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The purpose of the study is to describe the current status of and the relationships between teacher self-efficacy and in-service teachers’ perceptions and/or attitudes of (a) the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation, (b) toward feedback from formative evaluation, and (c) the impact of feedback from formative evaluation on teacher self-efficacy. In addition to calculating correlation coefficients, 6 teachers were interviewed – 2 each from high, medium, and low efficacy schools. The quantitative data reported low, positive correlations between all of the factors. Statistically significant correlations were found between 8 of the 12 factors including teacher attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation and: overall Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale ($r = .302$), student engagement ($r = .309$), instructional strategies ($r = .237$) and classroom management ($r = .266$). Other statistically significant correlations were found between teacher perceptions of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation and its relationship to self-efficacy and: overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale ($r = .295$), Student Engagement ($r = .300$), Instructional Strategies ($r = .209$), and Classroom Management ($r = .282$). The face-to-face interviews and online focus group supported the quantitative findings as the participants reported that they value formative evaluation and feedback and deem it a necessary component of professional growth. Participants felt that they would benefit from an increased number of formative evaluations followed by specific, frequent and positive feedback. The participants indicated that their self-efficacy was not negatively impacted by infrequent observations and/or feedback that lacks detail.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

For the past several years, the public school accountability movement has gained momentum and has targeted student academic achievement and teacher classroom performance (Ovando & Ramirez, 2007). The teacher development and appraisal process is not a new concept, but with the call for heightened educational accountability, the process has become a topic of analysis and review. For a number of years, both scholars and practitioners are promoting teacher evaluation and appraisal systems as vehicles for the improvement of both teaching and learning (Iwanicki, 1998; Cardno 1995, Stronge 1997; Ovando, 2001). A performance-based teacher evaluation and appraisal system includes multiple measures of teacher performance and provides a range of evidence that demonstrates teacher knowledge and skills related particularly to student achievement (Shakman, Riodan, Sanchez, DeMeo-Cook, Fournier, & Brett, 2012). Formative assessment is differentiated from formative evaluation, as one refers to student learning and the latter to adult learning. Linn and Gronland (2000) described formative assessment as, “any of a variety procedure used to obtain information about student learning” (p. 19) while Scriven (1967) suggested that formative evaluation is used to foster development and improvement with an ongoing activity (or person, product, program, etc.). Formative evaluations, as a part of the teacher appraisal process, are activities that are traditionally done with teachers in an effort to promote professional growth.

The teacher appraisal process includes judgments about the quality of teacher performance contained within feedback and provided for the purpose of instructor improvement. Teacher appraisals are focused on determining the quality of a performance, work product or use of skills against a set of standards and is intended to assist the teacher grow professionally. The
appraisal system used by most schools in Texas, the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS), can take place at any time throughout the school year and may be any length the administrator feels is necessary (Region XIII Education Service Center, 2013). The PDAS walkthrough observations is the act of the administrator observing the teacher in the classroom in short spurts of time, typically 10 to 15 minutes, to assess teaching strategies, student learning, and student engagement. For this research study, formative feedback will be the term used to describe the information that the teacher receives after a PDAS walkthrough observation. Shute (2007) refers to formative feedback as information communicated to the learner that is intended to modify the learner’s thinking or behavior for the purpose of improving learning, teachers may also receive formative feedback and use it as the basis for altering instruction. After each of the PDAS walkthrough observations, the administrator provides formative feedback of what he or she saw in the classroom and provides the teacher with feedback. The formative feedback is typically used by the teacher to improve and reflect upon instructional practices, classroom management, and other areas pertaining to student achievement.

School administrators in supervisory roles are expected to assist teachers in their efforts to enhance instruction and have comprehensive knowledge, skills, and dispositions with respect to teaching and learning. The role of “instructional leader” by school administrators is a concept that emerged in the early 1980s and called for a shift of emphasis from principals being managers or administrators to instructional or academic leaders (Phillips, 2004). This shift was influenced largely by research that found effective schools usually had principals who stressed the importance of instructional leadership (Brookover & Lezotte, 1982). In the first half of the 1990s, “attention to instructional leadership seemed to waver, displaced by discussions of school-based management and facilitative leadership” (Lashway, 2002, p. 1). Currently,
administrators are taking on more of the instructional leadership role due to an increasing importance placed on academic standards and the need for school accountability (Phillips, 2004).

Currently, there is not a specific number of PDAS walkthrough observations that an administrator is required to engage in according to the PDAS criteria. Administrators are to conduct the PDAS walkthrough observation(s) and provide teachers with formative feedback in the teacher appraisal process. The formative feedback may be presented in the form of comments provided in a PDAS observation walkthrough form that is submitted to the teacher electronically, in a face-to-face conversation with the teacher, or through e-mail. The delivery method of the formative feedback is initiated by the administrator and may be at the discretion of the administrator or the teacher. Campus administrators are responsible for conducting PDAS walkthrough observations in the teacher appraisal process that target specific areas such as successful teaching strategies, active student participation in the learning process, learner-centered instruction, and evaluation and feedback on student progress. These specific areas directly link to instructional methods and strategies that are intended to promote student achievement. Formative evaluation will be the term used to describe how administrators communicate their feedback to the teachers based on what they saw during the PDAS walkthrough observation. The purpose of providing teachers with formative feedback of the administrator’s observation is to guide the teachers in their efforts to improve their classroom instructional methods and strategies. Effective formative feedback occur when learners (in this case in-service teachers) are encouraged to articulate their tactic knowledge, existing motives, ideas, opinions, beliefs, and knowledgeable skills (Clark, 2012). Formative feedback can conceivably help construct a teacher’s self-efficacy and classroom practice or deflate any high
hopes for improvement based on the teacher’s perception of formative feedback within the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy.

Statement of the Problem

In order for school supervisors to provide beneficial and productive feedback from formative assessments that is well received by teachers, administrators will benefit from having working knowledge of teacher perception of formative feedback within the teacher appraisal process and its relationships to teacher self-efficacy. Understanding in-service teacher perception of formative feedback within the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy will assist teacher supervisors to engage in meaningful feedback and to facilitate conversation that is designed to improve instructional strategies. The problem of the study is to describe the current status of and the relationships between teacher self-efficacy and the following: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy.

Rationale

Merrow (1999) noted that providing adequate training and support for teachers leads to more competent, qualified, and satisfied professionals for America’s classrooms and improves student achievement. This study examines in-service teacher perception of formative feedback within the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy. The information that is provided by the research participants will give school officials better insight on (1) how teachers are receiving and utilizing formative feedback, (2) the role that formative feedback play
in constructing or destroying a teacher’s self-efficacy, and (3) overall, how school administrators can provide productive formative feedback.

In recent years, research has highlighted the importance of different phases of assessment and a divergence from “teach, test, and hope” as the best model dominating our schools (Earl, 2003; Harlen, 2007; Stiggins, 2008; Volante, 2010). The rationale for this shift has been coupled with many hopeful signs that improvements in classroom assessment will contribute to the improvement of student learning (Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall, & Wiliam, 2004).

Research Questions

Questions that guide this study are as follows:

1. With respect to in-service teachers participating in PDAS, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management?

2. With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

3. With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation.
evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

Assumptions

The following assumptions are made for this study:

1. Each research participant’s respective campus administrator holds a valid Texas administrator certification and has completed the PDAS training that is required for approved teacher appraisers.

2. All research participants have participated in the state required PDAS orientation and received the PDAS Teacher Manual.

Limitations

The first limitation concerns time allotted to conduct the research. The face-to-face interviews conducted by the researcher, online focus group, and transcriptions spans a time period of six weeks. If research participants had more time to reflect about their formative feedback, more information might surface over a longer period of time, and new experiences pertaining to formative feedback might develop during and after the research period. The second limitation is that the researcher is in a supervisory role in the same district where the research was conducted. The third limitation included narrowing the research participants to six in-service participants from one north Texas school district. The fourth limitation of this study concerns prerequisites of the final six participants, which include that they have a minimum of three years of classroom teaching experience and that they have experienced a professional evaluation by an administrator using the PDAS observation instrument provided by the TEA at least once in their teaching career. The last limitation is that the campus administrators were not interviewed about their PDAS walkthrough observation and formative evaluation processes. The research only considered teacher participant perceptions and information.
Definition of Key Terms

The following is a list of terms that are used within this study:

- Andragogy: Originated by Alexander Kapp in 1833, andragogy was developed into a theory of adult education by Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy and was refined by American educator Malcolm Knowles. Knowles used the term andragogy to describe a set of principles of teaching and learning specifically relating to adults (1973). Knowles defined the term as "the art and science of helping adults learn" in an effort to emphasize the differences between the education of adults and children (pedagogy) (Davenport, 1987, p. 110).

- External feedback: External feedback is most commonly produced in a conversation or dialogue between the learner and the learning assessor. For this study, external feedback is between the campus administrator and the classroom teacher after the administrator conducts a classroom observation and the observations are discussed with the teacher for conversation and collaboration. External feedback is interpreted according to reasonably stable beliefs concerning subject areas, learning processes, and the products of learning (Clark, 2012).

- Formative evaluation: Formative evaluation as a way to improve the caliber of still-underway instructional activities (Popham, 2008). Formative evaluation is supervisory judgments about the quality of teacher performance contained within feedback and provided for the purpose of teacher improvement. Formative evaluations are focused on determining the quality of a performance, work product or use of skills against a set of standards and is intended to assist the teacher grow professionally. In this research study, the formative evaluations takes place with the teacher after the PDAS walkthrough observation is complete.

- Formative feedback: Formative feedback represents information communicated to the learner that is intended to modify the learner’s thinking or behavior for the purpose of improving
learning; teachers may also receive formative feedback and use it as the basis for altering instruction (Shute, 2007). Formative feedback is multidimensional, nonevaluative, supportive, learner-controlled, timely, specific, credible, infrequent, contingent, and genuine (Brophy, 1981; Schwartz & White, 2000).

- **Formal observation**: Formal observation is a minimum 45 minute observation that is conducted by the campus administrator. According to the PDAS guidelines, a formal observation must be accompanied by a written summary that is provided to the teacher within 10 working days after the formal observation (Region XIII, 2013). The teacher and/or administrator may request a pre-or post-conference in reference to the formal observation.

- **Feedback**: Feedback is information about how we are doing in our efforts to reach a goal (Wiggins, 2012). For the purpose of this study, the term feedback will be used to describe the written and/or oral information that is provided to the observed teacher from the administration that observed the classroom. Feedback should be used primarily to assist the teacher in improvement of professional growth. Helpful feedback is goal-referenced; tangible and transparent; actionable; user-friendly (specific and personalized); timely; ongoing; and consistent (Wiggins, 2012).

- **Internal feedback**: Internal feedback is how one receives and internally generates information. Internal feedback is generated when formative feedback is used to monitor self-engagement with tasks (Butler & Winn, 1995). Self-regulated learners differ from their non-self-regulated peers by generating more internal feedback, responding positively to external feedback, and increasing efforts to achieve learning goals (Bose & Rengel, 2009).

- **Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS)**: The Texas Education Agency created the PDAS that is designed to link teacher appraisal to student performance.
(TEA, 2010). The PDAS is comprised of eight domains that have a set of standards that rate teacher job performance and quality according to the rubric. The PDAS is the approved teacher appraisal system in the district where the research was conducted.

- PDAS walkthrough observation: An informal, 10 to 15 minute observation completed for the purpose of teacher improvement; it may be in the form of a “comments box” submitted electronically to teachers, in an e-mail message, and/or in a face-to-face conversation.

- Self-efficacy: Self-efficacy is one’s beliefs about one’s capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect his/her life (Bandura, 1994). Self-efficacy beliefs dictate people’s actions, thoughts, motivators, and behaviors. For this research, instructional self-efficacy refers to how teachers feel about their capability to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over student learning as well as progress on their instructional methods and strategies.

- Social cognitive theory: Social cognitive theory is a learning theory based on the ideas that people learn by watching what others do and do not do. Social cognitive theory revolves around the process of knowledge acquisition or learning directly correlated to the observation of models (Bandura, 1988). Social cognitive theory notes that individuals have the ability to tap into their own set of problem solving skills and are able to produce actions and strategies in an effort to resolve the problems their environment presents to them.

- Summative evaluation: Summative evaluation is used to assess whether the results of the object being evaluated met the stated goals and serves as a final evaluation (Scriven, 1967). Sattler (1990) sees the summative evaluation used to test the validity of a theory or determine the impact of an educational practice so that future efforts may be improved or modified.
Synchronous feedback: This type of feedback occurs in the moment when learners receive immediate feedback and respond actively (Malone & Lepper, 1987). Synchronous feedback has been found to enhance learning (Dihoff, Brosvic, Epstein, & Cook, 2004) and can be more effective at supporting higher psychological functioning, such as synthesis (Maddox, Ashby, & Bohil, 2003; Maddox & Ing, 2005). During synchronous feedback, the learner, or the classroom teacher for this study, and the appraiser, or observing administrator, engage in questioning, answering, adjusting, listening, demonstrating, imitating, reflecting, and critiquing. These activities are done in an effort to improve a teacher’s classroom instruction and build his/her teaching capacity.

Volitional strategies: Willpower and volition are colloquial and scientific terms (respectively) for the same cognitive process. Volition is a self-regulatory concept that Black and William (2009) explicitly connect to their theory of formative assessment because volitional self-regulation is essential if a learner is to remain persistent and overcome threats to self-esteem that may divert him/her away from the learning process. Volitional processes can be applied consciously, or they can be automatized as habits over time.

Significance of Study

Having a better understanding of in-service teachers’ perception of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy promotes administrators’ and teachers’ collaborative efforts. These efforts can be directed toward enhancing in the quality of teachers’ classroom instruction, while maintaining a positive working relationship and preserving teachers’ self-efficacy. In addition, identifying the relationship that the teachers have with feedback from formative evaluation allows supervisors to
deliver formative feedback that is well received and productive for improving classroom instruction.

Summary

The role that administrators play in the teacher appraisal process continues to be under review by researchers. The concept of formative feedback, its impact on a teacher’s self-efficacy, and effects on teachers’ perceptions and attitudes of formative evaluation is important as administrators strive to assist teachers become more aware of their practices in the classroom. The problem of the study is to describe the current status of and the relationships between teacher self-efficacy and the following: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This review of the literature relating to in-service teacher perceptions of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy begins with the current status of formative evaluation and teacher appraisal in Texas. The second portion of the literature review analyzes the epistemology of constructivism as well as the psychological model of behavior that emerged primarily from the work of Bandura (1977; 1986) referred to as Social cognitive theory, and the theory of instruction. The third section provides a brief overview related to self-efficacy and effect factors and is followed by current research studies on formative evaluation, feedback, and self-efficacy.

Formative Evaluation

The aim of formative teacher evaluation is to shape the teacher’s performance so that it becomes more effective (Popham, 1988). What separates formative and summative evaluation is how the results are used (Chappuis & Chappuis, 2008). According to Danielson (2000), the purpose of formative evaluations is to enhance the professional skills of teachers while a summative evaluation is designed to make consequential decisions. The two evaluations are for professional growth and quality assurance, respectively. Formative evaluation is useful in analyzing teacher effectiveness. It is a building process that accumulates a series of components of new materials, skills, and problems into an ultimate meaningful whole (Guyot, 1978).

When an administrator conducts a Professional Development and Appraisal System walkthrough observation, he or she is looking for specific, targeted items that contribute to effective teaching. During and after the PDAS walkthrough observation, the administrator evaluates the effectiveness of teacher instructional strategies and the teacher instructional and
classroom strengths and weaknesses observed. The administrator then shares the feedback from the formative evaluation with the teacher in an effort to assist the teacher to grow professionally. Formative evaluation is not a test, a tool, or a measurement instrument but a process (Clark, 2012).

In the North Texas school district that served as the research site, the PDAS Walkthrough Observation Form (Appendix A) is the district’s chosen form used to record the administrator’s observations during the PDAS walkthrough observation. The form serves as an inventory of teaching instruction and student learning taking place in the classroom. During a PDAS walkthrough observation, an administrator will use 10-15 minutes to observe teacher instruction, student response to the instruction, teaching materials being utilized, and the classroom environment. Administrators may even question students about what they are leaning and how they will know if they have mastered that learning goal. After the PDAS walkthrough observation is complete, the administrator writes up the feedback. The PDAS Walkthrough Form has 4 domains (curriculum, learners, instruction, and the learning environment) with a series of boxes in each. The administrator is to check appropriate boxes to indicate that they have observed evidence of satisfactory teacher performance in each domain as well as check boxes that indicate the type of instructional strategies the teacher uses to deliver instruction. If the administrator did not see evidence of one the items on the PDAS Walkthrough Form during their observation, the box will remain unchecked. At the bottom of each domain, the form has a “comments box” for the administrator to offer written feedback if they wish to do so, but it is not required that the administrator leave comments on the form.

After the PDAS walkthrough observation has taken place and the PDAS Walkthrough Form is complete, the form can be electronically submitted for the teacher to view. In the district
where the research was conducted, central office administrators have the expectation that the completed PDAS Walkthrough Form is not only submitted electronically, but that the form is printed out for the teacher to sign and date. The signed PDAS Walkthrough From is filed in the teacher’s personnel file. The supervisor may opt to follow up with the teacher about the results of the PDAS Walkthrough Form or they may elect to have the PDAS Walkthrough Form alone serve as a vehicle for feedback. The teacher may also contact the supervisor to request additional feedback pertaining to the completed PDAS Walkthrough Form.

