. Juli’s comfort in establishing a rapport with her students, parents, and other school staff was improving. The increased intensity indicated at stage 6 (refocusing) suggested that Juli began to formulate ideas about ways to make the implementation work even better. Juli had a reputation from her previous school as being a strong teacher. She had 15 years of experience in leading students, innovations, and curriculum. Juli was a critical thinker and a problem solver.
**Individualized Coaching.** In comparison to all of the other participants on the second-grade team, Juli appeared most tenacious. Her perfectionist personality was palpable. Communications whether face-to-face or via email were on-going. My co-researcher and I met with Juli more than any other second-grade participant. Because Juli appeared to be so insistent, we were cautious in remaining enthusiastic with Juli, and took into the consideration the importance in enhancing evidence of others who were excited about the implementation (Hord et al., 1987). We met with Juli to peruse the social studies text and determine how it could be used as a reading basal. During the perusal of the text, we identified ways to integrate English-Language Arts standards as a means to teach social studies content. To further address Juli’s resource concerns, we met and gathered leveled readers that would complement an upcoming westward expansion unit in social studies. To plan long-term, Juli and I reviewed her yearlong plan and began to identify paired texts of non-fiction and fiction literary pieces. We answered questions such as: Where to start? and Where does it fit? Another meeting focused on scheduling and logistics. During this meeting, we discussed ways to schedule individual classes and specific logistics in maximizing instruction in order to effectively deliver required content for mastery. In addition to meeting individually as well as whole group, I met jointly with Juli and Tiffany to share ideas and classroom experiences. Tiffany shared with Juli ways she was integrating reading into science. As a means to offer assurance and validity to Juli’s instruction, the co-researcher observed Juli teaching. Juli was instructing reading groups in her social studies class. One group was engaged in a reading comprehension lesson which incorporated a reading passage about the Chattahoochee River. A second group was identifying the author’s purpose while reading leveled readers about regions. A third group was reading books about rivers. The co-researcher noted that during this one lesson, Juli touched on author’s purpose, text features,
and predictions, all of which are English-Language Arts curriculum standards. A follow-up meeting was implemented for reassurance.

Juli’s intensity level throughout the study was relatively consistent. Many factors had to be taken into consideration as to the point of reference for her elevated concerns. There were many new initiatives and adjustments Juli was undergoing. As mentioned, Juli was not only adjusting to being new to a school, but also she was a new member of a second-grade team, new to students and parents, and new to a different style of teaching. Through the progression in individual coaching, Juli’s overall high concern for managing the implementation decreased as “…students [were] responding better than expected, even with routine changes,” (Interview 1). Her demand to see student data was appeased once it started surfacing and, “…every piece of data has shown tremendous progress,” (Interview 2). Juli exclaimed, “I love it! I am definitely a person that needs to see data that it works.” Juli’s was comforted and encouraged when she recognized instructional integration was occurring in her team members’ rooms. She acknowledged, “Reading is everywhere, it is in every class.” She continued, “It is coming together,” (Interview 2). It was validating to Juli as she became aware that transformation was recognized and approved outside of school and “…parents [were] coming to [her] telling [her] they cannot believe the conversation that [their] child is coming home and having,” (Interview 2).

Cynthia

Cynthia is the youngest of the team of teachers. Cynthia serves as a lead teacher in the content area of mathematics with the integration of English-Language Arts. She holds a Bachelor’s Degree in Early Childhood Education. Cynthia has 4 years of teaching experience.
Three of the four years have been at Rural Charter School. Cynthia has taught pre-kindergarten thru second grade. She has teaching experience in all content areas.

Cynthia is characterized as easy to get along with and possessing a laid-back demeanor. She was not overly tenacious, but rather content and subtle. She was quiet in nature, but loud in thoughts. Her teaching role on the second-grade team was mathematics. Cynthia was new to the second-grade team. She was secure in classroom differentiation strategies. From the beginning, she saw value in the implementation, but was curious how it would function in math. Out of the entire second-grade team, Cynthia was the only participant who was involved in an extracurricular activity which took place after school. She was an assistant coach to Rural Charter School’s cheerleading team. Cynthia’s extracurricular involvement made it challenging for her to attend after school meetings with the team. In order to address this challenge, working lunch meetings were scheduled.

*Interview Protocol.*

Table 13

*Cynthia’s quotations coded using ATLAS.ti for specific themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Interview</th>
<th>Second Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Logistics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Planning Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Student Achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a Facilitator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As depicted on Table 13, Cynthia’s interviews portrayed effects on student achievement, relevance to instruction, and scheduling and logistics as being the main themes of concern. From the beginning, Cynthia viewed math as an outlier in comparison to social studies and science. She found it more difficult to integrate English-Language Arts into her content because, “…I sometimes stay in my own little math bubble,” (Interview 1). Cynthia expressed her concern for what was going on in the other classes. She contended, “I don’t get to hear what they are learning in science and social studies.” Cynthia was unclear of, “…their [students] reading abilities,” (Interview 1) and how to meet the students’ needs. Despite the lunch meetings, most of the collaborative conversations took place during grade level meetings, and due to her involvement with coaching cheerleading, Cynthia missed these afternoon meetings. Cynthia was focused on math and desired the mathematical skills to trump all other content. Her math-focused mindset created somewhat a resistance towards the integrated implementation and she, “…ensure[d] students [would] know the math standards prior to pulling the other stuff,” (Interview 1).

