Elementary Teacher Perceptions about the Missouri Educator Evaluation System and its Relationship to Teacher Self-Efficacy in Student Engagement, Instructional Practices, and Classroom Management

Deanna R. Feeback
B.S.E., University of Central Missouri, 2002
M.A.Ed., Baker University, 2006
Ed.S., University of Central Missouri, 2012

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of Baker University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Susan K. Rogers, Ph.D.
Major Advisor

James Robins, Ed.D.

Alisa Seidelman, Ed.D.

Date Defended: November 1, 2017

Abstract

The setting for this study was the XYZ school district in a small suburban area located near Kansas City, Missouri. A quantitative research design was used to determine if a relationship existed between a teacher's sense of self-efficacy and teacher's perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. Correlations were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between the variables. Overall, 55 teachers chose to participate and complete the survey. The results of the study revealed that teacher self-efficacy related to student engagement was connected to teacher perceptions of their evaluation. The results further indicated that there was not a correlation between teacher self-efficacy related to instructional practices and classroom management, and their perceptions of the evaluation system. These findings could imply that district and school leadership first look for ways to engage staff while incorporating the use of evaluative feedback so that teaching, learning, and student growth is achieved. Furthermore, these findings could imply that the evaluation model be revised to focus more in-depth on teacher performance evaluation measures. Lastly, these findings implicate that administrators and teachers need to be provided with professional development related to improving self-efficacy in instructional practices and classroom management.

Dedication

My dissertation is dedicated to my family, who positively encouraged me every step of the way. You made me want to pursue my goal of being the first person in our family, including grandparents, parents, siblings, aunts, uncles, and cousins, to complete a doctoral degree. To my husband, Travis, my high-school sweetheart and best friend, thank you for your constant words of encouragement and motivation to keep this journey going. There were days that I wanted to quit and give up, but you always knew what to say to keep me pushing through. Thank you for reminding that I can do this and for telling me how proud you are of me. To my daughters, Kylee and Baylee, thank you for being my inspiration to complete this program. Education is important. Kylee, I had a goal of finishing before you went to high school and guess what, I am finishing a year early because of you. Baylee, thank you for being my morning buddy when it came to working on my paper. You may not understand what I have been writing about all this time, but you did understand when I needed quiet time to work. You definitely loved to bargain with my quiet time in exchange for things you enjoyed doing. For both girls, your soccer and gymnastic practices each week were greatly appreciated. They allowed me the time that I needed to focus and write even when it meant sitting in the car for two hours. Now, I get to focus my time and attention on each of you and your strengths as players and performers. To my parents, I hope that my work makes you proud. Mom, I know that you are smiling down from heaven right now in awe of this accomplishment. To my in-laws, thank you for your continuous support along the way and for checking in regularly on my progress. I appreciate the times that you took the girls so that I could stay focused and finish my work, or taking them so I could enjoy a break.

Acknowledgements

The completion of my dissertation has required a tremendous amount of support from my family, friends, colleagues, and university advisors. I am eternally grateful for the positive encouragement and guidance that each of you gave to help me complete my doctoral degree. Without your help, I could not have finished this program or my dissertation.

To my family and friends, your love and support have shaped who I am today and what I aspire to become. Each of you holds a special place in my heart. This journey and accomplishment would not have been possible without your encouragement every step of the way. You have taught me that anything is possible if I set my mind to it.

To Dr. Susan Rogers, I am appreciative of your mentorship, knowledge, and guidance as my major advisor. Your thoughtful and timely feedback always propelled me to become a better writer; it improved the work contained within my dissertation. I was especially grateful for your timelines that kept me on track. I thank you for your commitment to me and my completion of the Baker Ed.D. program.

To Dr. Li Chen-Bouck, Dr. Peg Waterman, and Dr. Katie Hole, my research analysts, each of you spent time either at the beginning, middle, or end of my dissertation work and helped provide invaluable support, thoughtful feedback, and an understanding of statistical analyses along the way. My work is better because of each of you. To Dr. James Robins, thank you for taking the time to provide valuable feedback for my study and serving on my committee.

Finally, I am thankful to my amazing mentors, past and present, including my principals, Dr. Alisa Seidelman and Kimberly Mauck. I love working with both of you.

Your leadership and insight inspire me daily, to be a better educational leader for the district, staff, students, and families that I serve. You have never doubted me throughout this process, rather you encouraged me to realize that dreams do come true with persistence and perseverance. Thank you both for challenging me daily and for supporting my goals and aspirations. I have a great deal of respect and admiration for you both. Alisa, thank you for the serving on my committee.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

Teachers who complain about the evaluation process often do so because they believe that teacher evaluations systems do not reflect them and their abilities in the classroom (Noakes, 2009). Teacher perceptions of the evaluation process are that the systems can be subjective and flawed (Toch & Rothman, 2008). With the inception of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001, teachers have been held to stricter standards of teaching, which has resulted in new teacher evaluation models being developed and implemented (Ovando & Ramirez, 2007). These models were designed and "predicated on the improvement of educator practice" (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2013, p. 4). Teacher accountability is based on the premise that all students deserve highly-qualified teachers so that students develop to their fullest potential. Some Department of Education officials and lawmakers, in a number of states, believe that to determine good teaching, students should be evaluated based upon their yearly growth on district, state, and national assessments (Danielson, 2016). For example, in Missouri, the evaluation process is focused on a growth model for teachers, and it is the use of the growth model that "ultimately increases student performance" (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2013, p. 4). With the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2015), states are no longer required to set up this type of evaluation system rather, ESSA requires states to use different factors to determine high achieving schools (Klein, 2017). Factors for elementary schools must include reading and math achievement scores, and other achievement indicators such as

science or social studies assessment scores, English proficiency scores, and school quality scores (Klein, 2017).