**Historical Perspective of Teacher Evaluation**

The process of collecting and reviewing the data on a teacher’s classroom performance has evolved extensively over time. Beginning in the 1850s, the public school educational supervisors assumed the role of the first school personnel responsible for the evaluation of the classroom teacher and this process has continued, in most instances, today. The most dramatic change in the evolution of the process took place after the release of the National Commission on Excellence in Education’s 1983 report *A Nation-At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (Gardner, 1983). The report proposed that the public school system was in a dismal state, and, in many places, reforms were put in place to address concerns. In the 1980s, efforts were taken at the local, state, and national levels to improve the public schools, and policymakers left few items unaddressed, including teacher evaluation. During this time, most evaluations of teaching practices focused on judging a teacher’s classroom-based performance measured against a set of criteria and certain behaviors (Medley & Coker, 1987), but “many school systems moved away from the more traditional evaluation practice of rating on the basis of style or trait criteria to analyzing teaching on the basis of accepted practices” (Iwanicki, 1998, p. 156). Darling-Hammond (1990) summed up the Nation At-Risk report by noting that the public has come to
believe that the key to instructional improvement lies as much in upgrading the quality of teachers as in revamping school programs and curricula.

In 1995, in Texas, Senate Bill 1 passed, which required all school districts to adopt an appraisal system of teachers (TEA, 2010). This teacher appraisal system was designed to serve as an accountability tool for classroom teachers. In Texas, all school districts have two choices in selecting a method to appraise teachers: a teacher-appraisal system recommended by the Texas Commissioner of Education or a local teacher-appraisal system (TEA, 2010). The commissioner’s recommended teacher-appraisal system is the PDAS. If a district chooses not to use the commissioner’s recommended PDAS, the district must develop its own teacher-appraisal system that is supported by locally-adopted policy and procedures and by the process outlined in the Texas Education Code (TEC), §21.352 (TEA, 2010). Also, the local systems must include the following: classroom management/discipline and the academic performance of the teacher’s students.

PDAS as the Current Teacher Appraisal Process

Teacher appraisal has often been a meaningless exercise, endured by both teachers and evaluators. However, schools and districts have discovered that they can shape an appraisal system so that it contributes substantially to the quality of teaching (Danielson, 2001). The TEA created the PDAS that was first implemented for the 1997-98 school year and was designed to link teacher appraisal to student performance (Texas Association of School Boards, 2011). PDAS remains in place as the State's approved instrument for appraising its teachers and identifying areas that would benefit from staff development (Region XIII, 2013). The PDAS assessment tool covers eight domains reflecting the teacher proficiencies:
I. Active, successful student participation in the learning process

II. Learner-centered instruction

III. Evaluation and feedback on student progress

IV. Management of student discipline, instructional strategies, time/materials

V. Professional communication

VI. Professional development

VII. Compliance with policies, operating procedures, and requirements

VIII. Improvement of all students’ academic performance

During the 2010-2011 school year, approximately 86% or 1,086 of the public schools in Texas used the PDAS evaluation tool to assess teacher instruction and job performance (Region XIII, 2013). Though the PDAS does not require administrators to conduct walkthrough observations, many school districts set a minimum number of PDAS walkthrough observations that the administrator is to provide to the classroom teacher. Cerveone and Martinez-Miller (2007) describe classroom walkthroughs as a tool to “drive a cycle of continuous improvement by focusing on the effects of instruction” (p.1).

Constructivism and Formative Evaluation

When an evaluator provides the teacher with feedback from formative evaluations, it is necessary for the teacher to be able to self-reflect on the information using his or her current knowledge and background that pertains to student learning. The teacher will need to seek out new knowledge that can be constructed on the foundation of his or her prior knowledge to be able to provide better teaching methods and strategies that will be more beneficial for his or her students. The term constructivism has played a dominate role in educational literature for a number of decades (D’Angelo, Touchman, Clark, O’Donnell, Mayer, Dean & Hmelo-Silver,
Von Glasersfeld (1989) describes constructivism as, “a theory of knowledge with roots in philosophy, psychology, and cybernetics” (p. 2). Simply stated, constructivism is a theory that deals with the way people create meaning of the world through a series of individual constructs. Lake and Tessner (1997) see the basic formative evaluation goal of instructional improvement. When administrators provide formative feedback to the teacher, the information should allow the teacher to alter instruction, if necessary, through a process of self-reflection, self-assessment, collaboration, and manipulation of prior knowledge as it intertwines with the feedback to develop new knowledge.

To narrow the constructivist theory category down even further in regards to formative evaluation, social constructivism plays an important role. Social constructivism emphasizes the importance of culture and context in understanding what occurs in society and constructing knowledge based on this understanding (Derry, 1999; McMahon, 1997). Social constructivism encourages the learner to arrive at his or her own version of the truth influenced by his or her own background. Additionally, social constructivism not only acknowledges the uniqueness and complexity of the learner, but encourages, utilizes, and rewards it as an integral part of the learning process (Wertsch, 1997).

Social Cognitive Theory and Formative Evaluation

Another theory of particular importance is Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory, which emphasizes meta-cognition and self-efficacy. Social cognitive theory is founded on an agentic perspective (Bandura, 1986, 2001). To be an agent is to exert intentional influence over one’s functioning and the course of events by one’s actions. Although efficacy beliefs are multifaceted, social cognitive theory identifies several conditions under which they may co-vary, even across distinct domains of functioning (Bandura, 1997). Social cognitive theory provides
not only knowledge for predicting behavior but also a theory of learning and change. Perhaps the most significant aspect of Social Cognitive Theory is the presupposition that individuals can consciously deploy self-regulatory strategies which mediate the internalization of external stimuli (Bandura, 1986, 1997). In simpler terms, social cognitive theory notes that individuals have the ability to tap into their own set of problem solving skills and are able to produce actions and strategies in an effort to resolve the problems their environment presents to them. There is a strong reciprocal causality in play; individuals have some meta-cognitive and motivational qualities with which to regulate their environment, while at the same time, the classroom (and home) environment either facilitates or frustrates the acquisition and use of self-regulatory characteristics (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 2002). Social Cognitive Theory and formative evaluation go hand-in-hand as teachers have the capacity to regulate their mindset about their ability to change their behaviors and teaching strategies.

Theory of Instruction

According to Clark (2012), the theory of formative evaluation is found to be a unifying theory of instruction which guides practice and improves the learning process by developing strategies among learners. The province of an instructional theory is to propose a rationally-based relationship between instructional events, their effects on learning processes, and the learning outcomes that are produced as a result of these processes (Gagné, 1985). Snow and Swanson (1992) suggested that the components of an instructional theory are: (a) description of desired end states or goals of instruction in a domain; (b) description of goal-relevant initial states of learners prior to instruction; (c) explication of the transition processes from initial to desired states; (d) specification of instructional conditions that promote this transition; and (e) assessment of performance and instructional effects. Snow and Swanson’s (1992) components of
instructional theory coincide with Sadler’s (1989) three conditions for effective formative feedback that require knowledge of the standard or goal, skills in making criteria comparisons, and developmental ways and means for reducing the discrepancy between what is produced and what is aimed for.

Components of Feedback

The current uses of the formative teacher evaluations are essential for student achievement and overall school improvement (Ovando & Ramirez, Jr., 2007). For formative evaluation to be beneficial, discussing and understanding the assessment criteria with the learner must occur, be understood, and feedback must be provided for reflection (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Teachers should also have working knowledge of the PDAS criteria on which they will be assessed and what specific skills administrators are targeting prior to the PDAS walkthrough observation. Feedback is a crucial part of the formative assessment process. Sadler (1989) identifies three conditions or requirements for effective formative feedback:

1. Knowledge of the standard or goal
2. Skills in making multicriterion comparisons and
3. Developmental ways and means for reducing the discrepancy between what is produced and what is aimed for

Winne and Butler (1994) describe feedback as “information with which a learner can conform, add to, overwrite, tune, or restructure information in memory, whether that information is domain knowledge, meta-cognitive knowledge, beliefs about self and tasks, or cognitive tactics and strategies” (p. 5740). Black and Wiliam (1998) suggest that formative evaluation includes the use of any feedback to adjust teaching and learning activities. It is taken for granted by constructivist theorists that providing information or feedback in an ongoing manner, such as formative evaluations, will produce positive results (Young & Giegelhaus, 2005).
In their Finnish study, Voogt and Kasurien (2005) emphasize the importance of tactic knowledge: “Formative assessment may consist of hard data, but more often and more importantly of ‘tactic knowledge’” (p. 154). Matthew and Sternberg (2009) emphasize that tactic knowledge is “deeply rooted in action and context, and can be acquired without awareness and is typically not articulated or communicated” (p. 530). Tactic knowledge is made explicit and accessible through active participation and mutual discourse (Clark, 2012). This knowledge (in the form of experiences, beliefs, opinions) influences the process of externally-provided feedback and may even distort the message that the feedback is intended to carry (Corner, 1983).

There are three aspects of feedback which, when taken into account, have the potential to impact meta-cognitive and affective (self-efficacious) function among learners (Clark, 2012). They are formative feedback, synchronous feedback, and external/internal feedback.

Formative Feedback

According to Shute (2007), formative or descriptive feedback is information communicated to the learner that is intended to modify his or her thinking or behavior for the purpose of improving learning through. The objective of formative feedback is to that adult learners change poor habits and keep desirable behaviors (Sachdeva, 1996). Appropriate formative feedback should provide some combination of verification (linked to the learning goal and criteria for success) with elaboration (e.g., written communication). The elaborate component of feedback should be detailed and specific to how the learner can improve or advance the learning. In addition, feedback should be goal-directed, providing learners with information about their advancement toward specific goals. The direct, specific approach to providing feedback can create learner motivation and identification of the “just right” gap (Heritage, 2007). In instructional terms, the gap has been conceived of by educational
psychologists as the zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978; 1986). It is defined as the distance between what a person can accomplish during independent problem solving and the level of the problem solving that can be accomplished in collaboration with a more expert peer.

Processing formative feedback can be a personal situation for the recipient and requires self-reflection. According to Black and Wiliam (2009):

Formative interaction in which an interactive situation influences cognition, i.e., it is an interaction between external stimulus and feedback, and internal production by the individual learner which involves looking at the three aspects, the external, the internal, and their interactions. (p. 11)

Sharing learning intentions and identifying clear assessment criteria is the *sine qua non* of formative evaluation (Mansell, James, & the Assessment Reform Group, 2009). Empowering feedback makes the learning objective and the features of excellent performance transparent. Cauley and McMillian (2010) observe that such practices offer learner ownership, elaborating that collaborative goal setting improves intrinsic motivation and, when combined with formative evaluation practices, further supports mastery of goals. A central argument is that formative evaluation and feedback should be used to empower learners and promote self-regulation (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Those more effective at self-regulation produce better feedback and are more able to use the feedback they generate to achieve their desired goals (Butler & Winne, 1995). Bandura (1986, 1994, 1997) notes that self-regulated learning arises when strong perception of self-efficacy and transparent formative feedback co-exist. Bandura’s ideas concur with (a) those of Schunk (1998) and Butler and Winne (1995), who see feedback as essential, and (b) Black and Wiliam’s (1998, 2006, 2009) core notion of feedback as the material to be refined within the meta-cognitive process required for self-regulation. For formative evaluation
to be productive, discussion of the assessment criteria must occur and be understood, and feedback must be provided for reflection (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

Current research reinforces past research findings related to best practices. Joyce and Showers (1980) found that feedback, combined with classroom practice, was the most productive training design for teacher improvement. Adult learners need specific feedback and to see the results of their efforts and need to have accurate feedback about progress toward their goals (Mezirow, 1981). According to Sachdeva (1996), effective feedback plays a critical role in helping adult learners achieve their educational goals, reach their maximum potential, and be an integral part of every adult education program. Effective feedback is specific and describes the observed behavior. Telling a learner that he or she did a good job may reinforce a set of behaviors, but it does not tell the learner which of the observed behaviors should either be repeated or improved (Gigante, Dell & Sharkey, 2011). Effective feedback is also timely, optimally offered immediately; if feedback is deferred too long, the learner may forget the context or may not have the opportunity to practice and demonstrate improvement (Gigante, Dell & Sharkey, 2011).

Synchronous Feedback

Castaneda (2005) defines synchronous feedback as communication between sender and receiver that occurs in real time and without delay. Activities that provide immediate feedback and allow learners to respond actively are highly engaging (Malone & Leper, 1987); thus, synchronous feedback is a major factor in the popularity of technology in learning and computer-based academics. Synchronous feedback for teachers is most likely to take place during staff development, where interrupting student learning is not an issue and dialogue can occur regularly between the staff development instructor and the teacher. Schön (1987) describes the dialogue
between interactants as: “questioning, answering, adjusting, listening, demonstrating, observing, imitating, and criticizing--all are chained together so that one intervention or response can trigger or build on another” (p. 114). Although synchronous feedback is preferential, the nature of the administrator’s formative assessment timeline must allow for asynchronous feedback. Clark (2012) defines asynchronous feedback as existing when there is

(a) A time interval *between* gathering the evidence and sharing the evidence
(b) A time interval *before* gathering and sharing the evidence or
(c) Evidence that has been synthesized from historical analysis

Asynchronous feedback performs a useful function, permitting reflection on its use, and it is often a more comprehensive and permanently-recorded form of assessment evidence (2012).

External/Internal Feedback

Formative assessments are specifically aimed at generating feedback, both internal and external, which informs learners how to progress in their learning and meet standards (Sadler, 1989). External feedback is interpreted according to reasonably stable beliefs concerning subject areas, learning processes, and the products of learning (Clark, 2012). This information might augment, concur, or conflict with the learner’s interpretation of the task and the path of learning (Butler & Winne, 1995). External feedback is most commonly produced in a conversation or dialogue between the learner and the learning assessor.

Internally generated feedback is inherent to engagement and regulation (Clark, 2012). Butler and Winne (1995) observe that, “beliefs about their learning experiences influence the generation of internal feedback” (p. 254). Internal feedback affects cognitive and motivational behaviors and is derived from a comparison of current progress against desired goals (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Self-regulated learners generate more internal feedback; they tend to
respond positively to external feedback and to increase efforts to achieve learning goals (Bose & Rengel, 2009). According to Clark (2012), individuals differ in the sensitivity of self-reactive judgment to external feedback, which impacts conation. Conation (from the Latin conatus, in English “effort”) is of particular importance when considering the internal states of learners. Conation is synonymous with self-efficacy, referring to the personal, intentional, planful, deliberate, goal-oriented, or striving component of motivation. It is the proactive (as opposed to reactive or habitual) aspect of behavior (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998)

**Self-Efficacy**

Albert Bandura (1977) introduced the concept of self-efficacy, i.e. the belief in one’s capacity to organize and execute the course of action to produce given attainments. This term is not to be confused with the concept of self-worth, self-concept, or self-esteem, as these terms are specific to a particular task. Bandura offers this example to clarify the distinction:

On the one hand, a person may possess a low sense of efficacy for a particular activity, such as figure drawing or downhill skiing, and suffer no diminishment of self-esteem because that person has not invested self-worth in doing that activity well. Persons may question their self-worth despite being very competent if important others do not value their accomplishments, if their skills cause harm to others, or if they are members to a group that are not valued in society. (p. 192)

There is also a need to clarify the distinction between “teacher efficacy” and “teacher effectiveness.” Teacher efficacy, which will be referred to as “self-efficacy,” is a teacher’s belief or judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated (Armor, Conry-Osegua, Cox, King, McDonnell, Pascal, Pauly & Zellman, 1976; Bandura, 1977; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The clear distinction between these terms is that efficacy refers to the belief in one’s ability to produce something, while effectiveness is the proof of successful actions (Goddard, Hoy & Hoy, 2004). In addition, teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs also relate to their
behavior in the classroom. Self-efficacy affects the effort teachers invest in teaching, the goals they set, and their level of aspiration. Compared to teachers with lower self-efficacy beliefs, teachers with strong perceptions of self-capability tend to employ classroom strategies that are more organized and better planned (Allinder, 1994), student-centered (Czerniak & Schriver, 1994; Enochs, Scharmann, & Riggs, 1995), and humanistic (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). The higher a teacher’s sense of self-efficacy, the more likely he or she is to tenaciously overcome obstacles and persist in the face of failure (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2004). Teachers with higher self-efficacy are more open to new ideas and are more willing to experiment with new methods to meet the needs of their students better (Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988). Self-efficacy beliefs influence teachers’ persistence when things do not go smoothly and their resilience in the face of setbacks.

Volitional Strategies

Volitional control involves the use of strategies aimed at regulating emotions, motivation, and cognition in the process of goal striving (Corno, 1993). Volition, according to Corno (1993), is conceptually and functionally distinct from motivation in that, while motivation is necessary to set goals and select strategies appropriate to attaining them, volition is necessary to protect against the abandonment of goals and serves to maintain effort and persistence when competing goals are present. McCann and Turner (2004) have identified several volitional strategies that include: positive thoughts about one’s self-efficacy, actions to reduce anxiety, and thoughts that make one aware of the intrapersonal and interpersonal consequence of failure. Black and Wiliam (2009) explicitly connect volition to their theory of formative evaluation because volitional self-regulation in essential if a learner is to remain persistent and overcome threats to self-esteem that may cause the learner to divert resources away from his/her active participation in the learning
process ("growth track") and expend resources on efforts to avoid interaction and withdraw from the situation ("well-being track").