\textit{SoCQ.}

![Figure 10. Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results for Cynthia](image1)

Cynthia’s Pre-SoCQ indicated high relative intensity at stage 5 (collaboration) as noted in Figure 10. The relative intensity at stage 5 (collaboration) suggested that Cynthia’s concerns
posed in collaborating with others in relation to the implementation (George et al., 2006). This was indicative of Cynthia for she was new to the second-grade team. Her previous years of teaching had been in pre-kindergarten and kindergarten. Cynthia’s desire was to get to know the team of teachers and work well alongside them. Along with her concern about collaborating with others (stage 5), Cynthia’s survey results indicated the second highest concern at stage 1 (information). This suggested a desire to learn from what others on the team were doing as well as a desire to know more about content integration. What did it mean and how was it going to work were questions Cynthia needed answered. Second-grade math standards were new to Cynthia. There was anxiety in not only learning the math standards, but needing to learn the English-Language Arts standards and how the two would be co-taught. In comparison to Cynthia’s Pre-SoCQ results, the Post-SoCQ results displayed a rise in all stages. The increase suggested Cynthia’s concerns escalated throughout the study. Even though Cynthia met with the other participants during lunch, she was unable to attend most of the after school whole group meetings due to her involvement with coaching, thus resulting to her concerns not being alleviated as quickly as the other participants.

**Individualized Coaching.** Cynthia was easy to overlook because she stayed in her room and was not a tenacious individual. When asked how she was doing, oftentimes she would just nod, smile, and reply that all was well. Due to Cynthia’s involvement in an after school commitment, she was oftentimes unavailable for grade level meetings. One grade level meeting for which she was present was scheduled to discuss available resources. It was noted that there were more available resources pertaining to science and social studies than there were for math. This was not only an eye opener for Cynthia but for me and my co-researcher as well. Rural Charter School had a plethora of resources for social studies and science, but not for math. It
was somewhat of a challenge to locate reading resources to integrate into math content. Another grade level meeting was scheduled to review assessments. We discussed ways in which Cynthia could incorporate writing prompts in math. Again, it was noted that social studies and science dominated the discussion. I attempted to encourage Cynthia by providing positive feedback and support in the implementation initiative. I acknowledged her concerns as much as possible and tried to encourage her to share her immediate concerns and demands.

According to the SoCQ results illustrated in Figure 10, Cynthia maintained high levels of relative intensity throughout the study, but it was Cynthia’s voice that provided a glimpse that she was changing as the progression of the implementation proceeded. Cynthia elaborated on her excitement as the, “…kids seem[ed] excited to hear about science and social studies materials in math class,” (Interview 2). Cynthia began to see herself transforming out of the math bubble and viewed her strengths in the process as more integration of the reading and writing, where she wasn’t doing that before. She viewed herself as, “…moving past computation and explaining reasoning more,” (Interview 2). Another area of change Cynthia noted was in the writing application she integrated as students kept, “…more of a journal in math,” (Interview 2).

Ginger

Ginger, along with Pyra, had the fewest number of years’ experience in teaching. Ginger had taught for 2 years and was newly employed at Rural Charter School during the time of this study. She had a Master’s Degree in Education and is certified in the areas of early childhood education and school counseling. Ginger had teaching experience with Pre-Kindergarten and first grade prior to joining the second-grade team. She had taught in all content areas. During the course of the study, Ginger served as a teacher assistant with Juli and Cynthia where she
assisted in leading small instructional groups and performed other tasks within the classroom as needed.

Ginger was quiet and reserved in nature; somewhat private. Her facial expressions often indicated her thoughts. Ginger was assigned to work with Juli in social studies and Cynthia in math. Her daily schedule was split between both teachers. Even though Ginger saw working with both core content teachers as a benefit, she also perceived being a teacher’s assistant as somewhat of a disadvantage. Ginger was assigned lunch duty to enable the second-grade team lead teachers time to plan collaboratively. This created a feeling of isolation, being left out and uninvolved in team decisions. The only opportunity she had to collaboratively plan with the other teachers was the scheduled after school meetings which did not occur on a daily basis.

**Interview Protocol.**

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ginger’s quotations coded using ATLAS.ti for specific themes</th>
<th>Initial Interview</th>
<th>Second Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Logistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Planning Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Student Achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a Facilitator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As depicted on Table 14, the themes coded most in Ginger’s interviews were her concerns for scheduling and logistics. Being new to Rural Charter School, she was not familiar with the culture of the school. She joined a school that embraced change and welcomed new
ways for doing things. From the beginning, Ginger stated about the implementation, “I don’t know what it is supposed to look like,” (Interview 1). To her advantage, neither did her teammates. This implementation was new to all participants. Ginger claimed an advantage to being a teacher assistant to two of the four member team, but at the same time saw this as a disadvantage due to not working with all of the students. There were times Ginger felt separated from the lead teachers. She hinted such isolation when she stated, “They [lead teachers] meet at lunch and I don’t get to collaborate with others.” She continued, “I’m in the lunchroom, so I miss out on the collaboration,” (Interview 1). As the change facilitator, I worked to improve this situation by scheduling more whole-group meetings after school. Ginger also had concerns for self-progress as well as student progress. She voiced concerns on ways she could improve student achievement by, “…work[ing] on assessments and talk[ing] about them,” (Interview 2). She desired for students to grow academically. Having “appropriately leveled” resources to effectively implement the standards was important to Ginger, (Interview 2).

_SoCQ._

_Figure 11. Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results for Ginger_
Ginger’s Pre-SoCQ results revealed relatively high levels of concerns with the exception at stage 4 (consequence) as illustrated in Figure 11. This suggested that Ginger had minimal concerns about the effects of the instructional implementation on students (George et al., 2006). I attribute this to Ginger being an assistant to the teachers. Even though Ginger was a certified teacher, she served in the capacity of an assistant rather than a lead teacher. She did not have the same responsibilities as the lead teachers thus she did not carry the full responsibility and weight of student achievement solely on her shoulders. The high management concerns (stage 3), suggested that Ginger was concerned with the logistics and management for the instructional implementation. She was not only new to the second-grade team, but she was new to Rural Charter School. Ginger was adjusting to a new culture, and was experiencing many adjustments. She was adjusting to a new school, new teaching team, new students, and new parents. Ginger was trying to find her place on the team. Likewise, the high relative intensity at stage 1 (informational) suggested that Ginger wanted to know more information about the implementation. From the beginning of the implementation, Ginger shared concerns for wanting to know more about the integrated curriculum. She wanted more details. Ginger’s Post-SoCQ results, displayed an increase relative intensity at stage 5 (collaboration). This relative intensity reflected Ginger’s concerns about working with others pertaining to the instructional implementation. The high concern level at stage 5 (collaboration) and stage 1 (information) implied Ginger’s desire to learn from what others on her team were doing. This was indicative of Ginger. She oftentimes felt isolated and left out from grade-level decisions. The isolation was mainly due to the lack of time spent planning with the team. The lead teachers decided to meet during lunch a couple days a week to plan. In order for the teachers to be able to meet, Ginger had to stay in the cafeteria and monitor the students. Despite the high concerns for
collaboration (stage 5), the Post-SoCQ concern levels at stage 2 (personal) and stage 3 (management) both decreased. The decrease in concern levels at stages 2 and 3 suggested that Ginger was becoming more comfortable with the innovation and its impact on her and her role as a teacher assistant.

*Individualized Coaching.* Being new to Rural Charter School, Ginger had to make several adjustments. She was adjusting not only to a new employment, but to a new group of teachers, students, and parents. The co-researcher and I were intentional in making Ginger feel like she was an integral part of the team. Just because Ginger carried the role of an assistant teacher did not lessen her status or level of importance. Grade-level meetings were scheduled after school to address resource and scheduling concerns. During these meetings, the co-researcher and I gathered and presented resources for integration in the content courses. We discussed the importance of using leveled readers and appropriate times to incorporate them into daily practices. Ginger was observed leading small groups in social studies. She was integrating reading strategies while instructing social studies content. Following the observation, a meeting was scheduled with Ginger for reassurance and discussion on ways to engage all students and ideas on how to incorporate fluency while instructing social studies content.

Ginger was teachable and desired to “…learn everything from school expectations to what students know,” (Interview 1). She wanted to know “…all details,” (Interview 1). As Ginger’s personal and management concerns were addressed, those concerns began to decrease. Ginger’s level of confidence was apparent through her actions as she shared that she had “…learned a lot on how to structure time,” (Interview 2) She realized that “Each class and unit looks different,” and that “…every day is going to look different,” (Interview 2). Ginger was comforted and encouraged that “students accept change well,” because, “…they are used to
change and didn’t know different,” (Interview 1). Ginger transformed from unsure of her exact role in the implementation to claiming, “I am not teaching social studies. I am teaching reading,” (Interview 2).

Summary

The problem addressed in this study was teachers who are not supported through innovation adoption will result in unsustainable outcomes. This study proposed supporting teachers with individualized coaching through a change in instructional practices based on teacher concerns would result in a sustainable change in instructional practice. Teachers transformed from a traditional approach where teaching content in an isolated delivering was common practice to teaching content through an integrated approach by integrating English-Language Arts into social studies, science, and math. Teachers who receive coaching are more likely to buy-in to change initiative than teachers who do not receive coaching (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Understanding how the change process works and how to facilitate a change is essential (Hall & Hord, 2015).

Chapter four began with a presentation of the second-grade team’s collective findings, and was followed by individual findings were synthesized and highlighted. The participants’ emotions and concerns were voiced through their perceptions as depicted in the interview protocol and coded for themes. Following the interview protocol, graphs illustrated each participant’s Pre-SoCQ and Post-SoCQ results. The data analyses for each participant’s SoCQ results were synthesized to provide an overview of the participant’s concern levels and a comparison of how the concern levels changed throughout the instructional implementation process. Based on the needs revealed in the interview protocol as well as the questionnaire
survey, individual coaching was administered. Each participant’s individualized coaching experience was described.