Andragogy

Malcolm Knowles (1977) refined the European concept of andragogy, i.e. the art and science of how adults learn. The five assumptions underlying andragogy describe the adult learner as someone who (1) has an independent self-concept and can direct his or her own learning, (2) has accumulated a reservoir of life experiences that are a rich resource for learning, (3) has learning needs closely related to changing social roles, (4) is problem-centered and interested in immediate application of knowledge, and (5) is motivated to learn by internal rather than external factors. Cyrul Houle (1996), Knowles's mentor and author of a number of books on adult education, notes that:

Education is fundamentally the same wherever and whenever it occurs. It deals with such basic concerns as the nature of the learner, the goals sought, the social and physical milieu in which instruction occurs, and the techniques of learning or teaching used. These and other components may be combined in infinite ways. Andragogy remains the most learner-centered of all patterns of adult educational programming (p. 29)

Hartree (1984) questioned whether there was a theory at all, suggesting that perhaps it was just a set of principles of good practice or descriptions of "what the adult learner should be like" (p. 205). Knowles (1989) himself came to concur that andragogy is less a theory of adult learning than "a model of assumptions about learning or a conceptual framework that serves as a basis for an emergent theory" (p. 112).

Bartles, Magun-Jackson, and Kemp (2009) examined the difference in volitional strategy use (i.e., self-efficacy enhancement, negative-based incentives, and stress-reducing action) and its relation to cognitive self-regulated strategy use (i.e., rehearsal, elaboration, organization, and critical thinking). The data gathered from 141 graduate students indicated that approach-
motivated individuals utilized self-efficacy enhancements and stress reducing actions more often than avoidance-motivated individuals. In addition, the volitional strategy of self-efficacy enhancement emerged as a significant predictor of rehearsal and elaboration strategies. Bartles, Magun-Jackson, and Kemp (2009) suggests that interventions are particularly important for those who are avoidance-motivated, one who struggles with anxiety or self-doubt and is thus in the greatest need of having, within his/her self-regulatory repertoire, volitional strategies aimed at countering both.

Skaalvik and Skaalvik’s (2010) study examined relations between 2,249 individual teacher’s self-efficacy and external control defined as teachers' beliefs that factors external to teaching (e.g., students' home environments) puts limitations to what they can accomplish. The study also examined relations between teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout. Lastly, these researchers explored how teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout is related to teachers' perceptions of the school context and to their job satisfaction. Their results indicated that one of the strongest factors influencing teacher self-efficacy is supervisory support. Supervisory support in this study was indicated by items tapping teachers' feelings of having cognitive and emotional support from the school leadership, e.g., whether they could ask the school leaders for advice and whether their relationship with school leaders was one of mutual trust and respect.

The Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) (2009) conducted research using the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS). This instrument is the first international survey to focus on the working conditions of teachers and the learning environment in schools. TALIS focuses on lower secondary education teachers and the principals of their schools and seeks to provide policy-relevant data and analysis on the following key aspects of schooling:
• The role and functioning of school leadership
• How teachers’ work is appraised and the feedback they receive
• Teachers’ professional development
• Teachers’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching and their pedagogical practices

TALIS’s aim is to help countries to review and develop policies that foster the conditions for effective schooling. Beginning in October 2007 and concluding in the spring of 2008, 4,000 teachers and principals from a total of 24 countries were surveyed. The research results indicated that 83% of teachers surveyed agreed that the appraisal and feedback they received about their teaching was fair, and 79% of teachers agreed that the appraisal feedback helped develop their work as a teacher. The researchers also reported that over 40% of teachers stated that they did not receive suggestions for improving aspects of their work, and 74% of teachers said they would receive no recognition in their school for improving the quality of their teaching or being more innovative. TALIS provides, for the first time, international data from representative samples of countries that show that systems of appraisal and feedback have a positive impact on teachers.

In 2013, the OECD conducted another TALIS research study that inquired about teachers and schools, working conditions, and the learning environments. This study included school principals and teachers from 34 countries. Seventeen of the 34 countries participated in both the 2008 and 2013 TALIS research and the other 17 countries participated in only the 2013 research. The study provides information about issues such as professional development received, teaching beliefs and practices, review of teachers’ work, feedback and recognition received about work and various other workplace issues such as school leadership and school climate. The results of the 2013 TALIS study report teachers in the United States say that feedback is of “moderate” or “high importance” according to the following percentages:
• 82%-Student achievement (slightly lower than the overall percentage of 88%)
• 81%-Student management (slightly lower than the overall percentage of 88%)
• 80%-Pedagogical competency (slightly lower than the overall percentage of 87%)
• 81%-Assessment practices (1% lower than the overall percentage of 82%)

The 2013 TALIS study also reported that the average percentage of participants who did not receive feedback from direct classroom observation was 20%, the United States reported that only 4% of the participants did not receive feedback from direct classroom observations. In addition, the United States participants indicate that 39% of them believe that appraisal and feedback have little impact on the way that they teach in the classroom. Fifty-four percent of the United States research participants reported that they felt more motivated after receiving feedback on their work and reported a “moderate” or “large” change in teaching practices after receiving feedback. Overall, the participants reported that the more they participated in collaborative practices with their colleagues, the higher their levels of self-efficacy. A third TALIS study is scheduled for 2018.

Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling (2009) analyzed the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation systems that are currently in place. The report was the product of an extensive research effort spanning twelve districts and four states. It reflects survey responses from approximately 15,000 teachers and 1,300 administrators. The researchers identified lack of feedback as the primary problem with the teacher supervisory and appraisal systems. The study found that, “nearly three out of four teachers went through the evaluation process but received no specific feedback about how to improve their practice” (p.14). Even when supervisors do provide feedback, it was often too infrequent to improve performance.
Summary

This chapter reviewed formative evaluation, the PDAS appraisal system, and the historical perspective of teacher appraisals. Additionally, the chapter reviewed the literature of the epistemology of constructivism as well as the psychological model of behavior that emerged primarily from the work of Bandura (1977; 1986) referred to as Social Cognitive Theory.

The chapter reviewed the literature of five studies; two studies focused on self-efficacy and three on formative evaluation. The review of the literature exposes some common threads of productive formative feedback and preservation of a teacher’s self-efficacy. These common threads are (a) specific feedback pertaining to specific goals, (b) opportunity for teacher reflection, and (c) having strong supervisory support. There is a limited body of literature that provides information on how the teacher evaluation process and formative feedback affects teacher self-efficacy; however the aim of this research is to contribute to the existing literature. The following chapter will discuss the research methodology for this study in detail and procedures for data analysis and reporting.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This descriptive study employs mixed methods to answer the following research questions:

1. With respect to in-service teachers participating in PDAS, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management?

2. With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

3. With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

An online survey was sent to teachers in all 14 elementary schools in one north Texas school district. Of the estimated 305 elementary school teachers in the district that were offered an opportunity to participate in the research study, 94 elementary teachers from 13 elementary
schools completed and returned the survey. The participants were grouped based on the elementary school where the participants and their collective campus responses were analyzed. Based on overall survey results, the schools were then ranked from highest average reported teacher efficacy to the lowest average reported teacher efficacy. The school with the highest reported collective mean efficacy was the high efficacy school in this study, or the HES. The school that ranked in the middle was the medium efficacy school (MES), and the school that ranked the lowest was the low efficacy school (LES). Once the HES, MES, and LES schools were identified, two teachers were chosen from each campus, the highest efficacy teacher and lowest efficacy teacher based on the individual teachers’ overall survey scores. Once the highest efficacy teacher and the lowest efficacy teacher were identified at the HES, MES, and LES, these six research participants completed face-to-face interviews with the researcher and engaged in an online discussion group forum. Quantitative data was compiled and reported tabular form. The researcher then conducted the face-to-face interviews and online focus group, transcribed the data, analyzed the results and reported the findings. Discussed in this chapter is the participant recruitment process, description of the data collection instruments, research design, data analysis, and consideration of participant confidentiality and ethics.

Research Design

Two online surveys were sent to all classroom teachers from all 14 elementary schools in one north Texas school district. Of the estimated 305 elementary school teachers in the district that were offered an opportunity to participate in the research study, 94 elementary teachers from 13 elementary schools completed and returned the survey (n = 94). The first online survey was the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale that was created by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) which asked 24 questions that obtained information about the each participant’s personal and
professional sense of self-efficacy. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy found that the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale had three moderately correlated factors: efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. Table 1 shows the alpha coefficients for Tschannen-Moran and Hoy’s Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale. The results of the analyses indicate that the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale can be considered a reasonably valid and reliable tool to measure teacher self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The current study’s reliabilities (Cronbach’s Alpha, \( \alpha \)) for the teacher efficacy subscales were Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale overall 0.946, student engagement was 0.876, instructional strategies was 0.891, and classroom management was 0.871.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Coefficients for the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpha (( \alpha ))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tschannen-Moran &amp; Hoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second online survey, titled Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback, was created by the researcher and contains 18 questions that obtained information from participants about their attitude toward and perception of formative evaluation and feedback within the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy. The 18 questions were created to fall equally into three categories. The three categories are as follows:

TPQ². In-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process
TAF. In-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process.

TPI. In-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy.

Ninety-four elementary teachers from 13 elementary schools completed and returned the both surveys. Once the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale and the Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback was completed and returned to the researcher, the researcher used SPSS 20.0 to rank the 13 elementary schools from highest to lowest based on teacher’s mean Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores reported for each school. Once the 13 elementary schools were ranked from highest to lowest, the researcher utilized SPSS 20.0 again to rank the individual teachers from highest to lowest based on their Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score within each school.

The researcher chose to select six interview participants (the highest and lowest efficacy teacher at the HES, MES, and the LES), in an effort to ensure that the quality of the data was not compromised due to time constraints, and all interview data were thoroughly examined and reported. Samples for qualitative studies are generally much smaller than those used in quantitative studies (Mason, 2010). Ritchie, Lewis & Elam (2003) state that the reasons for this is because there is a point of diminishing return to a qualitative sample—as the study goes on, more data does not necessarily lead to more information. The six participants were provided information about scheduling the face-to-face interviews and participation in the online focus group. Each face-to-face interview was scheduled at a mutually agreeable time for both parties-interviewer and interviewee. Eventually, the six teachers were reorganized into a “high efficacy” and a “low efficacy” group based solely on the rank order of their individual overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores rather than their school memberships. This reorganization or regrouping was more reflective of the individual teachers’ actual sense of self-efficacy that their
respective school category labels (HES, MES, LES). Table 2 shows the reliability of the Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback and coefficients for TPQ², TAF, TPI. The results indicate that the scores are moderate to high internal consistency. The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback, face-to-face interview questions, and online focus group questions were created purposively to provide information pertaining TPQ², TAF, and TPI. The research participants had no prior working knowledge of the questions or prompts that were created to go with TPQ², TAF, and TPI. The researcher, however, created a color-coded key for each of the three instruments that noted which of the three foundational categories pertained to each question/prompt (Appendix E). This step was incorporated to assist the researcher in a more efficient categorization process and to ensure that the data instruments provided information that answered the three research questions. The color coding was also helpful as it aided in quick and efficient placement of information into TPQ², TAF, and TPI.

Table 2

*Reliability Coefficients (α) for the Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation (n = 94)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPQ²</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPI</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To review, the researcher did the following: conducted two online surveys \((n=94)\), narrowed the participant field from 94 participants down to six interviewees (three “high” and three “low” in teacher self-efficacy) based on participant Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale survey scores, recorded a face-to-face interview with each of the six participants, and conducted an online focus group with the six research participants as well. The Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback and each of the 18 face-to-face interview questions were written to fall into one of the three categories of TPQ², TAF, and TPI. The researcher also transcribed the participant responses from the online focus group and placed the information in the corresponding categories using the constant comparison method and recorded emerging themes. The themes that emerged were *post facto* (i.e. they were not predetermined). According to Patton (1990), a constant comparative method is used “to group answers into common questions and analyze different perspectives on central issues” (p. 376). The researcher utilized a former supervisor who has recently completed her Ph.D. to check the researcher’s categorization of the data. The supervisor was asked to read the researchers transcriptions from the participant’s responses of the online focus group and cross check accuracy of data placement. The supervisor is versed in qualitative data disaggregation. The information collected from these four instruments was carefully analyzed. Each data item was placed under one of the three data categories and was used to identify the current status of and the relationship between (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy.
Participants

Qualitative case studies rely on carefully selected participants (Ovando & Ramirez, 2007). The participants chosen for this study were highly-qualified elementary school teachers employed by the same north Texas school district. The participants in the study included 94 elementary teachers. The results of the participants’ ethnicity, gender, years of teaching experience, and years of service at their current campus are displayed in Tables 3 through 6. The participants in the current study closely resemble the participant’s in the studies described in the literature review. Both groups of participants are of mixed gender, age, ethnicity, and are in-service teachers. The researcher allowed the participants to select the option “Prefer Not To Answer” as an option. The researcher did not want to deter participants from completing the surveys out of fear of possible participant identification or administrator retaliation for undesirable teacher responses on the survey.

Table 3

Research Participants Ethnicity (n = 94)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Research Participants Gender (n = 94)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*Research Participants Years of Teaching Experience (n = 94)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the online surveys were reviewed, SPSS 20.0 software was utilized to sort all 94 participant responses and to group participants by their respective school. Once all of the teachers were grouped by their school and the mean Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale efficacy scores were compiled for each school, all 13 elementary schools were then ranked based on their scores from individual teachers so that a high efficacy school (highest ranked efficacy school-HES), middle efficacy school (middle ranked efficacy school-MES) and low efficacy school (lowest ranked efficacy school-LES) could be identified. Once the HES \( n = 6 \), MES \( n = 5 \) and LES \( n = 4 \) were identified, SPSS software ranked the individual teachers within the high, middle and low efficacy schools. Next, the highest and lowest efficacy teacher was identified at each of the high, middle, and low efficacy schools. To further compare the six participant’s scores, the participants were also ranked in order of their overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores only, and their ranking at their school was not taken into consideration. The qualitative data was also analyzed and reported to find commonalities among responses from the top three interview participants who were ranked with relatively “high” efficacy scores down to the bottom three interview participants with relatively “low” efficacy scores. The six interview participants were contacted individually to request their ongoing participation in the face-to-face interviews and the online focus group.

The first group of participants was from the high efficacy school (HES). Ms. A (Rank 1) was 33 years old and had been teaching for 13 years. Mrs. A received her teaching credentials from an alternative certification program in Texas. She is Caucasian and she had taught 1\(^{st}\) and 3\(^{rd}\) grade in two different school districts. She was the high efficacy teacher at the HES. Ms. B (Rank 5) the low efficacy teacher at the HES, had been teaching for six years and received her
teaching credentials from a region service center in South Texas. She was a 30-year-old Caucasian teaching 5th grade.

The second group of participants was from the middle efficacy school (MES). Ms. C (Rank 3) was a 38-year-old Caucasian female and had been teaching elementary school age children for ten years. Ms. C is currently a fine arts instructor for students in grades kindergarten through 5. She had taught 3rd grade in her former district and received her teaching certificate from a Texas university. Ms. D (Rank 6) was the identified low efficacy teacher from the MES. Ms. D, a 34-year-old Caucasian female, taught kindergarten and had been a classroom teacher for 11 years. She received her teaching credentials from an out-of-state university, and she taught out-of-state for 2 years.

The last group of participants was from the low efficacy school (LES). The high efficacy teacher at the LES, Ms. E (Rank 2) had been teaching for 25 years and was 54 years old. She was a Caucasian female who had her teaching certification from a Texas university and taught 4th grade. The last research participant rated as the low efficacy participant from the LES. Ms. F (Rank 4) was a 48-year-old Caucasian who had been teaching for 14 years. She had her teaching credentials from a Texas university and had just completed her graduate work in early childhood literacy. Ms. F taught 1st grade. Race, age, gender, type of certificate (i.e. university degree, alternative certification), and assigned elementary grade level were not factors in selecting participants, but these characteristics are noted in the six participant summaries for informational purposes.

Procedure

To answer the three research questions, the researcher used four data collection instruments to gather information from the participants: two online surveys (Teacher Sense of
Efficacy Scale and Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback), a 45 minute face-to-face interview, and a researcher-conducted online focus group. The data from the two online surveys were used to report the quantitative data. The findings of the face-to-face interview and the online focus group were used to report the qualitative data.

The first research question asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in PDAS, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management?

The 94 participant’s responses to the 24 question Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale were analyzed. The mean and standard deviation of the participants’ overall self-efficacy was calculated as well as for the three factors of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management.

The second research question asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy? To answer the second research question, the researcher’s 18-question online survey results identified the mean and standard deviation for the 94 research participants in the TPQ², TAF, and TPI.

The third research question asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom
management and: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy.

To answer the third research question, a Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient was computed (with probability level set at $p \leq .05$) to assess relationships between variables TPQ², TAF, and TPI and the overall score of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, and subscores of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management.