Chapter five presents a discussion of findings for each specific research question. Additionally, the chapter highlights the limitations of the study, my personal reflections on the research methodology, as well as reflections on the impact on the research site and individuals. Furthermore, the implications for future practice in local context as well as the implications for future research are described in chapter five.
Chapter 5

Discussion, Implications, and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to monitor the change process of a team of second-grade teachers as an innovation was infused into their instructional practices. The study examined the experiences of teachers as they integrated English-Language Arts into the core subject areas of social studies, science, and mathematics; focusing specifically on their stages of concern throughout the change process. This chapter provides discussion of the findings specifically related to the two research questions that focused the study. In addition, the limitations of the study, my personal reflections on the research methodology, the relationship of findings to previous literature, as well as the implications for future practice and research are shared.

Discussion of Findings

Through this qualitative action research, I joined a team of teachers as they participated in an instructional change initiative. It was through this journey that I engaged with them by providing individualized coaching based on their concerns determined by their SoCQ results, as well as their needs communicated through the interview process. My focus throughout this study was to be able to answer the following two research questions: (1) How do participants’ concerns change over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation and (2) What do teachers attribute to their ability to change their practice over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation? Hord et al. (1987) stated that change is a process that is accomplished by individuals. The authors further stated that change is a personal experience that develops through personal growth (Hall et al., 1987). As the change facilitator, I made sure the focus remained on the participants. Realizing that all individuals involved in innovation adoption experience the change process differently, it was essential to be
cognizant of the participants’ emotions and stages of concern. The concerns were influenced by the participants’ feelings about the content integration implementation (Hord et al., 1987). Oftentimes, the individuals expressed their feelings in terms of how they were changing and growing during the course of the initiative. They wanted to understand the “what”, “why”, and “how” of the innovation.

**Research Question 1**

The first research question probed how the participants’ concerns changed over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation. The participants brought to the study differing perspectives and beliefs shaped by varying factors. These factors included their demographics such as age, educational experience, areas of practice, as well as their years of teaching experience. Collectively, the pre-SoCQ results indicated an overall higher relative intensity at stages 1, 2, and 3. This was no surprise because it was at the beginning of the instructional implementation. The participants were mostly concerned with the substantive aspects of the innovation (George et al., 2006), wanting early on to mostly know more about the innovation, how it would impact their teaching, and how they would manage their time throughout the implementation process.

As expected, as I began to implement individualized coaching based on the participants’ individual responses to the pre-administration of the SoCQ, the post-administration of the SoCQ revealed a decrease in the relative intensity of stages 0, 1, 2, and 3. I attribute this to the implementation of individualized coaching rather than addressing the content implementation through traditional professional development methods. Another important finding in the comparison of the pre- and post-administrations of the SoCQ was the increase in relative intensity of stage 5 (collaboration). I attribute the increase in relative intensity of stage 5
(collaboration) to being a second-grade instructional initiative with internal support. The participants in the study were peer teachers within the school environment. Time for the team to collaborate about the content implementation was organized, therefore giving the participants an opportunity to meet and discuss the integrated content implementation. Even though time for the team to collaborate about the implementation was organized, due to daily logistics of the school day, the scheduled meetings organized were not always conducive and convenient for every participant. The lunch meetings included all participants except for Ginger who remained in the cafeteria to monitor the students while the other teachers met. The after school meetings included all participants except for Cynthia who was an assistant high school cheerleading coach. Perhaps, assisting in finding a sub to take Ginger’s place in monitoring students during lunch would have been more beneficial to the group to meet and collaborate as a complete team rather than fragment the team’s participation.

**Research Question 2**

The second research question sought to study what teachers attribute their ability to change their practice over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation. Responses from the interviews helped provide an understanding of the participants’ perceptions about the instructional implementation thus what they attributed to their ability to change their practice over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation. Collectively, the participants attributed four factors to their ability to change their practice over the course of the study. The four attributing factors were: (1) positive student responses, (2) support for flexibility in structure, (3) collaboration with others, and (4) ongoing communication.
Attributing factor #1: Positive student responses. Seeing how the students were responding to the integrated approach for instructional delivery was encouraging to the participants. The students’ responses were affirming that there was value in the implementation. Rural Charter School was an academically successful school, and had received the National Blue Ribbon as well as many other accolades. How students responded was important to the culture of the school. Maintaining positive student responses and high achievement were essential to the participants as they began the implementation for integrating content integration. Throughout the study, the participants noted seeing student improvement in achievement as a result of their innovation implementation.

Attributing factor #2: Support for flexibility in structure. The fact that the teachers had flexibility in adjusting their schedules and daily classroom routines was paramount in their ability to change their practice over the course of their participation throughout the innovation implementation. The participants were transforming their instructional strategies and their approach to delivering instruction. It was important to allot teachers the flexibility to organize their schedules in alignment with how they felt best to incorporate the new approach.

Attributing factor #3: Collaborating with others. The participants attributed their ability to change their practice to the opportunities they had to collaborate with each other. Because collaborative approaches are highly effective in promoting school change (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017), collaborative meetings were intentionally scheduled as getting the participants together became crucial to the sustainability of the innovation implementation.

Attributing factor #4: On-going communication. Along with positive student responses, support for flexibility in structure, and collaborating with others, ongoing communication throughout the implementation process was vital. Both face-to-face and email
communication became an essential aspect of the change process. My co-researcher or I communicated daily to answer questions, alleviate immediate concerns, or just to check in. Additionally, whole group, small group, and individual communication opportunities were provided and soon became a priority for everyone involved.

These attributing factors emerged as necessary criteria for helping individuals successfully adopt innovations and increased the likelihood of a change being sustainable.

**Limitations of the Study**

Action research was the research method selected in order to address a specific problem within the educational institute (Glanz, 2003). I conducted action research because it instills continuous improvement, creates a positive school climate, impacts the practice directly, and is empowering to those who participate in the process (Glanz, 2003). Although there are many benefits to action research, there are limitations as well. A major limitation to performing an action research study is the small sample size. Conducting a study with a small sample size makes it nearly impossible to generalize the findings to a larger population. By focusing on the purposefully selected eight members of the second-grade team, I was able to learn about their particular practice and focus on their individual journey through the change process at Rural Charter School. Unlike a representative sample, the small sample size inhibits the ability for one to assume that all of the participants are indicative of the same responses to that of a larger population. However, the data results will inform future innovative implementations at Rural Charter School.

Failure of participants to respond with openness and truthfulness is another limitation. I trusted the participants to respond to the interview protocol and SoCQ with honesty and straightforwardness. Collecting data in a qualitative study can be arduous and cumbersome;
however, it has proven to allot creativity and applicability (Creswell, 2013). Results might not accurately reflect the opinions of the selected sample population if the participants fail to answer with candor. I relied on the frankness from the participants in order to evaluate and administer individualized coaching based on their needs and concerns. In order to verify the participants’ responses and code for thick descriptions as emphasized throughout the change process, I relied on member checking as a means of respondent validation (Stake, 2010).

**Researcher Comments**

This study was intentional and purposeful. As a school administrator, I was inspired to build a community that embraced change. Change is constantly evolving and is ongoing and school improvement is a cyclical process. Whether new implementations are state mandated, district mandated, or school mandated, change is prevalent. As charged by the CEO of Rural Charter School, I identified an area of instructional practice within the school that I could support through a change process. I embarked on a qualitative participatory action research with a second-grade team. Throughout the study, a co-researcher joined me in implementing the innovation of individualized coaching. Together, we focused on effective ways for supporting teachers as they integrated English-Language Arts within social studies, science, and math curriculum.

Information was gathered and knowledge was generated through the qualitative participatory action research approach. I collaborated with a team of teachers to better understand innovation adoption and individuals’ role in organizational change. My interaction with the participants was differentiated based on their individual needs and concerns and due to the individualistic approach the participants, received the necessary support to adopt the innovation and eventually see its benefits for their students.
As a former teacher now serving in the role as an administrator, I appreciated the time this study provided me to be in the classroom working with teachers to better understand the change process from their perspective. I learned that addressing the needs and concerns of the teachers by individualizing their professional development is a crucial component for sustaining change. The data gathered by conducting qualitative participatory action research proved to enrich the study by fostering the voices of the participants as they journeyed through the process of academic implementation. The qualitative approach to this study allowed me to convey the story of the participants (Stake, 2010). This is important because it elucidated the participants’ perspectives and allowed their voices to be heard.

The goal for the study was to implement individualized coaching that would result in a sustained change for the team of second-grade teachers. The individualized coaching became a practice that could be implemented throughout Rural Charter School’s campus and perhaps be emulated by other institutions. To date, the team of second-grade teachers have continued to teach the curriculum through an integrated approach. Subsequently, the findings of this study were used to inform the change process for the same innovation with the third-grade team of teachers. Four lead teachers, a teacher assistant, and a special education resource teacher were divided into core content areas just like that of the second-grade team. The intent was to utilize the same teaching model for integrating English-Language Arts standards into social studies, science, and math content as was implemented in second grade, however, the individualized coaching that was paramount in this study was not utilized in that initiative. The effort failed. Individualized coaching based on teacher concerns and perceptions is necessary for successful innovation adoption. The study revealed the importance of recognizing the role of the individual in the change process and differentiating professional development accordingly.
Relationship of Findings to Previous Literature

The review of literature expounded in chapter two supported the findings in this study. Hall and Hord (1984) asserted the vital ingredient to educational change is a supportive school administrator. It was the administrator’s communication of the institution’s vision that offered purpose and direction to the stakeholders. In relation to this study, Rural Charter School has embraced the acceptance for changing areas of practice in order to improve and make a good practice even better. My role in this study as an effective leader was to foster and support the collaboration amongst the teachers. It was through this collaboration that participants had a voice and felt supported thus increasing the confidence levels for the participants (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996). Throughout the study, I developed a partnership with the participants involved in the study. In order to focus on effective leadership, I concentrated on Knight’s (2011) seven assertions in working with the teachers. These assertions included equality, choice, voice, reflection dialogue, praxis, and reciprocity. Equality allowed the participants and me to collectively make decisions about the implementation. I empowered the participants in being the final decision maker through choice. The participants’ voices were welcomed through a non-biased point of view. Individuals’ thoughts and ideas were encouraged through reflection and the relinquished control for a one-sided agenda through dialogue. Teachers were encouraged to apply their new knowledge and understanding for content integration. Finally, reciprocity was present in that all those engaged were viewed as equals throughout the process.