To answer the three research questions, triangulation was employed. Triangulation of the three data sources (online surveys, face-to-face interviews, and online focus group) was used to explore the current status of and relationship between self-efficacy and teacher perceptions of and attitudes toward formative evaluation and feedback. Each of the three research questions were answered using the three data collection tools: online surveys, face-to-face interviews, and online focus group. The three data sources were used to compare the conclusions for each research question. The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale answers research question number one: With respect to in-service teachers participating in PDAS, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management? Research question number two asks: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the
impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy? The data from the Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback was used to answer the second research question. The third research question was as follows: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy? Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient (PPMCC) was used to measure the direction and strength of relationships between teacher self-efficacy and teachers’ perception of and attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback. Qualitative data from the face-to-face interviews and online focus group were categorized into the three data categories and compared with the quantitative findings.

The idea of triangulation is very much associated with measurement practices in social and behavioral research. An early reference to triangulation was made by Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, and Sechrest (1966), who suggested, “Once a proposition has been confirmed by two or more independent measurement processes, the uncertainty of its interpretation is greatly reduced. The most persuasive evidence comes through a triangulation of measurement processes” (p.3). To accomplish this triangulation of data, all instrumental items and corresponding responses were categorized into three categories.

TPQ². In-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process.
TAF. In-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process.

TPI. In-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy.

Online Surveys

Disbursing two online surveys to the 14 elementary schools was the first step in gathering data. Upon receiving district approval, the researcher e-mailed all 14 of the elementary school campus principals to inform them of the research taking place. The link to both of the surveys was included in the principal’s e-mail, as well as the recruitment flyer (Appendix B) and the informed consent form (Appendix C) for the principals to review. The principals were then asked to forward the information on to classroom teachers for their consideration as to whether or not to participate in the research. Two weeks later, the principals were asked to send out a reminder e-mail to all of the teachers about research participation in an effort to include as many participants as possible. Both of the online surveys were hosted by www.surveymonkey.com and protected with a user ID and password selected by the researcher.

The online survey titled, Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, was created and validated by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale consists of 24 questions and obtains information about the participant’s personal and professional sense of self-efficacy. Each response has a numerical value on a scale of 1-9; 1-nothing, 2, 3-very little, 4, 5-some influence, 6, 7-quite a bit, 8, and 9-A great deal. To test the construct validity of the TSES, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy conducted three factor analyses. The factor analysis consistently found three moderately correlated factors: Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Strategies, and Efficacy in Classroom Management. The study reported reliabilities for the teacher efficacy subscales were Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale overall 0.94, 0.87 for Student Engagement, 0.91 for Instructional Strategies, and 0.90 for Classroom Management. The
results of the analyses indicate that the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale could be considered a reasonably valid and reliable tool to measure teacher self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). In the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, Questions 1, 2, 4, 9, 12, 14, and 22 were related to Student Engagement. Instructional Strategies questions were numbers 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, and 24; Classroom Management questions were numbers 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 21. The mean and standard deviation were reported for the overall result of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, and of Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, and Classroom Management. The results of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale were used to answer the first research question: With respect to in-service teachers participating in PDAS, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management?

The data obtained from the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale were used to rank the six research participants as the high efficacy teacher and low efficacy teacher with in their campus, but the participants were also ranked one through six based purely on their Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale overall score without consideration of their campus status. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) provides a scoring guide to the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale; however, the researcher for this study opted to categorize the six participants into a high and low group based on the ranking of their Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Overall scores. Currently, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy do not provide literature with recommendations on how to do this. Through electronic correspondence with Tschannen-Moran, the researcher was advised that a standard convention would be to use one standard deviation above the mean as your cut-off for the high self-efficacy group and one standard deviation below the mean as your division for the low self-efficacy group. The researcher modified the convention to come up with a “high” and “low”
efficacy group for the six interviewees. The three top-ranked interviewees had overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores ½ to 2 standard deviations above the mean of all participants, while the three bottom-ranked interviewees has overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores 1 to 1.5 standard deviation below the mean.

The second online survey is titled Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback and consists of 18 researcher-created questions designed to obtain information from in-service teachers participating in the observation component of PDAS on the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy. The Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback is scored on a Likert scale of 1 to 5. Each possible choice that the participant selects holds a numerical value: 1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neither, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree. The questions are purposefully created so that each question is categorized and equally distributed under one of the three categories of TPQ², TAF, and TPI. Questions 2, 4, 8, 10, 13 and 16 of the Teacher Survey fell under TPQ². Questions 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, and 18 fell under TAF, and Questions 1, 5, 7, 12, 15, and 17 fell under TPI. The researcher consulted with the dissertation committee to validate and approve the 18 questions that were used in the Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback. The results of the Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback are reported in tabular format and discussed in Chapter 4.
Face-To-Face Interview

Interviews, according to Ovando and Ramirez (2007), constitute one of the most effective tools for obtaining information, and they provide the best approach for reducing researcher bias (Patton, 1990). The face-to-face interviews were composed of 18 questions that guided the conversation (Appendix D). The participants were asked questions that gave the researcher information about their perception of feedback from formative assessment within the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to self-efficacy. Each of the 18 questions was written to fall into one of the three categories, and the questions were distributed equally totaling six questions per category. Questions 1, 5, 7, 10, 14, and 17 fell under TPQ², while questions 2, 4, 8, 11, 15, and 16 were under TAF. Questions 3, 6, 9, 12, 13 and 18 coincided with TPI. The researcher consulted with the committee to validate and approve the 18 questions that were used in the face-to-face interview. In an effort to receive a more enriched, detailed responses to the questions, the interview questions were sent to each of the six research participants 48 hours before the interview so that the participants were allowed time to reflect on their experiences with formative assessment and feedback. The interview was recorded via the researcher’s personal iPhone, utilizing the voice control feature only; camera phone and photography were not used. Each recorded conversation was downloaded and saved to the researcher’s personal laptop and a backup flash drive with a pseudo name for confidentiality purposes. The researcher transcribed each participant’s responses and placed the data in the designated data category for analysis and reporting.

Online Focus Group

The last data collection tool was an online focus group. Traditionally, focus groups, regardless of purpose, have been conducted in a face-to-face situation, but virtual communities
have flourished online. Hundreds of thousands of people regularly participate in discussions about almost every conceivable issue and topics of interest (Horrigan, 2001; Wellman, 1997; Wellman & Haythornthwaite, 2002). Today, electronic communication technologies have enabled researchers to utilize new approaches to this form of research. However, the social sciences, humanities, health, and education are areas that are now beginning to use the Internet to facilitate qualitative research, especially focus groups that can be conducted online (Rezabek, 2000). Online focus groups can provide a number of advantages, such as (a) cutting costs; (b) having the potential to reach a broad geographic scope; (c) providing access to hard-to-reach participants, such as business travelers and professionals who have little time during normal hours to participate; and (d) providing for a convenient and a comfortable way of participating (Edmunds, 1999). Another advantage of virtual communities as sites for research is that they offer a mechanism through which a researcher can gain access to people who share specific interests, attitudes, beliefs, and values regarding an issue, problem, or activity (Wright, 2006).

The host site for the online forum for this study was www.edmodo.com. Edmodo utilizes a design that provides teachers a secure place to connect, collaborate, and share content. The participants set up a log in name and password so that they could begin to provide their responses to the researcher’s questions. In the current study, the asynchronous online focus groups began with the researcher’s initial posting which read, "What role does formative assessment play in your professional growth?" Participants were asked to provide a minimum of three posts per question and were encouraged to engage in conversation with other participants as well as pose questions of their own to each other. The researcher periodically posted questions as participant conversations evolved (Appendix E). The researcher intervened with follow-up questions to a participant post that encouraged participants to elaborate on an experience or
situation that they had referred to in a post that was of particular interest to this research study.

The online focus forum took place for approximately six weeks. Participants were allowed to log into the site to read other participants’ posts about their experiences at their convenience. After the six week data collection period had expired, the researcher generated transcriptions of the postings. Subjects’ responses to each set of questions corresponding to the three categories of TPQ², TAF, and TPI were placed in thematic categories with categories emerging post facto from the data itself. The information gathered from the online focus groups was analyzed using the constant comparative method. This was utilized by the researcher to compare the participant’s responses from the face-to-face interviews and survey responses in an effort to categorize and find common threads among the data. Again, the researcher’s former supervisor read the researchers transcriptions from the participants’ responses of the online focus group and cross check accuracy of data placement into emerging categories.

Data Analysis

The data gathered allowed the researcher to answer the following three research questions:

1. With respect to in-service teachers participating in PDAS, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management?

2. With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?
3. With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

The online survey titled Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale employed 24 questions that fell into three focus Categories. Questions 1, 2, 4, 9, 12, 14, and 22 were in the Student Engagement category. The Instructional Strategies category consisted of Questions 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, and 24 while Questions 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 21 corresponded with the Classroom Management. The researcher examined descriptive data of how the teachers responded to TPQ², TAF, and TPI as well as Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, and Classroom Management. The 18 question Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback was divided evenly into three categories. Questions 1, 5, 7, 10, 14, and 17 fell under TPQ². Questions 2, 4, 8, 11, 15, and 16 were categorized under Instructional Strategies and questions 3, 6, 9, 12, 13, and 18 coincided with Classroom Management.

The researcher transcribed the face-to-face interviews and categorized the participant responses in the appropriate data categories. Questions 1, 5, 7, 10, 14, and 15 fell under TPQ²; Questions 2, 3, 8, 11, 15, and 16 fell under TAF; and Questions 3, 6, 9, 12, and 18 fell under TPI. To allow readers to better understand the complex processes by which the participants made
sense of an experience with formative evaluation and feedback or responded in the way they did, the researcher utilized posting of direct participant quotes. Verbatim quotations could, it was believed, offer readers greater depth of understanding. According to Corden and Sainsbury (2006), people’s spoken words sometimes show the strength or depth of their views in ways that the researcher’s own narrative cannot. The research findings were reported separately (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy.

For the online focus group, one initial question that began participant dialogue was, “What role does formative evaluation play in your professional growth?” The researcher asked two more questions that read, “Although your administrators may not have prolonged experience (or perhaps any at all) in your content area, do you feel that your administrators are a resource or a lead to a resource that may enhance your teaching strategies or general classroom instruction?” and “When you receive feedback about your teaching, how does that make you feel?” Once the online focus group was complete, the researcher again sorted data using the constant comparison method and employed the expertise of a former supervisor to cross check the data placement and see that it is placed into appropriate categories TPQ², TAF, or TPI. As common themes emerged throughout the participants’ responses, the commonalities were colored coded to assist the researcher to identify common threads of information that were sorted appropriately into one of the three categories for reporting purposes.
Confidentiality and Ethics Considerations

The participants and their information remained confidential through a series of actions. First, the participants’ identities were guarded by use of a pseudo name. This pseudo name was used in every portion of the research when referring to the participants and their verbal and written information. All interviews were recorded with the researcher’s personal iPhone and then saved to the researcher’s laptop for transcription. Passwords were in place on all electronic devices that the researcher used to store information. All records and information were stored in the researcher’s office in a secure area with limited access. The Edmoto contents were password protected by special codes given to the users and secured in an attempt to prevent outsiders from joining school networks. These codes were given to users and are necessary to join groups. The company had recently enhanced the security of the Edmodo service by implementing SQL Ingestion protection to prevent unauthorized access to the website's resources and database.

This research presented a minimum amount of risk to the participants. Institutional Review Board (IRB) application was submitted for review and approval from the IRB Ethics Committee before the research was conducted.

Summary

This chapter described the research design, participants involved in the study, procedures, and data analyses. The recruitment process for research participants and a description of the research participants themselves were also provided. Further, the researcher described in-depth the methodology that was employed to answer the three research questions. Chapter 3 also described the online surveys, face-to-face interviews, and the online focus group as well as how the data were analyzed and reported. The chapter concluded with confidentiality and ethics considerations. Chapter 4 reports the results of the researcher’s findings.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the data findings from the 94 research participants who completed both the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale survey and Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback and the six participants who were selected to participate in the face-to-face interview and the online focus group. Mixed methods were employed to collect, analyze, and report the data. The following three questions that guided this research study were:

1. With respect to in-service teachers participating in Professional Development and Appraisal System, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management?

2. With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

3. With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the
impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

Quantitative Findings of All Research Participants

Using a mixed methods research design to analyze the data, the findings were reported according to the research questions of the study discussing quantitative outcomes first, followed by qualitative data second. Two online surveys were administered to all 94 research participants. The first survey entitled the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale was a 24 item survey that measured the teachers’ sense of personal and professional self-efficacy. The second survey, Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback, consisted of 18 items that provided information about (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy

Results of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Relating to Research Question 1

The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale was administered to the research participants (n=94) in order to answer the first research question: With respect to in-service teachers participating in PDAS, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management? The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale was created and validated by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). Each one of the 24 questions had a numerical value on a scale of 1-9; 1-nothing, 2, 3-very little, 4, 5-some influence, 6, 7-quite a bit, 8, and 9-A great deal. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy’s three factor analyses found three moderate correlations: efficacy in Student Engagement,
efficacy in Instructional Strategies, and efficacy in Classroom Management. The 24 questions were categorized into one of the three correlations. Table 7 reports the means and standard deviations of overall teachers’ sense of self-efficacy as well as teacher efficacy pertaining to Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, and Classroom Management. The results of Table 7 indicated that overall, the participants have a relatively high level of self-efficacy. Teacher self-efficacy is affected most by teacher perceptions of their ability to establish and maintain classroom management. The results shown in Table 7 are consistent with the research of Marzano, Marzano, and Pickering (2003) who note that:

Effective teaching and learning cannot take place in a poorly managed classroom. Teachers struggle to teach, and students most likely learn much less than they should. In contrast, well-managed classrooms provide an environment in which teaching and learning can flourish (p. 1).

Table 7

| All Subject Means and Standard Deviations of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (n = 94) |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|
| TSES Overall                   | 176.83 | 20.84  |
| Student Engagement             | 56.83  | 8.18   |
| Instructional Strategies       | 59.75  | 7.27   |
| Classroom Management           | 60.24  | 7.16   |

Figure 1 show that the participants report that classroom management (a teacher’s ability to control disruptive student behavior, clearly communicate behavioral expectations, establish classroom routines during activities, redirect disruptive students, and respond to defiant students) has the highest on their self-efficacy in comparison to Instructional Strategies and Student Engagement. Instructional Strategies reported second highest mean and effect on self-efficacy when compared to Classroom Management and Instructional Strategies. Student Engagement
reported the lowest mean and had the least effect on self-efficacy in comparison to Classroom Management and Instructional Strategies.

![Figure 1](image.png)

Figure 1. All subject mean scale scores of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale.

Results of the Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback Relating to Research Question 2

The second online survey, the Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback, was composed of 18 researcher-created questions. The survey, related to the second research question, was designed to obtain information from participants about their perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluations, their attitude about feedback, and their perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation on their self-efficacy. The Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback was scored on a Likert scale with 1 being “Strongly Disagree” and a 5 rating as “Strongly Agree”. Each of the 18 questions were designed
to be categorized equally into one of three categories of TPQ², TAF, and TPI. Table 8 reports the mean and standard deviation for each of the 18 items on the Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback.

The results of Table 8 show that the highest averages include teachers receiving feedback from formative evaluations in a timely manner, feedback from formative evaluations are useful in teachers’ classroom instruction, and feedback helps teachers to feel positive about their instructional effectiveness. Lower averages were reported when participants were asked if they feel that the administrator has an accurate snapshot of their classroom due to the frequency of formative evaluation observation and if feedback offered helpful resources or offered assistance in utilizing resources. Averages ranged from $M = 3.97$ ($SD = .909$) to $M = 3.05$ ($SD = 1.213$).

Table 8

*Mean and Standard Deviation of 18 Item Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback (n = 94)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. After receiving formative evaluation feedback, I feel positive about my ability to be an effective teacher.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I receive formative feedback in a timely manner.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I perceive formative evaluation and feedback to be a useful tool in my professional instructional growth.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel that the administrator has an accurate snapshot of my classroom due to the frequency of formative evaluation observation.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feedback received from formative evaluation has allowed me to better identify my strengths as well as areas of focus.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I perceive the information that I receive from my formative evaluation to be a useful self-reflection tool.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The formative evaluation feedback that I have received has allowed me to feel successful in my classroom instruction.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The feedback that I receive from my formative evaluation offers helpful resources and assists me in utilizing resources.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 8 (continued).

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I trust my administrator to provide accurate and honest feedback.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>During post-observation conferences with my administrator, I receive undivided attention.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My administrator provided feedback about my job performance that is useful.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I feel good about the changes that I am able to make in my classroom based on the formative evaluation and feedback received.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Formative evaluation and feedback that I receive is thorough and specific.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The only feedback that I receive from my administrator is on my PDAS Walkthrough Observation Form that I sign and return.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Feedback provided suggestions and resources that are helpful in assist me to be a better teacher.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Feedback that is received from my administrator is encouraging and productive.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Feedback received from formative evaluation helps me evaluate the impact of my teaching strategies.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Formative evaluation and feedback is useful to my classroom instructions.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 reports the mean and standard deviation for all 94 research participants in TPQ², TAF, and TPI. The results of Table 9 indicate that teachers’ perceptions of the quantity and quality of formative evaluation, attitude towards feedback, and perceptions of impact form feedback are favorable. The Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback was scored on a 5-point Likert scale with each category receiving a maximum of 30 points each. Teacher attitudes received the highest average of $M = 22.18$ ($SD = 5.01$) indicating that participants have a good attitude toward from feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process.
Table 9

Mean and Standard Deviation of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback (n = 94)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPQ²</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service teachers’ perceptions of the quantity and quality of formative evaluation in the teacher appraisal process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAF</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service teachers’ attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPI</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service teachers’ perceptions of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within in-service teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 reports that overall, teachers have generally good attitudes and perspectives toward formative evaluation and feedback.