Even though the study focused on sustaining individual change, it was essential to research literature as it pertained to organizational change. The organization, in this case Rural Charter School, consisted of the immersion of the teachers, school administrators, students, as well as resource supports such as the media specialist. Situating the study on a foundation of a
democratic approach fostered a buy-in tactic for the participants. The administrative staff at Rural Charter School embraced Fullan’s (2008) six ways for sustaining organizational change, which are love your employee, connect peers with purpose, capacity building prevails, learning is the work, transparency rules, and systems learn. Understanding that a school will only be as good as the individuals involved and loving the employee through support and engagement will assist in preserving the desired quality of educators needed in order to sustain organizational change. Connecting peers with purpose through the establishment of equal partnership between teacher and administrator promoted a desired change. Throughout the study, I worked with the participants in order to build a trust bond which enhanced capacity building. The focus of the participants zeroed in on strength enhancing and determination. The sustaining change became evident through the integration of daily practices, not through separate entities. The participants’ willingness to be transparent was essential in the success for sustainability.

From the perspective of sustaining change at the organizational level, I was able to address the components of individual change throughout the study. The participants came to the study with varying perspectives and educational background understanding about content integration. Regardless if the participants had multiple years of teaching experience, they all had their own opinions and preconceived beliefs about the implementation. In order to foster the individual change, I attempted to construct a positive relationship with them through individualized coaching. This support was vital for change to not only occur but also to sustain. The individual support was offered based on their individual needs and concerns.

Presenting the study as being worthwhile and sure to make a difference in order to deflect teacher resistance was crucial (Knight, 2009). Were all of the participants’ needs and concerns met? Were some of the teachers reluctant to embrace the implementation for integrating the
content? As the change facilitator, making the participants feel supported was important.

Presenting the participants with a purpose for change and supporting them through the process proved to be challenging. I was able to overcome the challenge by offering individualized coaching based on the participants’ specific needs and concerns.

The premise for the study was to sustain change through individualized coaching. It was through the individualized coaching that Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) asserted was effective for teacher development. Results from the SoCQ and the interview protocol steered the development of the individualized coaching for each of the participants. It was the coaching that supported the implementation of content integration (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). The participants whose levels of concern were heightened decreased through intentional individualized coaching. The individualized coaching throughout the study was in the form of providing resources, modeling lessons, observing classes, meeting with individuals, and meeting collaboratively with participants as a group.

Andragogy (Knowles, 1984) implies that adult learning should foster a cooperative climate, address specific needs and interests, and base learning objectives on the learner’s skill levels. In working with the second-grade team, I situated the study in order to meet the implications suggested through the individualized coaching. In conjunction with Knowles’s implications for how adults learn, Hall and Hord (2015) offered peer participation strategies which included planning and providing resources, investing in professional learning, checking progress, providing continuous assistance, as well as creating a context conducive to change. This study confirmed that teachers engaged in the individualized coaching through continuous learning and provisions based on their individual concerns were successful in sustaining change. Through self-directed learning, the participants in the study incorporated the change initiative for
content integration into their daily routine. They were provided tools based on their individual concerns and needs and in turn, charged with the challenge to implement them in the classroom. The tools were in the form of resources, observation feedback, modeling opportunities, and group collaboration.

Vygotsky (1978) asserted that learning is social and active. The teachers in the study were positioned in a social environment of collaboration and active participation. Through the cyclical process, teachers’ inquiry and discovery guided the individualized coaching methods. As the change facilitator, I situated myself to be open-minded in allowing the participants to openly debate and share their perceptions as supported through the constructivist’s lens (Creswell, 2013).

One of the driving forces for determining individualized coaching for the participants was derived from the results of SoCQ. The SoCQ provided me with the concern levels for each the participants. The higher the intensity of the innovation implementation, the higher the level of concern (George et al., 2006). Based on the participants’ responses to the 35-item Likert scale questionnaire, I was able to individualize coaching based on the indicated levels of concern.

Implications for Future Practice

Professional development has evolved over the years. From workshops to job-embedded learning, professional development has taken on many forms. Traditionally, schools select an area in which needs improvement. Typically, this area of needs is derived as result of low testing and student achievement. A teacher or group of teachers are sent to training and once the training is over, they are expected to implement the strategies learned. Research has shown that the model for traditional professional development does not prove to have sustainable implications (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Through individualized coaching, teachers are
supported as dictated by their concerns and needs which lowers the chance for resistance. In this particular study, the concerns and needs were indicated by the SoCQ and interview protocol.

While this research was not focused on student achievement, participants indicated that students were responding to the innovation implementation favorably. For future practice, change facilitators could address the component of student achievement along with sustaining a change in instructional implementation. A recommendation for further research for the students of the participants could be tracked and studied for an endurance of retained knowledge and achievement in comparison to those students who did not receive instruction through an integrated approach.