![Figure 2](image_url)

*Figure 2. All subject mean scale scores of the Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback Categories.*
The averages recorded in Figure 2 indicate that teachers’ have a positive attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback as it averaged the highest \( (M = 22.19) \) over teachers’ perceptions of impact that feedback has on their self-efficacy and their perception of how the quantity and quality of feedback effect their self-efficacy. The averages of Figure 2 also show that teacher’s report that the quantity and quality of formative evaluation have the least effect on teacher attitudes \( (M = 20.96) \) and perceptions of formative evaluation and feedback \( (M = 21.79) \).

Quantitative Results by HES, MES, and LES Relating to Research Questions 1 and 2

Table 10 \( (n = 15) \) reports the school efficacy results from the HES, MES, and the LES. The HES had a total of 6 teachers complete and submit the online survey \( (n = 6) \), while the MES had a total of 5 teachers \( (n = 5) \) and the LES had a total of 4 teachers \( (n = 4) \). Also reported is the mean and standard deviation across the following seven categories: overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score, Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, Classroom Management, TPQ\(^2\)- in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, TAF-in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal, and TPI-in-service teachers’ perceptions of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within in-service teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy.

The results from Table 10 indicate that the teachers from the HES \( (n = 6) \), MES \( (n = 5) \), and LES \( (n = 4) \) have overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores that is reflective of their high, medium, and low efficacy school ranking. The HES participants consistently scored the highest across categories. The MES participants scored in the middle with the exception of the Classroom Management and the TAF categories. The LES reported scores that outranked some of the MES scores; however, they still remained the LES.
Table 10

Participants from the HES, MES, and LES Efficacy Means (top) and Standard Deviations (bottom) (n = 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>TSES Overall</th>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Classroom Mgmt</th>
<th>TPQ²</th>
<th>TAF</th>
<th>TPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Efficacy School</td>
<td>184.28</td>
<td>59.79</td>
<td>60.76</td>
<td>63.72</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>26.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.71</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Efficacy School</td>
<td>171.54</td>
<td>55.94</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>60.40</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>22.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Efficacy School</td>
<td>162.83</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>58.50</td>
<td>55.83</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>22.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TPQ² = Teacher perceptions of the quantity and quality of formative evaluation. TAF = Teacher attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation. TPI = Teacher perceptions of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy.

Table 11 takes a closer look at the six individual participant responses to both of the online surveys. The table identifies the two teachers at the HES, the two MES teachers, and the two LES teachers. They are identified by their pseudo names. The table reports total scores for the overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, and Classroom Management, and as well as scores for TPQ², TAF, and TPI. Table 11 also labels the six participants as “high” or “low” efficacy grouping based on their overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score. The six participants’ overall scores on the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale ranged from the highest score of a 214.00 (Ms. A) to the lowest reported score of a 144.00 (Ms. D.), a difference of 70 points. The high efficacy teachers from the HES, MES, and LES reported scores that placed them in the “high” efficacy grouping while the three “low” efficacy teachers from the HES, MES, and the LES reported scores that placed them in the “low” efficacy grouping as shown in Table 12.
Table 12 shows the ranking of the six research participants based on their overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores. The data shows that there are discrepancies between the participants and their perceived self-efficacy. The participants’ scores show a gap of 28 points between the top three ranked teachers and the bottom ranked teachers. While this is a notable point gap, the largest point spread of the table is between the scores of the two teachers from the HES (Ms. A and Ms. B), which is 66 points. The top three ranked participants scored somewhat closely together with a 27 point spread. The bottom three participants scored much closer with only a 15 point score difference. These rankings represent the individual interviewee’s true level of teacher efficacy better than the HES, MES, and LES labels do. Thus, in the remaining qualitative analysis, the three teachers with the highest overall teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores and the teachers with the lowest overall Teachers’ sense of Efficacy Scale scores will be categorized in either the “high” efficacy or “low” efficacy group for the purposes of comparison. The teachers in the “high” efficacy group have scores that are between ½ standard deviation and 2 standard deviations above the mean for all participants in the study. The teachers in the “low” efficacy group reported overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores that are 1 to 1.5 standard deviations below the mean for all participants in the study.
Table 11

*Six Participants’ Scores Across TPQ², TAF, TPI and Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, and Classroom Management (n = 6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale score</th>
<th>Efficacy Grouping</th>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Classroom Mgmt</th>
<th>TPQ²</th>
<th>TAF</th>
<th>TPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Efficacy School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. A</td>
<td>214.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. B</td>
<td>148.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Efficacy School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. C</td>
<td>187.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. D</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Efficacy School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. E</td>
<td>194.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. F</td>
<td>159.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* TPQ² = Teacher perceptions of the quantity and quality of formative evaluation. TAF = Teacher attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation. TPI = Teacher perceptions of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy.
Table 12

*Six Participants Rank Based on Their Overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Score (n = 6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score</th>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Classroom Mgmt</th>
<th>TPQ²</th>
<th>TAF</th>
<th>TPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. A (Rank 1, High Efficacy)</td>
<td>214.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. E (Rank 2, High Efficacy)</td>
<td>194.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. C (Rank 3, High Efficacy)</td>
<td>187.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. F (Rank 4, Low Efficacy)</td>
<td>159.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. B (Rank 5, Low Efficacy)</td>
<td>148.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. D (Rank 6, Low Efficacy)</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* TPQ² = Teacher perceptions of the quantity and quality of formative evaluation. TAF = Teacher attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation. TPI = Teacher perceptions of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy.
PPMCC Results Related to Research Question 3

With respect to the third research question, Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients (PPMCC) were used to measure strengths between relationships pertaining to teacher self-efficacy and teachers’ perceptions and attitudes regarding formative evaluation and feedback. Table 13 below reports the findings of the coefficient correlations of the overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score, Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, Classroom Management, and TPQ², TAF, TPI.

The results displayed in Table 13 revealed no statistically significant correlations between teachers’ perception of quantity and quality of formative assessments and teacher self-efficacy. However, statistically significant correlations were noted between teacher attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation and teacher self-efficacy. Correlation coefficients ranged from $r = .237$ to $r = .309$, suggesting that teacher attitudes toward formative evaluation explained approximately 9% of the variance in teacher self-efficacy. Similarly, the correlations between the TPI and the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale ranged from $r = .209$ to $r = .300$, indicating that teachers’ perception of impact accounted for approximately 9% of the variance in teacher self-efficacy.

Table 13

PPMCC Results (n = 94)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TPQ²</th>
<th>TAF</th>
<th>TPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSES Overall</td>
<td>$r = .176$</td>
<td>$r = .302^{**}$</td>
<td>$r = .295^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>$r = .194$</td>
<td>$r = .309^{**}$</td>
<td>$r = .300^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>$r = .109$</td>
<td>$r = .237^{*}$</td>
<td>$r = .209^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Mgmt</td>
<td>$r = .167$</td>
<td>$r = .266^{*}$</td>
<td>$r = .282^{**}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TPQ² = Teacher perceptions of the quantity and quality of formative evaluation. TAF = Teacher attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation. TPI = Teacher perceptions of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Qualitative Findings

In an effort to find commonalities between the teachers that reported the highest efficacy scores and the lowest efficacy scores, the results of the qualitative findings will be reported in the rank order in which the six research participants scored (from high score to low score) based solely on their overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores from Table 12. Table 12 also indicates the final rank order if the six interview participants. For the purpose of this analysis, teachers ranked, 1, 2, and 3 are considered to be relatively high in self-efficacy, while the teachers ranked 4, 5, 6 are considered to be relatively low in self-efficacy. The “high” interview group (n = 3) had overall teacher self-efficacy scores that were 0.5 to 2 standard deviations above the mean score of all study participants (n = 94), while the “low” interview group (n = 3) had overall teacher self-efficacy scores that were 1 to 1.5 standard deviations below the mean score of all study participants (n = 94).

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in PDAS, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management?

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?
In response to (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, Ms. A (Rank 1) shared that administrator PDAS walkthrough observations were “Not often enough, maybe once every 6 to 9 weeks.” She stated that, “No, I don’t think it’s enough time.” Her experience with the quantity and quality of the formative evaluation and feedback received varied with the administrator; however, her current experience with formative feedback was “positive because it has changed the way that I reach out to my students.”

Ms. E (Rank 2) reported that she technically has not seen her administrator in her classroom this year due in part to the administrator’s busy schedule. Ms. E observed that her administrator was “overwhelmed” and unable to be in the classrooms very much.

Ms. C (Rank 3) shared that administrators conducted PDAS walkthrough observations as infrequently as Ms. A did. She said that:

I want to say they walk through, maybe, 3 to 5 times per year. Sometimes I wish they would come in here more and see what’s going on. I guess they see what’s going on when I put stuff in the hallway, but still. It would be nice if they would come and visit.

Ms. C’s view on formative evaluation and feedback in her current position as a fine arts teacher showed that she felt that she was viewed differently than she used be as a third grade teacher. She said, “Sometimes I don’t feel in the art and music position… I don’t get as much (feedback) as I used to when I was teaching 3rd grade, so it’s a lot different”. She stated in the online focus group that the quantity of the PDAS walkthrough observations were “irregular” and the quality of the feedback that she received was not specific and “often vague”, but she had some recent feedback via conversational dialogue with her administrator that was positive and informational, which allowed her to reflect on her lessons in more detail.
Ms. F (Rank 4) was completing her Master’s degree and had requested that her administrators engage in more frequent formative evaluations and provide her with feedback for her course work. At the time of the study, Ms. F was experiencing more feedback than she had in the past, but she noted in her interview three times that it was because she had specifically asked for her administrators to come into the classroom to observe her more frequently and to provide her with regular feedback. Due to her request, she, at the time of the study, was experiencing more PDAS walkthrough observations and receiving more formative evaluations with more detailed feedback. She noted that her current feedback was, “reaffirming to me that I was doing what I need to do or realize that, ‘oh, I didn’t realize that’, and I needed to adjust it.”

Ms. B (Rank 5) said that her administrators typically came to conduct a PDAS walkthrough observation about once per month on average, which was the most observations reported of all six participants. She deemed this as adequate and perceived the overall quality of her experience with formative evaluation to be, “…valuable to my teaching experience because it allows me to have honest, constructive feedback to improve my classroom instruction.” Ms. D (Rank 6) stated that her current administrators conducted 4-5 PDAS walkthrough observations per year. She referred to this number of PDAS walkthrough observations as “…adequate. You don’t want them in there (the classroom) all of the time, it’s somewhat of a distraction…” She referred to formative evaluation and feedback as “better over time” and stated that she used the feedback to “help me grow.”

The second part of research question number 2 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process? Ms. A (Rank 1) referred to her attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback as “positive.”
In the online focus group, she wrote that “…the principal that I have been with for the past few years make it a priority to come into the classroom. She gives pretty good feedback that I can use in the classroom to monitor my teaching strategies.” Ms. E (Rank 2) referred to formative evaluation as a “necessary evil” and saw the benefits of regular formative evaluation and feedback for new teachers, but less often for veteran teachers. Ms. E reported that she did like to have another set of eyes observing her teaching and currently perceives her status with formative evaluation and feedback as “quite positive”.

Ms. C (Rank 3) described her current attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback as “good” though she stated that formative evaluation and feedback was “irregular”. Though her past experience with formative evaluation and feedback was not productive, current experiences in her latest district had allowed her to see formative evaluation and feedback in a more positive way. Ms. F’s (Rank 4) attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback was similar to that of Ms. C who, in the past, had a negative experience with formative evaluation and feedback, but, at the time of the study, Ms. F’s attitude was, in her opinion, “good”. In the past, Ms. F did not value her formative evaluation and feedback due in part to the “negativity” that the administrator provided, but her current attitude had changed since receiving regular, more positive, formative evaluations and feedback. She said that, “In the time that I requested more walkthroughs, which impacted me because it changed the way I taught and the way I thought of feedback and formative evaluations on me as a teacher and how I can actually improve what I’m doing.”

Ms. B (Rank 5) reported that she had a good experience with formative evaluation and could not recall a time when she disagreed with feedback. Ms. B did share that one administrator chose to come to her classroom on an early release day before a holiday break near the end of the school day. She was unsure if the administrator was trying to meet a PDAS walkthrough
observation quota or trying to catch her “doing something wrong”. She disagreed with the timing of the PDAS walkthrough observation, but it did not change her attitude about formative evaluation or the feedback she received. Ms. D (Rank 6) described her current attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback as positive and noted that she understood that formative assessment and feedback was “going to help me make improvements.”

The third part of research question number 2 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy? In her interview, Ms. A (Rank 1) noted that formative evaluation and feedback “has always impacted me professionally.” She did not specifically state whether it was positive or negative, but an online focus group posting that she provided contained the following statement:

I, too, take more seriously the feedback that I know was written to what was actually happening in my classroom at the time. It certainly does have a higher value in my book. That means more to me than any warm and fuzzy generic comment.

Ms. E (Rank 2) said that formative evaluation and feedback kept her on her toes and helped her remain focused on student engagement. She used formative evaluation and feedback to help remind her of best teaching practices, but not to alter her teaching style.

Ms. C (Rank 3), at the time of the study, perceived formative evaluation and feedback as impacting her instructional self-efficacy, “Yeah, I do think that it has an effect on how you feel as a teacher.” Now, as a more experienced teacher in her 10th year of teaching, she was willing and able to take feedback given to her and continues on with the productive teaching strategies that were observed as well as to willingly make any changes that the administrator recommended or saw fit. Ms. F (Rank 4) perceived that formative evaluation and feedback “impacted me
because it changed the way that I taught and the way that I thought of feedback and formative evaluation on me as a teacher and how I can actually improve what I’m doing to help me find better ways to help students.” She noted again that the formative evaluation and feedback was beneficial because of the frequency of the evaluations that were being conducted at her request for her graduate courses.

Ms. B (Rank 5) used her formative evaluation and feedback to set the bar for herself to continue to perform better. She reported that she had received honest, positive feedback that had allowed her to progress in her profession. After Ms. B received feedback, she chose one thing to focus on that she would like to improve.

Ms. D (Rank 6) perceived formative evaluation and feedback to have an impact on her self-efficacy, but it was both positive and corrective feedback that had the most effect. Both items were the “most important to help me feel that I am doing the right thing.” In summary, research question number 2 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy? Though the six teachers come from a variety of professional backgrounds and experiences, the overall consensus of opinion was evident. With respect to in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, the majority of teachers in this study did not feel that administrators came into the classroom to observe teacher instruction as much as teachers would like for them to, nor did they spend the amount of time in
the classroom during the PDAS walkthrough observation that teachers preferred. The participant’s current status of formative evaluation and feedback was of a mostly positive and productive nature that guided them to make changes in the classroom as well as continue on with educational practices that benefit student learning. According to the participants, formative evaluation and feedback impacted their self-efficacy, but not in a detrimental or unproductive fashion that led to professional negativity. The positive impact of formative evaluation and feedback on the participant’s self-efficacy encouraged the participants to continue to utilize formative evaluation and feedback to enhance their instructional practices.

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

Again, in an effort to find commonalities between the teachers that reported the highest efficacy scores and the lowest efficacy scores, the results of the qualitative findings will be reported in the order in which the six research participants scored based solely on their overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score from Table 12.

The first part of research Question 3 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher
self-efficacy (overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management) and the following: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process. Ms. A’s (Rank 1) perception of the relationship between her self-efficacy and in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process was impacted by the changes that she experienced when she left one school district and began employment in her current school district. She also noted differences between different administrative practices. Ms. A stated that in the past, formative valuation and feedback had been “…absolutely nothing, which was not helpful in any way so to me that’s a waste of administrators time and space in my classroom.” Once arriving in her current district, she observed that formative feedback was not as prevalent, either, but noted that the quantity and quality of formative evaluation and feedback had improved overall due in part to heightened accountability throughout the state. She did not perceive that the insufficient quantity and quality of formative valuation and feedback in the past had impacted her self-efficacy.

Ms. E (Rank 2) noted that the quality and quantity of the formative evaluation and feedback that she has experienced was lacking; however, this did not affect her self-efficacy. The administrator reportedly did not conduct regular PDAS walkthrough observations, but the feedback that was received from the formative evaluation of the PDAS walkthrough observations was somewhat helpful. In her online focus group entry, Ms. E stated, “I mainly use my student’s scores and their outcomes on their work to alter my professional growth.” She also depended on her veteran teaching status to be able to know when and how to make necessary instructional changes in the classroom.
Ms. C’s (Rank 3) relationship between her self-efficacy and her perception of the quantity and quality of formative evaluation and feedback stemmed from her first year of teaching, which she referred back to several times throughout the course of the interview. Initially, Ms. C was intimidated with the abundance of PDAS walkthrough observations that were being conducted in her classroom. It took her some time and advice from peers to assure her that the district wanted to make sure that they were conducting PDAS walkthrough observations to be able to support her in her new teaching career. The number of PDAS walkthrough observations led her to wonder if she was teaching well enough. At one point, she wondered, “Is this the right job for me?”

Ms. F (Rank 4) perceived the relationship between self-efficacy and the quantity and quality of formative evaluation and feedback to be affected by past experiences. Once she asked for additional PDAS walkthrough observations, she found the feedback “changed the way I taught and the way I thought of feedback and formative evaluation on me as a teacher and how I can actually improve what I’m doing and to help me find better ways to help students.” She went on to say, “If you give a (PDAS) walkthrough and leave it alone, there is not going to be an impact at all.”

Ms. B (Rank 5) reported that her current relationship between her self-efficacy and perception of the quantity and quality of formative evaluation and feedback received was positive, though she did experience a less-than-desirable experience in the past. She shared that she depends on formative evaluation and feedback to continue to be a better teacher. The feedback that she received was regular, and the administrator was genuine in her efforts to help Ms. B reflect and progress as a teacher. Ms. D (Rank 6) perceived her self-efficacy to be relatively unaffected by the quantity and quality of formative evaluation and feedback. In the
online focus group, she noted that, “...as long as I am happy with the number of check marks that I see, I usually leave it at that.” She was referring to the PDAS Walkthrough Form that was completed by the administrator and submitted to the teacher to view. The check marks represent components of classroom instruction and management that were evident to the administrator.

The second part of research Question 3 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the observation component of PDAS, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy (overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management) and (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process? Ms. A (Rank 1) explained that overall, she perceived a positive relationship between self-efficacy and her attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback. She shared that, “The tone of the conversation (when receiving feedback) has always started out to be positive, and so it’s been a pleasant experience.” Ms. A stated that:

I don’t think I’ve ever had a negative attitude about formative evaluation. I think my negativity came with not getting feedback. And so I was receiving feedback at one school, moved schools, and received hardly any feedback at all. So I was left wondering what they were seeing, what they were doing. So I went from a positive to a negative about assessments. Now I am back thinking they are positive again. But it’s a new school.

Ms. E’s (Rank 2) acknowledged a positive relationship between her self-efficacy and evaluation toward formative evaluation and feedback overall. She depended on regular feedback more often as a new teacher and now uses feedback as a tool to help “keep me on my toes” and to prevent her from getting into teaching ruts. She stated that administrators should take an authentic interest in helping teachers improve and not merely go through the motions of assessing. Ms. E also shared her thoughts on the importance of maintaining a teacher’s dignity and offering positive and constructive criticism. She wrote that, “I think it (feedback) can just be
reassurance that what you are doing is good. I think that can be the most positive impact is just giving a good feeling that you are doing something right.”

Ms. C’s (Rank 3) self-efficacy waivered at one point in time due to an undesirable interaction with formative evaluation. The interaction ultimately produced a negative attitude. Her years of experience allowed her to develop a better sense of self-efficacy which improved her attitude about formative evaluation and feedback. She recalls:

I think it takes experience. Being secure in yourself, at first when you get started getting all these (PDAS) walkthroughs when you’re beginning to teach, you’re scared of everyone; you’re scared to make a mistake. A few more years into it, you get used to it, and it’s okay—not just okay, it’s expected. I don’t want to get stale; I want to grow.

Ms. C attributed her current positive outlook on formative evaluation and feedback to her relationship with her administrator. She stated that, “I would hope that most people would be able to have a relationship with their administrator to be okay with them just walking in and coming to check and not freak out thinking they are going to get fired. But, I don’t know how to fix that.” The majority of her formative evaluation and feedback conversations were conducted in a kind, professional manner that preserved her self-efficacy.

The relationship between Ms. F’s (Rank 4) self-efficacy and attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback can be best understood in her experience in one particular situation with an administrator. She began by saying:

There was a couple of times when there was a check mark, and it was just ‘Met Standard,’ ‘Met Standard,’ ‘Met Standard’ (on her PDAS Walkthrough Form); and I felt that my lesson had exceeded with technology, interactive technology, interactive board and the students had created the project. They (the students) had written it themselves, and doing the interactive white board and everything was ‘Met Standard,’ ‘Met Standard,’ ‘Met Standard.’ When I questioned it, he (the administrator) didn’t have any feedback for me and just kept postponing the meeting, and it (the rating) never got changed; so I never got feedback as to why it was never ‘Exceeds.’

Ms. F acknowledged that formative evaluation and feedback was “the door to communication to
let them know how they are doing.” She gave no indication that a prior lack of formative evaluation and feedback affected her self-efficacy as it relates to her attitude about formative evaluation and feedback. Though frustrated about not receiving feedback as readily as she would have liked, she stated that she still viewed it as, “A good tool when used correctly.”

Ms. B’s (Rank 5) saw a positive relationship between self-efficacy and her attitude toward formative evaluation feedback and she attributed this to her relationship with her administrators. She recalled one administrator that she did not have the best relationship with, due in part to her inability to trust his decision making. She did not allow this one circumstance to alter her overall attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback and how it impacts her self-efficacy. Ms. B said that she still very much depends on formative evaluation and feedback to drive her instruction and that the feedback she has received to this point has been encouraging and positive.

For Ms. D (Rank 6) her perspective of the relationship between her self-efficacy and attitude towards formative evaluation and feedback appeared to be built on facts. She stated that she never disagreed with formative evaluation and that it was “…objective, but maybe they didn’t see what was going on either before or after; they don’t have all of the factors involved. They don’t know all of the variables.” Her attitude remained positive due to her acknowledgement of formative evaluation and feedback being an opportunity for her to continually grow.

The last section of research Question 3 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from
formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy? All six research participants in this study provided very similar responses to this question. Ms. A (Rank 1) had an experience in one district where feedback was extremely limited; however this did not tamper with her self-efficacy. Now in a new district where formative evaluation is more prevalent, she is able to take the formative feedback to reflect on her teaching practices. She has not disagreed with any of the formative evaluations or feedback that has been shared with her by her administrator. Ms. E (Rank 2) shares that formative evaluation and feedback has impacted her positively, though she does not see it as a necessity for veteran teachers. Ms. C’s (Rank 3) initial experience with formative evaluation and feedback as a new teacher caused her to have self-doubt as to whether teaching was the career choice for her. Her administrators engaged in frequent formative evaluation and the feedback that she received was “helpful;” but one administrator’s feedback was the cause of her questioning her ability to teach. Ms. C stated that the administrator that would, “…call me in regularly for things that I didn’t feel were necessarily affecting my teaching.” She finished by adding, “I think a lot of times when you get called in too many times, you start to think this isn’t where I’m supposed to be.” She had co-workers that were supportive and assured her that, “Things will get better. You don’t have to know it all right now.” She stated that if feedback was accurate and specific, she received it with “an open mind, and I don’t let it interfere with my personal feelings.”

Ms. F (Rank 4) stated that once she specifically requested more PDAS walkthrough observations and feedback during her graduate studies, she was positively impacted by the formative evaluation and feedback. The information she received helped her to be more aware of her students and her instruction. Even though Ms. F had a negative experience with receiving feedback that she did not agree with and was not given an opportunity for explanation, she did
not perceive that the feedback harmed her self-efficacy. Ms. B (Rank 5) perceived that formative evaluation and feedback impacted her self-efficacy constructively. She viewed her formative evaluation and feedback as an opportunity to challenge herself. She said, “I feel like it positive, it’s beneficial. I think it’s truly help build a better teacher and I think that the principals who are using it correctly are using it for that purpose.” Ms. D (Rank 6) believes that formative evaluation and feedback has impacted her self-efficacy and professionalism “positively” and it “helped me grow” despite her thought that formative valuation should be less frequent for veteran teachers such as herself. All six research participants noted a desire to have administrators conduct more PDAS walkthrough observations, and provide formative evaluation with regular feedback.

Commonalities between the Quantitative and Qualitative Data Findings

The top three ranked participants, Ms. A, Ms. E, and Ms. C, were categorized in the “high” efficacy group based on their overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores. Commonalities appeared throughout their interview and online focus group information. All three “high” grouped participants agree that they do not receive as many PDAS walkthrough observations as they would like to have. This did not affect the participants’ self-efficacy and they all value the feedback that they do receive. The participants from the “high” group see feedback as valuable as it allows them to reflect on their teaching practices and overall professional improvement. They also report a better relationship with their current administrators which allows for more of an opportunity to engage in dialogue when feedback is provided.

The bottom three ranked participants, Ms. F, Ms. B, and Ms. D, were categorized as the “low” efficacy group based on their overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores. The researcher also found commonalities among the participants based on their interview and online
focus group information. The three “low” ranked participants note that the quantity of PDAS
walkthrough observations that they currently experience is adequate but that they would benefit
from more. They state that they depend on formative assessments and feedback to grow. Ms. F
and Ms. B both shared a specific negative experience with formative evaluation and feedback.
Ms. F received feedback from a PDAS walkthrough observation that she disagreed with and was
unable to make an appointment with her administrator to receive specifics about the feedback or
have an opportunity to ask questions. Ms. B disagreed with the timing of one PDAS walkthrough
observations as it occurred in the last few minutes of the school day before students were
released for a major holiday break. The “low” group appears to be most affected by formative
evaluation and feedback as it pertains to disagreeing with the actual PDAS walkthrough
observation and feedback.

The findings of the interview and online focus group data were relatively consistent with
the correlation coefficient findings. TPQ² and overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score,
Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, and Classroom Management reported a low,
positive correlation. The research participants reported that the quantity and quality of the
formative evaluation and feedback did not affect their self-efficacy, though many participants do
wish for more PDAS walkthrough observations with regularly provided feedback. TAF and
overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, and
Classroom Management show a higher level of statistical significance with TAF reporting a low,
positive correlation. The research participants did not specifically state examples of their
attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation and its effects self-efficacy of their
classroom management, but shared that they find factual, specific feedback necessary to either
continue on with best practices or to tweak actions that could be improved. It was stated that
participants’ attitudes affected self-efficacy pertaining to student engagement as the participants utilized feedback to reflect on the effectiveness of their lesson and overall ability to stay focused on students. TPI and overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, and Classroom Management all have positive correlation coefficients which is consistent with the teacher’s provided information from the interviews and online focus group. Many of the teachers said that they perceive formative evaluation and feedback to impact their self-efficacy when it is received. It is used to enhance teacher performance, which the participants stated that they need in order to grow professionally.

Scatter Plot Representation

Scatter plots are graphs used to investigate the possible relationship between two variables that both relate to the event. Figures 3 through 14 are scatter plot representations of the correlations between the overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score and Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, Classroom Management and the correlation to TPQ², TAF, and TPI. Each scatter plot shows the scores of all 94 of the initial participants. The six participants will be referred to based on their overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale ranking. In each of the twelve scatter plots, the top three teachers categorized in the “high” efficacy group and represented with a black dot and the “low” efficacy group will be represented with X’s. A line of best fit is included in each scatter plot.

The three top ranked participants fell above the line of best fit while the bottom three scored below it. Figure 2 shows that there was a wider variance of scores between the “high” efficacy and “low” efficacy teachers as their marks covered a larger area of the scatterplot. The highest score for the overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale is 214.00 and Teacher Perception of Quantity and Quality is 27.00. The lowest reported score of the overall Teachers’ Sense of
Efficacy Scale is 144.00 with an average of 17.00 for their Teacher Perception of Quantity and Quality of Feedback.

![Scatter plot displaying the relationship between Teacher Perceptions of Quantity and Quality of Feedback and Overall Teachers’ Sense of Self-Efficacy.](image)

Figure 3. Scatter plot displaying the relationship between Teacher Perceptions of Quantity and Quality of Feedback and Overall Teachers’ Sense of Self-Efficacy.

The “high” efficacy group again remains above the line of best fit while the three “low” efficacy participants fall below it. The top two participants in the “high” efficacy group share similar Student Engagement scores of 67.00 and 70.00. They also have similar Teacher Perception of Quantity and Quality scores of 26.00 and 27.00. The lowest Student Engagement score is 42.00 and 17.00 for the Teacher Perceptions of Quantity and Quality of feedback.
Figure 4. Scatter plot displaying the relationship between Student Engagement and Teacher Perception of Quantity and Quality of Feedback.

Figure 5 reports a variance in the top three “high” efficacy teachers and the bottom three “low” efficacy teachers. The highest efficacy teacher scored a 70.0 in Student Engagement and a 27.00 in teacher Perception of Quantity and Quality of Feedback. The lowest ranked participant in the scatter plot scored a 54.00 in Instructional Strategies and a 17.00 in Teacher Perception of Quantity and Quality of Feedback.
Figure 5. Scatter plot displaying the relationship between teacher Instructional Strategies and Teacher Perception of Quantity and Quality of Feedback.

The scatterplot represents a wide range of responses, more so from the “low” efficacy group than the “high” efficacy group and much wider from the “high” efficacy teacher to the “low” efficacy teacher. The “high” efficacy teacher reported a Classroom Management score of 72.00 and a score of 27.00 for the Teacher Perception of the Quantity and Quality of Feedback. The lowest reported score for these items are from the lowest teacher in the “low” efficacy group who had a 48.00 in Classroom Management and a 17.00 in Teacher Perception of the Quantity and Quality of Feedback.
Figure 6. Scatter plot displaying the relationship between teacher Classroom Management and Teacher Perception of Quantity and Quality of Feedback.

The highest ranking efficacy teacher had a very high overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score of 214.00 and a high score of 27.00 from teacher Attitude Toward Feedback. The last two “high” efficacy teachers scored very similarly to the top two “low” efficacy teachers as scores ranking from 22 to 24 were reported. The “low” efficacy participants reported Overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy scores ranging from 144.00 to 159.00 and averages of Teacher Attitude Toward Feedback of 22.00 and 24.00.
Figure 7. Scatter plot displaying the relationship between Overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale and Teacher Attitudes Toward Feedback.

Figure 8 reports that the six research participants have a more positive attitude toward feedback as the scores ranged from 22.00 to 24.00 with the highest score averaging 27.00. The scores showed a wider range as the highest efficacy teacher scored a 70.00 and the lowest efficacy teacher scored a 42.00.
The highest efficacy teacher scored increasingly higher than the other participants in the “high” efficacy group and the “low” efficacy group with an instructional strategy score of 72.00 and a 27.00 in the teacher attitude toward feedback category. The last participant in the “high” efficacy group fell on the line of best fit line with the second highest efficacy teacher located very close to the line.

Figure 8. Scatterplot displaying the relationship between teacher Student Engagement and Teacher Attitude Toward Feedback.
Figure 9. Scatter plot displaying the relationship between teacher Instructional Strategies and Teacher Attitude Toward Feedback.

Again, the highest efficacy teacher scored beyond the other two “high” efficacy teachers with an average Classroom Management score of 72.00 while the other two “high” efficacy teachers scored a 64.00 and 66.00. The “high” efficacy teachers reported scores of 23.00, 24.00, and 27.00 in the Teacher Attitude Toward Feedback. The three participants in the “low” efficacy group were close to aligning vertically with each other due to scores in Classroom Management that were 48.00, 55.00, and 56.00 and very similar Teacher Attitude Toward Feedback scores.
Figure 10. Scatter plot displaying the relationship between teacher Classroom Management and Teacher Attitude Toward Feedback.

The two participants in the “high” efficacy group remained close on the scatter plot of the Overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy (23.00, 26.00) while the highest ranked efficacy teacher from the “high” efficacy group remained in the top position with an average overall score of 30.00. The bottom three “low” efficacy teachers displayed greater distances between their scatter plot placement and falling further from the line of best fit than the “high” efficacy teachers.
Figure 11. Scatter plot displaying the relationship between Overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale and Teacher Perception of the Impact of Feedback on Self-Efficacy.

The “high” efficacy teachers in Figure 12 show a trend line going upward in both Student Engagement and Teacher Perception of Impact of Self-Efficacy. The “low” efficacy teachers show a great variance in scores, especially within the Teacher Perception of Impact on Self-efficacy where scores varied from 18.00 to 27.00.
Figure 12. Scatter plot displaying the relationship between teacher Student Engagement and Teacher Perception of the Impact of Feedback on Self-Efficacy.

Figure 13 shows the teacher with the highest efficacy had the most variance between their scores and the scores of the other five participants scoring a 72.00 in Instructional Strategies and a 30.00 in Teacher Perception of Impact of Self-Efficacy. The other two high efficacy teachers scored relatively close with the last “high” efficacy teacher falling on the line of best fit. The three “low” efficacy teachers’ scores show a downward trend line that falls opposite of the line of best fit.
Figure 13. Scatter plot displaying the relationship between teacher Instructional Strategies and Teacher Perception of the Impact of Feedback on Self-Efficacy

Figure 14 shows that the two close scoring “high” efficacy teachers reported averages that place them almost parallel to the line of best fit. The “low” efficacy teacher’s averages in Classroom Management ranged from 48.00 to 56.00, but again, the greater variance is between their Teacher Perception of Impact on Self-Efficacy where scores ranged from 18.00 to 27.00.
Emerging Themes

Each of the 18 face-to-face interview questions was written specifically to fall into one of three categories of TPQ², TAF, and TPI. Once the interviews were completed and participant responses were sorted into their categories, the researcher transcribed and analyzed the interviews and online focus groups postings to uncover any potential emerging themes. One overarching theme presented itself between the two data sources: the essential components of productive formative evaluation and feedback. Participants noted three main components of productive formative feedback as being specific, frequent, and most importantly, positive.