Another area for future practice is to emulate the implementation to other sectors within the educational institution such as academic initiatives or school-wide initiatives. Compare the outcomes not only from one grade level to another but also within other departments within the school who have experienced the same instructional implementation. In order to track and address the needs and concerns of those involved in a change initiative, the use of the SoCQ would be beneficial. In order to compensate for leading larger populations in change initiatives using the SoCQ in determining concern levels about an innovation, participants should be grouped based on similar relative intensities as identified in the SoCQ results. The change facilitator would then administer coaching through differentiation by addressing the similar concern levels of the comparable groups. Through the progression of the innovation and re-administrations of the SoCQ, the participants’ groupings would need to be adjusted and reformed as the concerns levels for each participant changed.
Implications for Future Research

Individualized coaching as a means of professional development compared to the insulated workshops of the 1970s described by Katzenmeyer and Moller (2009) has shown great progress in the areas of teacher development, organizational change, and as a result also of student achievement. More research in the area of the effectiveness sustaining a changed practice through individualized coaching is a consideration for future research. How effective is a changed practice without identifying the needs and concerns of those who are experiencing the change process? Identifying teacher concerns using a research based instrument such as the SoCQ when implementing an instructional implementation with the intent for sustaining the practice is beneficial to the world of educators.

Research in the area of executing an implementation of instructional sustained change and its ability to prove increased student achievement could be an additional area of future study. This awareness would educate institutions as the accountability process continues to grow and the demand to perform well on state administered assessments increase. Teachers are continuously involved in professional development for improving student achievement; however the focus for the professional development is not on the strategies for sustaining the changed practice. So perhaps, research in the area of professional development for sustaining a changed practice could be valuable.

Conclusion

The only constant in education is change. In my 21 years of teaching experience, I have participated in countless change initiatives including, but not limited to, state mandated assessments, teaching standards and curriculum, textbooks, best practices, teacher certification assessments, and school and state policies. Through the vast changes in education, teachers are
rarely given the choice to adopt or even the opportunity to fully understand and adopt the change expected. The problem with non-supported change is the likelihood that it will not be sustainable. Traditionally, schools would send teachers to trainings or one-shot workshops (Cooper, n.d.; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009) expecting them to return and immediately be ready to implement the innovation and produce higher student achievement results. However, before one can begin to look at the student achievement levels as a result to instructional implementation, one must address what it takes to successfully sustain the innovation.

Through individualized coaching, based on addressing teachers’ needs and concerns, the innovation in this study has been sustained, as the participants are still integrating English-Language Arts in the content areas of social studies, science, and math. Through the use of the SoCQ instrument, along with coding teacher perspectives through individual interviews, the desired change was successful and likely sustainable because personal attention was given to the individuals based on their concerns through individualized coaching that lowered their individual concerns and encouraged them to successfully integrate English-Language Arts into the social studies, science, and math curriculum.
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Stages of Concern Questionnaire

Name (optional):

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine what people who are using or thinking about using various programs are concerned about at various times during the adoption process.

The items were developed from typical responses of school and college teachers who ranged from no knowledge at all about various programs to many years’ experience using them. Therefore, many of the items on this questionnaire may appear to be of little relevance or irrelevant to you at this time. For the completely irrelevant items, please circle “0” on the scale. Other items will represent those concerns you do have, in varying degrees of intensity, and should be marked higher on the scale.

For example:

This statement is very true of me at this time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
This statement is somewhat true of me now. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
This statement is not at all true of me at this time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
This statement seems irrelevant to me. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please respond to the items in terms of your present concerns, or how you feel about your involvement with this innovation. We do not hold to any one definition of the innovation so please think of it in terms of your own perception of what it involves. Phrases such as “this approach” and “the new system” all refer to the same innovation. Remember to respond to each item in terms of your present concerns about your involvement or potential involvement with the innovation.

Thank you for taking time to complete this task.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not true of me now</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat true of me now</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Very true of me now</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measuring Implementation in Schools: THE STAGES OF CONCERN QUESTIONNAIRE

1. I am concerned about students’ attitudes toward the innovation.  
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I now know of some other approaches that might work better.  
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I am more concerned about another innovation.  
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. I am concerned about not having enough time to organize myself each day.  
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I would like to help other faculty in their use of the innovation.  
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I have a very limited knowledge of the innovation.  
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I would like to know the effect of reorganization on my professional status.  
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. I am concerned about conflict between my interests and my responsibilities.  
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I am concerned about revising my use of the innovation.  
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I would like to develop working relationships with both our faculty and outside faculty using this innovation.  
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. I am concerned about how the innovation affects students.  
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. I am not concerned about the innovation at this time.  
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. I would like to know who will make the decisions in the new system.  
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. I would like to discuss the possibility of using the innovation.  
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. I would like to know what resources are available if we decide to adopt the innovation.  
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. I am concerned about my inability to manage all that the innovation requires.  
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. I would like to know how my teaching or administration is supposed to change.  
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. I would like to familiarize other departments or persons with the progress of this new approach.  
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Copyright © by SEEL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I am concerned about evaluating my impact on students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I would like to revise the innovation's approach.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I am preoccupied with things other than the innovation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I would like to modify our use of the innovation based on the experiences of our students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I spend little time thinking about the innovation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I would like to excite my students about their part in this approach.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I am concerned about time spent working with nonacademic problems related to the innovation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I would like to know what the use of the innovation will require in the immediate future.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I would like to coordinate my efforts with others to maximize the innovation's effects.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I would like to have more information on time and energy commitments required by the innovation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I would like to know what other faculty are doing in this area.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Currently, other priorities prevent me from focusing my attention on the innovation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I would like to determine how to supplement, enhance, or replace the innovation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I would like to use feedback from students to change the program.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I would like to know how my role will change when I am using the innovation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Coordination of tasks and people is taking too much of my time.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I would like to know how the innovation is better than what we have now.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please complete the following:

1. How long have you been involved with the innovation, not counting this year?
   Never ___ 1 year ___ 2 years ___ 3 years ___ 4 years ___ 5 or more ___

2. In your use of the innovation, do you consider yourself to be a:
   non-user ___ novice ___ intermediate ___ old hand ___ past user ___

3. Have you received formal training regarding the innovation (workshops, courses)?
   Yes ___ No ___

4. Are you currently in the first or second year of use of some major innovation or
   program other than this one?
   Yes ___ No ___

   If yes, please describe briefly:

   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________

   Thank you for your help!
Appendix E: Stages of Concern Quick Scoring Device

Stages of Concern Quick Scoring Device

The Quick Scoring Device can be used to hand score the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ) responses and to plot an individual profile. It is especially useful when only a small number of questionnaires need to be processed or when computer processing is not available. By following the step-by-step instructions, the SoCQ responses are transferred to the device, entered into seven scales, and each scale is totaled. Then the seven raw scale score totals are translated into percentile scores and plotted on a grid to produce the individual’s SoCQ profile.

Instructions
1. In the box labeled A, fill in the identifying information taken from the cover sheet of the SoCQ.
2. In the table labeled B on the Scoring Device, transcribe each of the 35 SoCQ circled responses from the questionnaire (raw data). Note that the numbered blanks are not in consecutive order.
3. Row C contains the Raw Scale Score Total for each stage (0-6). Take each of the seven columns (0-6) in Table B, add the numbers within each column, and enter the sum of each column (0-6) in the appropriate blank in Row C. Each of these seven Raw Scale Score totals is a number between 0 and 35.
4. Table D contains the percentile scores for each Stage of Concern. For example, find the Raw Scale Score Total for Stage 0 from Row C ("12" from the example) in the left-hand column in Table D, then look in the Stage 0 column to the right in Table D and circle that percentile rank ("69" in the example). Take the raw score for Stage 1 ("31" in the example) to Table D and locate that numeral in the left hand Raw Score Total column. Move across in the percentile table to the Stage 1 column and circle the percentile value ("98" in the example). Do the same for Stages 2 through 6.
5. Transcribe the circled percentile scores for each stage (0-6) from Table D to Box E. Box E now contains seven numbers between 0 and 99.
6. Box F contains the SoCQ grid. From Box E, take the percentile score for Stage 0 ("69" in the example) and mark that point with a dot on the Stage 0 vertical line of the SoCQ grid. Do the same for Stages 1-6. Connect the points to form the SoCQ profile.

You can now check your own scoring by using the blank profile sheet (see Appendix C). You will want to make copies of the blank scoring device before writing on it. Reproduce the data in the example by recording the original data from the completed SoCQ.
### Stages of Concern Quick Scoring Device

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Raw Score Totals
- **Percentile Scores**

#### Percentile Scores Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score Totals</th>
<th>Percentile Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A - Date: ____________
### A-site: ____________ SS#: ____________
### A - Innovation: ____________

---

**Concerns Based Systems International**
Appendix F: Network of Participant Quotations Coded for Instructional Resources
Appendix G: Network of Participant Quotations Coded for Scheduling and Logistics
Appendix H: Network of Participant Quotations Coded for Relevance to Instruction
Appendix I: Network of Participant Quotations Coded for Collaborative Planning Time

- **6:4 02:40.90 - 02:49.26**
  - Reading is everywhere, it's every HUBS coming...

- **8:2 00:45.00 - 01:06.78**
  - Communication with some teachers but not all teachers. I know what's going on in the inquiry HUBS, but I don't have communication with the other teachers. I don't know what they are doing or what they need or how I can help them or supplement what they are doing.

- **10:5 03:22.16 - 03:28.12**
  - Change that has been made is the collaboration amongst participants. Utilizing the support teachers, science lab, media specialist, and technology teacher.

- **15:5 03:05.28 - 03:15.62**
  - It has been wonderful to work with Ms. and all the other teachers to find those resources. In a lot of schools, teachers don't collaborate that effectively.

- **9:1 01:08.01 - 01:27.94**
  - Style is different - facilitating. Each day is different. A lot of collaboration, amongst other teachers. I am planning more than ever before. Designated planning times with support teachers.

- **8:3 05:57.62 - 06:05.11**
  - I love that they are pulling in people that have a specialty.

- **8:2 01:53.41 - 02:05.48**
  - I coach in the afternoon and y'all meet as a grade level. I don't even know what they are doing in science and Social Studies unless I look at their newsletters.

- **1:8 06:02.81 - 06:09.38**
  - I don't get to hear what they are learning in science and social studies. I don't know their teaching abilities.

- **3:2 01:00.50 - 01:07.17**
  - They meet at lunch and I don't get to collaborate with others. I'm in the lunchroom, so I miss out on the collaboration.
Appendix J: Network of Participant Quotations Coded for Effect on Student Achievement
Appendix K: Network of Participant Quotations Coded for Becoming a Facilitator
Appendix L: Network of Participant Quotations Coded for Evidence of Change