Specific Feedback

Ms. A (Rank 1) stated that, in her opinion, feedback should contain “facts supported by data that was seen”, such as specific quotes that the administrator has written down based on...
what the teacher has said or what students said during the PDAS walkthrough observation. She also said that the feedback should specifically state what the students were doing and what the teacher was doing. She believed that it is “also important to leave a lingering question to help stimulate growth on the individual rather than forcing them to do something.”

Ms. C (Rank 3) reported that:

Feedback should be constructive, specific. If it’s not specific, nobody knows what they’re good at, ya know? If they (the administrators) just said, ‘all your kids are on task’. I’m like okay, they’re on task, but at what point? Or, what were you watching for? I so like specifics to know, this is where your classroom management should be at. Specific, positive, not overwhelming.

Ms. C also stated that feedback needs to be constructive, accurate, and specific, not just a general statement, like “you did great today.” She specified that feedback should be “specific, pin pointing the essentials that the administrator feels needs to be dealt with. Always try to find something positive.” She appreciated the time that the administrator takes to give her “ANY feedback”. Ms. D (Rank 6) thought back to how she provided feedback for her students, “I think it goes right along with what we do for kids. It needs to be specific; sometimes it’s hard to take. When you (the administrator) speak generally, I’m not clear on what it is that you expect me to do the next time.” She also shared that she believes feedback needs to be specific and corrective. Ms. D stated “I need to know what I’m doing right in order to continue to do that rather than, okay, well maybe, I’m under the assumption that maybe that wasn’t the right thing to do so I scrap it and really that was a positive thing I was doing.” She also recalled a time when she had a conversation with her administrator after receiving feedback that provided clarity and confirmation of her teaching strategies that was positive and promoted her self-efficacy.

Ms. D added that feedback should be, “…timely. There are guidelines as to when administrators need to have the feedback returned to me, but the sooner I get it, the quicker I am able to
implement it in my classroom.” She concluded with, “I’d love to have more time to really sit
down and have those conversations with the administrator. I think that would be more beneficial
rather than just getting the piece of paper back. It’s better because you can really get behind the
thinking of it and have dialogue about it.”

Specificity was important to Ms. F as well. She would like to see feedback required and
with more detail. She provided this example:

So, if you’re saying your lesson was good, what about it was good? Why was it good?
What did you see that made you think that? So it needs to be specific. And if they noticed
that students aren’t engaged…okay, what was I doing? Was I helping a group, and they
got off task? Just a little bit more feedback should be required. At least one piece of
feedback for each (PDAS) walkthrough, each formative evaluation, so that the teacher
knows where they are at, not just check marks.

Frequent Feedback

During the face-to-face interview and postings on the online focus group forum, the six
research participants noted that they felt that an increase in the frequency of PDAS walkthrough
observations would allow the administrators to have a more informed view of their respective
classrooms, instructional practices, and student learning. Ms. E (Rank 2) recalled, “I didn’t see
my administrators much, I know they get busy and have good intentions of coming by the
classrooms. Ms. C (Rank 3) stated that she wished that her administrators would “come in more
and see what’s going on.”

Ms. F (Rank 4) made a statement that could be used to summarize the need for more
formative evaluations and feedback and that may lead to improved instructional practices and
preservation of teacher self-efficacy:

Most of my experience with administrators was one (PDAS) walkthrough the whole year
and then the formal (observation). No, I don’t think that you can walk through a
classroom one time and then [conduct] a formal observation and be able to give teacher
feedback and grade them on how they’re instructing in their classroom—[not] if you total,
maybe, one hour in the classroom the whole school year. I feel like to really know what’s
Ms. F (Rank 4) believed that PDAS walkthrough observations should be “…done on a regular basis. I don’t think it should be just checking in and no feedback. I think feedback is really important, especially if there is something that needs to be changed. They (teachers) need that feedback.” She said that administrators should have those honest conversations and offer solutions of things that can be done to assist a teacher grow.

Ms. D (Rank 6) commented that, “I feel like to really know what’s going in a teacher’s classroom you need to have several walkthroughs….”

Positive Feedback

The third theme that emerged from the participant’s responses during the interviews and online focus group postings may be seen as one of the most crucial components to providing the teachers with impactful feedback that not only preserves, but potentially enhances their self-efficacy. The participants shared strong thoughts about the necessity for positivity to be at the core of productive feedback. Ms. A (Rank 1) believed the following about formative evaluations:

It should be positive. I don’t think that negativity should be entangled or woven in it in any way where a teacher has to read between the lines. I also think it needs to have, like I said throughout the whole thing, those questions that should lead the teacher to their own understanding rather than feeling like it’s a mandate.

Ms. A shared a time when her administrator’s feedback focused on all of the things that needed to be corrected but neglected to inform Ms. A of the positive things that she was doing in the classroom. Though this did not impact Ms. A’s self-efficacy, she still found it to be redundant and unconstructive. Ms. A also would like to see the administrator spend more time with each
teacher individually. She saw room for each teacher to grow and believes that “if administrators had time to give each teacher equally, it would be more beneficial.”

Ms. E (Rank 2) believed that formative feedback should be, “…somewhat positive and anything negative should be done in an encouraging way and not be critical but be constructive.” In support of this view, Ms. C (Rank 3) recalled an experience with formative evaluation and feedback that was unproductive and overwhelming. One administrator in her first few years of teaching was overtly negative. She stated that:

I think that every feedback should, at some point, even if the teacher is awful, at some point say something positive, something they got right. At least for a teacher to know, ‘Okay, at least I’ve done something right…’. Thank goodness there were some administrators who came in and told me, ‘This is what you did right, but this is what we need to fix.’

Ms. F (Rank 4) also agreed that, “making sure that when you give feedback that you always find something positive, something that they are doing right so they don’t feel like everything they are doing is wrong.” She believed that if the feedback that administrators provide to teachers is positive and constructive, it “builds up their self-worth so that they are more reliable on themselves and can do a good job and if you ask them to make a change, they know they can do things right so they can make that…it’s something that they can do.”

Participants from this study agreed that formative evaluation and feedback should contain elements of positivity in an effort to maintain a teacher’s sense of self-efficacy. If a teacher’s efficacy is diminished, the teacher may lack the motivation or desire to make necessary changes in the classroom.

Ms. B (Rank 5) similarly stated, “I feel like if there is any criticism, it should be constructive feedback, constructive criticism. If you see something that I’m doing wrong, maybe
a suggestion of what you want to see done differently, mostly ending with encouragement or appreciation for what I’m doing and accomplishing in the classroom.”

Additional Comments

The participants provided other statements that were not pulled forward to create an emerging theme, but the researcher concluded that these were important nuggets of information that would be useful to take into consideration for this study. Ms. A (Rank 1) commented on her welcoming of any feedback, good or bad, so long as it is “authentic,” not “cut-and-paste generic information.” Ms. E (Rank 2) stated that:

I feel good about my walkthrough as long as the administrator is taking an active interest in making me a better teacher and not observing out of sheer obligation. I work hard and appreciate when authentic (PDAS walkthrough) observations are conducted. It’s hard to take feedback seriously if the administrator doesn’t seem to be actively interested in my classroom.

Ms. B (Rank 5) shared that she does not want to receive run-of-the-mill, standardized comments as they are not helpful in her efforts to improve her job performance.

Summary

This chapter summarized the data analysis process and findings for the data collected from the initial 94 research participants and the six participants chosen to provide further information through individual and focus group interviews. SPSS software was utilized to calculate means, standard deviations, and correlation coefficients and to rank the participating elementary schools so that the researcher could identify the highest ranked efficacy school (HES), middle ranked efficacy school (MES), and lowest ranked efficacy school (LES). SPSS software also determined the highest efficacy teacher and lowest efficacy teacher at the HES, MES and LES. These six identified teachers were later ranked by their overall teacher efficacy score, with the top three labeled as being relatively high in self-efficacy and the bottom three
labeled as being relatively low in self-efficacy (regardless of their initial HES, MES, and LES membership). All six teachers completed two online surveys, engaged in a face-to-face interview with the researcher, and participated in an online focus group. The researcher transcribed the participants’ face-to-face interviews and placed responses in the appropriate categories of TPQ², TAF, or TPI. The researcher also transcribed the participant’s posted focus group responses to identify emerging themes. Themes that were identified within the transcribed data included the desirability of specific feedback, frequent feedback, and positive feedback. The quantitative and qualitative data were reported to answer the three research questions.

The purpose in reporting these findings were to understand the current status of and relationships between teacher self-efficacy and in-service teacher perceptions of and attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process. Having clarity of this subject matter should offer administrators better insight as to how to conduct PDAS walkthrough observations more thoroughly and provide accurate formative evaluation with feedback that is conducive to preserving teacher’s self-efficacy. Conclusions and implications are discussed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This study employed a mix methods approach to the analysis of data collected by the researcher to answer three research questions. The questions that guided this study were as follows:

1. With respect to in-service teachers participating in PDAS, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management?

2. With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

3. With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?
As heightened educational accountability continues to evolve in American public schools, research is necessary to examine teacher perceptions of and attitudes towards formative evaluation and feedback within the teacher appraisal process and their relationship to teacher self-efficacy. A better understanding of the current status of and relationship between teacher self-efficacy and formative evaluation and feedback will better prepare administrators to engage in an adequate number of meaningful evaluations that provide beneficial, quality feedback to teachers.

This chapter summarizes the findings of the study and provides a discussion of the themes that emerged from the interview and focus group transcriptions. An analysis in the form of a comparison to the current body of literature is also included. This chapter specifies implications of the study along with recommendations for future research.

Overview

This study sought to describe the current status of and relationship between teacher self-efficacy and the following: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy.

The information that the research participants provided in this study lends itself to enlightening administrators on the necessity to inventory their current formative evaluation and feedback practices to ensure that they are conducive to teacher growth and preservation of their self-efficacy.
Discussion of the Findings

In order to address the problem of the study, the researcher utilized four tools to compile data that was necessary to answer the three research questions. The researcher employed two online surveys, a 45 minute face-to-face interview, and an online focus group. The results were reported in Chapter 4.

Current Status of Teacher Self-Efficacy (Research Question 1)

The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale survey was created to answer the first research question that asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in PDAS, what is the current status of teachers’ self-efficacy related to these areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management? Based on the results from the survey, the researcher concluded that student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management averages were similar. Student Engagement reported an average of 56.83 (SD = 8.18), Instructional Strategies averaged a 59.75 (SD = 7.27), and the Classroom Management average was the highest with a 60.24 (SD = 7.16). The overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score was 176.83 (SD = 20.34). The results of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores indicate that classroom management affected total self-efficacy score the most, with instructional strategies as a close second. Student engagement self-efficacy contributed the least to the teachers’ self-efficacy score total. The self-efficacy means calculated across all study participants appeared to be in the high range (i.e. in the top third of the total possible points for the total overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score and for each of the three self-efficacy subscores separately).
Current Status of Teacher Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback (Research Question 2)

Research Question 2 was as follows: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the current status of (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

To review, TPQ² was in-service teachers’ perceptions of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation in the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy. TAF was in-service teachers’ attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy, and TPI was in-service teachers’ perceptions of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within in-service teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy. The online Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback indicated that the TAF mean 22.18 (SD = 5.01) produced the highest average indicating that teachers attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation was positive. The TAF was the second ranked category based on the responses from the Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback with an average of 21.81 (SD = 4.70). The lowest category from the online survey was the TPQ², which produced an average score of 20.88 (SD = 5.47). The results indicate that teachers do not perceive the quantity and quality of feedback from formative assessment to affect their attitude of formative evaluation and feedback. In other words, the quantity and quality of feedback was not rated as highly/positive as the other two areas. This same conclusion was reinforced later in
the study through qualitative data obtained in individual and focus group interviews of six selected teachers.

The qualitative data, obtained through individual interviews and focus group interview with three relatively high efficacy and three relatively low efficacy teachers suggests that the six participants perceived their attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback to be positive overall, although they perceived the quality and quantity of the formative feedback received to be lacking at times. The participants deemed formative evaluation and feedback as a necessity for professional growth and as having a generally positive impact on their self-efficacy. In contrast, the six teachers participating in the study perceived formative evaluation and feedback, when it is infrequent, non-specific, and overly negative, to have a minimal or no impact on their self-efficacy as it relates to their performance. The participants stated that they have a willingness to change and that they see change as a necessity to improving instruction as prescribed by current, high frequency, and high quality, feedback received.

Relationship of Teacher Self-Efficacy to Teacher Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback (Research Question 3)

Research Question 3 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?
The first part of research Question 3 asked about the relationship between self-efficacy (overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management) and in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process. All correlations, calculated with data from all 94 study participants were very low and positive ranging from $r = .109$ to $r = .194$. The relationship between the overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale score and TPQ² (teacher perception of the quantity and quality of formative evaluation and feedback) was found to be a very low, positive correlation of $r = .176$ which did not reach statistical significance. In their individual interviews and focus group interviews, the six interview participants (three relatively high in teacher self-efficacy and three in relatively low self-efficacy) shared their past experiences and the personal evolution of their self-efficacy as it relates to the quantity and quality of formative evaluation and feedback. One participant shared that she had a realistic understanding of administrative time constraints and attributes that lessened the number of formative evaluations she experienced. She also shared that time constraints were a factor that she believed was a cause of less detailed feedback from administrators. While the majority of the teachers desired more frequent formative evaluation and detailed feedback, one research participant reflected on the excessive number of formative evaluation in her first few weeks in the classroom. The abundance of PDAS walkthrough observations that she endured caused her to question her future as an educator. She also received feedback that was laced with negativity and that lacked any indication of the positive things that she brought to her classroom. Many of the participants recalled an experience where formative feedback had a negative connotation. Though the negativity was disheartening and at times frustrating, the participants did not indicate that this readily impacted their self-efficacy in the long term; however, it did not promote productive change in the teachers’ classroom instruction.
In much the same way, participants noted that a lack of detailed feedback led to performance ambiguity, resulting in minimal instructional changes in the classroom.

The second part of research Question 3 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process? The correlation between Teacher Attitudes Toward Feedback from Formative Evaluation and Teacher’s Sense of Efficacy Scale produced a statistically significant correlation of $r = .302$ and student engagement score was $r = .309$. A lower but positive correlation was reported between teacher attitudes toward feedback from formative evaluation and instructional strategies ($r = .237$) and classroom management ($r = .266$). The relationship between the participants’ self-efficacy and their attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback was still a low positive one, but overall it was statistically significant at a probability level of .01. As the teachers’ positive attitudes toward formative evaluation and feedback went up, so did the teachers’ sense of self-efficacy.

Although the six interview participants had a few negative past experiences with formative evaluation and feedback that may have caused their perception and attitude to temporarily fluctuate, their overall attitude toward formative evaluation and feedback remained positive and their positive self-efficacy remained intact. One participant reflected on a time when she received a majority of the check marks on her feedback form stating “proficient” in regards to her instructional performance. Due to the high level of student involvement in the planning of the activity and engagement in the lesson, the teacher anticipated receiving “Exceeds Expectations” in specific domains of the assessment. She requested an appointment with her
administrator in an effort to derive more detailed information. The request was accepted and appointment scheduled, but due to continuous rescheduling, the conversation never took place. The teacher was left without further clarification or justification as to the scores she received. Again, while disgruntlement and frustration was a byproduct of this particular formative evaluation and the feedback provided, it did not impact the teacher’s overall self-efficacy as she remained confident that her lesson was positive and impactful on her students’ learning outcomes.

The last part of research Question 3 asked: With respect to in-service teachers participating in the PDAS walkthrough observation, what is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in the following areas: overall, student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and: (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy?

The correlation of overall Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale scores and TPI scores, i.e. in-service teachers’ perceptions of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy, resulted in a statistically significant but low, positive correlation coefficient of $r = .295$ at a probability level of .01. As the teachers positive perceptions of the impact of formative evaluation and feedback on teacher self-efficacy went up, so did teacher self-efficacy. Correlation coefficients between TPI scores and Student Engagement self-efficacy scores, Instructional Strategy self-efficacy scores, and Classroom Management self-efficacy scores were also low, positive and statistically significant at a probability level of .01, with the correlations ranging from $r = .209$ to $r = .300$. The correlation coefficients suggested that teacher attitudes toward formative evaluation explained approximately 9% of the variance in teacher self-efficacy.
In short, the researcher found that TPI, in-service teachers’ perceptions of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy, had a very small but statistically significant relationship with teacher self-efficacy; TAF, teacher attitude toward feedback, had the strongest correlation relationship to teachers’ self-efficacy with TPI having a slightly lower, positive correlation to teachers’ self-efficacy. In the participant’s individual and focus group interviews, they shared that they relied on peers, district-provided professional development, and whatever feedback was provided to them from their administrator to drive their classroom instruction. The teachers had developed strategies to cope with the infrequent formative evaluation and feedback in an effort to continue to grow professionally. They depended on each other, district resources, and outside resources, such as regional service centers, for professional development. While some participants continued to maintain their self-efficacy with limited amounts of administrator support, other participant’s reported that they were in a position to utilize their administrators as a resource to enhance their instructional self-efficacy. One participant connected her formative evaluation and feedback to the relationship that she has with her administrator. She noted that no matter what type of feedback she received, she felt that she was able to have dialogue with her administrator that assisted her in better understating what the administrator saw and the beneficial information that the administrator offered to guide the teacher’s future instructional practices. She contended that this relationship allowed for productive feedback that preserved her self-efficacy as a teacher.

An Emerging Theme: The Importance of Specific, Frequent, and Positive Formative Evaluation and Feedback

As the researcher transcribed the interviews and online focus group responses, one overarching theme presented itself: the existence of three essential characteristics of productive formative evaluation and feedback. Participants noted that the three main features of productive
Formative evaluation and feedback are as follows: high specificity, high frequency, and most importantly, high positivity. The participants stated on several occasions that they perceive a need for feedback data to be very specific. In order for instructional changes to be made, teachers need to know exactly what they do well and need to continue to do in their classroom, what practices are evolving and need to be fostered, and what things are unconstructive and not beneficial to student achievement. The teachers participating in the study agreed that they welcome change and seek opportunities to grow. In order to grow, specific feedback must be provided for the teachers to feel good about the changes that they are making as opposed to going blindly into changes that may or may not need to occur. Specific feedback also allows the teacher to tailor their professional development opportunities and find time to pursue the targeted areas of need.

Frequent PDAS walkthrough observations and feedback, the participants concluded, is a necessity that allows the administrator to obtain a well-rounded, candid snapshot of what is truly taking place in a classroom. The participants felt that when more frequent PDAS walkthrough observations take place, more authentic feedback is available to the teacher. The participants saw the quantity of PDAS walkthrough observations they had received as “adequate”, but felt they would benefit from an increased number of PDAS walkthrough observations. One research participant requested more frequent PDAS walkthrough observations from her administrator due to her participation in a graduate program. She said that when she saw more PDAS walkthrough observations take place, the feedback received also assisted her in improving her reading instruction. Before the increased number of PDAS walkthrough observations, she continued on with her same instructional practices without much reflection or change.
A common thread that ran through the interviews and online focus group postings was the inherent need for feedback to possess notes of positivity. As the research participants shared their past experiences with formative feedback that they had received from their respective administrators, the tone at times was one of disconnect. Their self-efficacy was not immediately challenged through their experiences, but disappointment was prevalent. One participant told the researcher that she saw positive feedback as a necessary counterpart to being able to receive undesirable or critical feedback. She believed that when self-efficacy is bolstered by positive statements, it makes it easier to take any recommendations for improvement. She made a connection that teachers tend to view positive recommendations for improvement with a “can-do” spirit and more optimistic attitude.

Additional Comments

One emerging theme and three essential characteristics presented themselves and were discussed in detail; however, the researcher felt that bringing forward the following tidbits of information to be pertinent to this study. During transcriptions of the interviews and online focus group data, the researcher noted that two of the participants stated that it was important for them to receive “authentic” feedback rather than what they described as “cut and paste,” generic feedback. Teachers had a heightened sense of self-efficacy when they perceived administrators as taking an active interest in assisting them grow professionally. One participant said that she very much appreciated authentic observations and accurate feedback.

Comparison to Other Research

Connections from this study and the overarching theme and essential characteristics that emerged from data analysis are consistent with past research that imply the important influence that formative evaluation and feedback have on a teacher’s self-efficacy. Teachers in this study
reported that they would like to be able to depend on formative evaluation and feedback to be a driving force to make instructional improvements and to explore the effectiveness of their instructional strategies. This is consistent with Skaalvik and Skaalvik’s (2010) study that found that one of the strongest factors influencing teacher self-efficacy is supervisory cognitive and emotional support from supervisors. The research participants in this study reported very similar experiences as the findings in Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling’s study (2009) that indicated three out of four teachers that engaged in an evaluation process received no specific feedback about how to improve their practices. In the current study, the teachers reported past situations that included receiving insufficient amounts of feedback that lacked specificity to details, thus leaving them to make assumptions about their instructional strategies.

Existing research and the findings of this study uncover the need for a more cohesive, collaborative method for conducting formative evaluation and providing feedback. The research participants shared stories of both positive and negative experiences with formative evaluation and feedback. The negative experiences seemingly stemmed from the inconstancy and ambiguity of the infrequent feedback they received, if they receive any feedback at all. Clark (2012) states that effective feedback is pivotal and at the core of formative evaluation.

This study is also consistent with a significant aspect of Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory--the presupposition that individuals have the ability to tap into their own set of problem-solving skills in order to produce actions and utilize strategies in an effort to resolve the problems that their environment presents to them. Teachers in this study were able to utilize their peers and other resources to continue to improve their practices, and in certain cases, were able to approach their administrator in an effort to retrieve more specific data that explained and helped the teacher understand the formative feedback received.
Implications for Teachers

The purpose of this study was to describe the current status of and the relationships between teacher self-efficacy and the following: (a) in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, (b) in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process, and (c) in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy. The teachers in this study noted that administrative time constraints were a factor that prevented administrators from conducting more formative assessments and offering more in-depth feedback. Teachers also stated that they have become more dependent on other resources to gauge their instructional effectiveness that affects their self-efficacy. Teachers will find that collaborating with their peers not only improves student achievement (Park, 2005), but also builds teacher capacity and is conducive to the improvement of teacher efficacies (Guo, Justice, Sawyer, & Tompkins, 2011). Teachers may also benefit from carefully selected, relevant staff development. Effective professional development is often seen as vital to school success and teacher satisfaction (Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, 2011).

Implications for Administrators

A goal of this research was to uncover (a) particular actions that administrators engage in that influence teachers to either feel positively or negatively toward formative assessment and feedback and (b) how these acts impact a teacher’s sense of instructional self-efficacy. Increasing demands are being placed on administrators, which cause time constraints, making it more difficult to be in each classroom long enough to provide individualized feedback. However, this study concluded that teachers value feedback and welcome administrators into the classroom to
conduct PDAS walkthrough observations as part of the PDAS teacher appraisal process. Though time is limited, administrators should remain focused on improving classroom instruction and supporting teachers’ self-efficacy as they strive to become more effective professionals. Creating a system that helps teachers improve themselves involves the generation of continual, accurate feedback (Mielke & Frontier, 2012). Using comprehensive teaching frameworks and allowing teachers to generate data about their own teaching, identify their own area of focus, and establish their own improvement goals can increase teacher motivation and engagement. When teachers participate in these self-assessment protocols, they are remarkably adept at identifying specific areas of need and pathways to improve (Milke, 2012). Additionally, it may be beneficial for administrators to be trained in gathering and sharing non-judgmental data with teachers.

School leaders who foster collaboration among novice and veteran teachers can improve teacher satisfaction (Kardos & Johnson, 2007) and student achievement (Goddard, Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, 2007). It would benefit administrators to engage in ongoing communication training that supports productive dialogue with staff. Teachers need to be actively involved and empowered as leaders in the formative use of assessment tools that will be the basis for their own summative evaluation (Mielke & Frontier, 2012).

Recommendations for Future Research

For this study, the researcher focused on the current status of and relationship between teacher self-efficacy and in-service teacher perception of the quantity and quality of feedback from formative assessment within the teacher appraisal process, in-service teacher attitude toward feedback from formative assessment within the teacher appraisal process, and in-service teacher perception of the impact of feedback from formative assessment within the teacher appraisal process on teacher self-efficacy. Recommendations for future research include:
1. Studies that analyze data on administrator’s professional beliefs about the role that formative evaluation and feedback play in teacher development and how these beliefs impact the teacher’s sense of administrative support.

2. Studies that review the impact of district-adopted programs that intend to support teacher growth and collaboration (e.g. Solution Tree© Professional Learning Communities).

3. Studies that compare the effectiveness of currently-utilized formative and summative feedback practices, including observation forms used, as they relate to teacher satisfaction and improved practices.

4. Study of the administrator’s concepts of what feedback should consist of

Summary

This chapter briefly recapped the findings derived from the two online surveys, a face-to-face interview, and an online focus group. Conclusions were drawn and discussed with respect to each research question. Emerging themes were identified and additional insightful comments were made. Comparisons to past research were made, and implications for both classroom teachers and administrators were drawn to suggest ways in which this research could be applied to impact existing formative evaluation and feedback practices in today’s schools. Recommendations for future research were made, and a summary of the study concluded the chapter.
APPENDIX A

PDAS OBSERVATION WALKTHROUGH FORM
Teacher:                                   Observed By:
Class Information:         Observation Date:
Start Time:                          End Time:

I.  Evidence of:

□ Student engagement in learning  □ Teacher engagement of targeted students  □ Successful learning
□ Critical thinking/problem solving □ Self-directed learning  □ Connected/applicable learning

Student Expectation:
Focus Question:
Comments:

II. Evidence of appropriate:

□ Goals and objectives  □ Learner-centered instruction  □ Critical thinking and problem solving
□ Motivational strategies  □ Variation of instructional strategies  □ Alignment
□ Pacing/sequencing  □ Value and importance  □ Appropriate questioning and inquiry
□ Use of technology

Comments:

III. Evidence that:

□ Learning was monitored and assessed  □ Targeted students were monitored and assessed  □ Students-specific I.E.P. modifications and/or short-term objectives were addressed
□ Assessment and instruction were aligned  □ Assessment was appropriate  □ Learning was reinforced
Feedback was constructive

Re-teaching and re-evaluation took place

Comments:

IV. Evidence of:

- Established discipline procedures
- Implementation of Student Behavior Plans
- Implementation of Response to Intervention goals/objectives
- Preferential seating for targeted students
- Self-discipline/self-directed learning
- Equitable teacher-student interaction
- Expectations for behavior
- Redirection for disruptive behavior
- Reinforcement of desired behavior
- Equitable and varied characteristics
- Time and material management

Comments:
APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT FLYER
PURPOSE:

The purpose of this study is to examine in-service teacher perception of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy.

Who will be conducting the study?

The researcher is Chaney Curran, a doctoral student at the University of North Texas.

ELIGIBILITY:

1. A minimum of 3 years of classroom teaching experience

2. Professionally evaluated by an administrator using the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) observation tool at least once in their teaching career

If I participate, what is involved?

A person will be considered a research participant when a completed survey is returned to the researcher and eligibility criteria is met. Six research participants who have completed and returned a survey will be chosen using SPSS version 20.0 software and asked to volunteer in face-to-face interviews and participate in an online focus group. If you agree to volunteer to be one of the six participants to continue on in the research, the researcher will schedule face-to-face interviews with you at your convenience. The interviews will be held at your home campus.
The face-to-face interviews will be recorded (audio only, no photography) for the researchers use only. The focus group will be conducted via the internet (similar to a chat room, though not live) and allows participants to be able to post their comments and responses to the researchers initial questions as well as read and respond to posts from other research participants. Participants will be asked to post at least 3 comments to each of the researcher’s questions or other participants’ comments. All participants will have pseudo names for confidentiality purposes.

**BENEFITS:**

This research will provide you with an opportunity to voice your thoughts and ideas about how professional formative evaluation affects your self-efficacy in an effort to build better communication between teachers and administrators for more beneficial formative assessments and feedback.

**COMPENSATION:**

Each participant will receive a $10 gift card to a location of their choice.

**CONTACT:** Please feel free to call, text, or e-mail at any time

Chaney Curran, UNT doctoral student/researcher

Cell phone:

E-mail:
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT NOTICE
University of North Texas

Informed Consent Notice

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose, benefits and risks of the study and how it will be conducted.

Student Investigator: Chaney L. Curran

Supervising Advisors: Dr. Jim Laney, Ed.D.………...jim.laney@unt.edu (940) 565-2602
Dr. Jimmy Byrd, Ph.D.…………………jimmy.byrd@unt.edu (940) 565-2940

Title of Study: In-Service Teacher Perception of Feedback from Formative Assessment within the Teacher Appraisal Process and Its Relationship to Teacher Self-Efficacy

Purpose of Study

You are being asked to participate in a research study that seeks to understand current status of and relationship between teacher’s perception of the quality and quantity of formative evaluation and teacher perception and attitude of the impact of formative evaluation and feedback on teacher self-efficacy.

Study Procedure

You will be asked to complete two electronic surveys. The first survey is a 24-item titled, Teacher Sense of Efficacy Survey. The second online survey an 18-item survey titled, “Survey of Teacher Perspectives of and Teacher Attitudes Toward Formative Evaluation and Feedback”. Completion of both surveys should take approximately 30-40 minutes to complete. Six participants will be asked to volunteer to move forward in the research study. If you choose to volunteer, you will be asked to engage
in face-to-face interview session (not to exceed 45 minutes) and participate in an online focus group. The amount of time that is spent on the focus group website will vary depending on how many posts and the length of posts that are submitted. Each participant is asked to submit no fewer than three posts. The researcher estimates that the participants who volunteer to move forward in the study will spend a total of two hours completing posts and reading other participants comments over the course of the six week window that the site will be available. The researcher predicts that the six volunteer participants will spend 3.5 hours completing study activities.

**Foreseeable Risks**

All research has the potential risk or harm to participants. The potential risks involved in this study are possible loss of participant confidentiality and fear of retribution for non-participation. All necessary steps will be taken to protect participant confidentiality to the extent that is allowed by law. This includes protecting documentation under lock and key in offices with restricted entrance without the researcher present, pass code protected technology, and assigned pseudo names for all participants. Participants will be notified that there is no personal or professional penalty should they decline to participate or discontinue participation nor will the researcher seek retribution for participants who choose to opt out of the research project at any time.

**Benefits To Subjects Or Others**

This research study will offer teacher's an opportunity to express their thoughts and perceptions about the current status and relationship between formative evaluation and feedback and how it impacts their self-efficacy. The information that you offer to the researcher will also assist campus and district administrators better understand how teacher's receive, interpret, and utilize formative feedback in their classroom. This study will provide information that will assist administrators to provide more accurate, beneficial formative feedback to teachers and creates dialogue between teacher and administrator in an effort to accelerate instruction.
Compensation For Participants

If you choose to volunteer to move forward in the research, you will receive one $10 gift card to a location of your choice. The gift card will be purchased by the researcher. The cards will be presented no later than 2 weeks after the last day of the research period. Participants must participate in both face-to-face interview sessions and provide no fewer than three posts to the online focus group discussion.

Procedures For Maintaining Confidentiality Of Research Records

The information that you provide to the researcher will remain confidential through a series of actions. First, the participants’ identities will be guarded by use of a pseudo name. This pseudo name will be used in every portion of the research when referring to the participants and their verbal and written information. All interviews will be recorded with the researcher’s personal iPhone and then saved to the researcher’s laptop for transcription. Passwords are in place on all electronic devices that he researcher will use to store information. All records and information will be stored in the researchers’ office in a secure area with limited access. The Edmodo contents are password protected by special codes given to the users and secured in an attempt to prevent outsiders from joining school networks. These codes are given to users and are necessary to join groups. The company has recently enhanced the security of the Edmodo service by implementing SQL Ingestion protection to prevent unauthorized access to the website's resources and database. Dr. Laney will maintain a copy of all collected research data on the UNT campus for three years past the end of the study.

Questions About The Study

If you have any questions about the study, you may contact the student researcher, Chaney Curran, at chaney330@yahoo.com or at (903) 821-5225 or supervising advisor, Dr. Jim Laney, at jim.laney@unt.edu.
Review for the Protection of Participants

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Participants’ Rights: Your participation in the survey confirms that you have read all of the above and that you agree to all of the following:

- Chaney Curran has explained the study to you and you have had an opportunity to contact her with any questions about the study. You have been informed of the possible benefits and the potential risks of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.
- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
- You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
- You understand you may print a copy of this form for your records.
APPENDIX D

FACE-TO-FACE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
1. In your experience, what have been some of the campus administrator’s methods for collecting formative evaluation data?

2. Please describe the general tone of the conversation when formative feedback is given to you.

3. Can you tell me about a time when formative feedback led you to make a change for better or worse in your classroom teaching strategies?

4. Can you tell me about a time when you disagreed with feedback from a formative assessment?

5. How often does your administrator conduct formative evaluations? Do you feel that this is an adequate amount of evaluations? Why or why not?

6. Can you recall a time when feedback from a formative evaluation changed for better or worse how you felt about your classroom instruction?

7. What is the average length of time between when the formative evaluation is conducted and when feedback is returned to you? How do you feel about that length of time?

8. Can you tell me about a time when your attitude about formative evaluation changed?

9. What do consider necessary components of positively impactful formative evaluation and feedback?

10. How would you fill in the blanks of this sentence? “I perceive the overall quantity and quality of my experience with formative evaluation and feedback to be…because…”.

11. In your opinion, what purpose does formative evaluation serve for teachers?

12. What do you perceive to be elements of formative evaluation and feedback to make the most positive impact on a teacher’s self-efficacy?

13. Can you recall a time, either positive or negative, that formative feedback impacted you professionally?

14. How does the administrator communicate the results of the formative evaluation data?

15. How does formative evaluation and feedback prepare you for a summative evaluation?

16. What is your overall perception of formative evaluations?

17. In your opinion, what characteristics should formative evaluation and feedback possess? Why?

18. If you could make formative evaluations more beneficial for teachers’ effectiveness, what would you change about the system?
Initial researcher posting that will begin the online dialogue: "What role does formative evaluation play in your professional growth?"

Possible researcher follow-up prompts to participant postings:

- How did that make you feel?
- What was your response to that?
- How did that action/comment motivate or unmotivate you?
- Why do you think that happened?
- How did that change your perspective on formative evaluation?
- What would you change about that situation?

The researcher may interject to a researcher's post with a question that may ask for elaboration to a post. The interjections will be broadly stated so that the participants do not feel obligated to share specific information outside of their comfort zone.
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