Research has shown a correlation between the amount of effort a teacher is willing to provide during instruction and the teacher's level of perceived self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy & Hoy, 1998). Teachers, who feel they are effective in the classroom, often have a greater sense of self-efficacy about their instructional practices while teachers who often lack confidence in their performance have a lower sense of perceived self-efficacy (Artino, 2012). Teacher self-efficacy must be nurtured through feedback that is received during the teacher evaluation process (Randall, 1999). Meaningful teacher feedback should be well established in leading educators to develop instructional practices aimed at promoting student growth and achievement (Edelman, 2016). Feedback is crucial to teaching performance so that educators recognize the impact they have on student success (Tucker & Stronge, 2005).

Many states, including Missouri, are moving toward a growth model for teacher evaluation. Little research has been conducted to show the impact this model has on teacher self-efficacy (Becchio, 2016). While growth models have the potential to impact the instructional performance of teachers, administrators need to provide routine feedback that includes information from classroom observations such as areas of professional improvement (The New Teacher Project, 2009). Feedback from school leaders is essential to establishing professional learning relationships, and it could positively impact student learning and achievement (Patterson, 2012).

Background

The XYZ School District is a public school district that educates students in a small suburb of Kansas City, Missouri. During the 2016-2017 school year, approximately 5,500 students were enrolled in grades kindergarten through 12 (K-12). The district was comprised of six elementary buildings that housed students in grades Kindergarten through the sixth grade, one middle school/freshmen center that housed grades seven through nine, and one high school building that housed grades 10-12. During the 2016-2017 school year, the district employed approximately 400 teachers in grades K-12. Approximately 220 of those teachers taught at the K-6 level.

The 2016-2017 enrollment data for K-6 schools and the percentage of low socioeconomic (SES) and full pay students are found in Table 1. The data were gathered from Tyler Pulse: Enrollment Analysis Report (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2016a; XYZ School District, 2016). Students classified as low SES were students who received free or reduced meal prices. Low SES students appeared to be equally distributed across all buildings except school C.

Table 1

2016-2017 Socioeconomic Status for K-6 Schools in the XYZ School District

School	Total Enrollment	% Low SES
A	327	56.1
B	370	47.9
C	507	69.1
D	496	47.3
E	282	57.8
F	561	51.6
Total	2,543	55.1

Note. Adapted from *Tyler Pulse: Enrollment Analysis Report*, by XYZ School District, 2016. Retrieved on January 6, 2016 from the XYZ School District website.

Minority student enrollment data that were gathered during the open enrollment process in XYZ School District are found in Table 2. During open enrollment, parents identify students as being Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic/Latino, Multi-Racial, White, or Other. In Table 2, those identified as Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic/Latino, Multi-Racial, or Other were classified as Minority. Those identified as White were considered Non-Minority.

Table 2

2016-2017 Minority Status for K-6 Schools in the XYZ School District

School	Total Enrollment	% Minority	% Non-Minority
A	327	31.6	68.4
B	370	24.8	75.2
C	507	30.9	69.1
D	496	21.2	78.8
E	282	28.4	71.6
F	561	29.5	70.5
Totals	2,543	27.7	72.3

Note. Adapted from *Tyler Pulse: Enrollment Analysis Report*, by XYZ School District, 2016. Retrieved on January 6, 2016 from the XYZ School District website.

With the passage of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, schools were charged with ensuring the success of every child regardless of their abilities to perform academically. This focus on quality instruction and student accountability, through achievement measures, was the driving force behind the NCLB Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). With growing emphasis on NCLB mandates, states were tasked with identifying measures they could use to rate the effectiveness of all teaching staff. Under NCLB, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Request allowed individual districts to have some local control over what those measures of effectiveness meant for them (U. S. Department of Education, 2013a).

In Missouri, the work of developing better accountability standards began in 2010 when the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education started collaborating with the Missouri Advisory Council of Certification for Educators. Both

organizations joined in collaboration efforts, in hopes of developing standards, that effectively guided teacher preparation programs across the state of Missouri. In 2011, both organizations successful gained approval for Missouri's Model Teacher and Leader standards.

The Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES) was developed utilizing research-based practices of renowned practitioners including Marzano, Hattie, and Lemov (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2013). The Missouri State Board of Education approved this system in 2013. The foundation for this system included

> that evaluation processes are formative in nature and lead to continuous improvement; are aligned to standards that reflect excellence; build a culture of informing practice and promoting learning; and use multiple, balanced measurements that are fair and ethical. (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2013, p. 4)

The Missouri Educator Evaluation System is a shift away from the old paradigm of all teachers being evaluated the same way and moves towards closing gaps, improving student achievement, and the quality of instruction over time; evaluating as viewed through the eyes of growth. The XYZ School District adapted the Missouri Educator Evaluation System for their local evaluation process. Teacher growth is based on four levels of progression (emerging, developing, proficient, distinguished). Teachers are rated on these levels based upon their ability to effectively improve student learning. Teacher progression or improvement is demonstrated through classroom observations in

which teaching practices are observed. This model was developed as a tool to assist administrators in the growth and development of their teaching staff.

One aspect of effective teaching lies within a teacher's sense of self-efficacy. Not only does self-efficacy influence teacher motivation in the classroom, self-efficacy also helps inhibit teachers being able to affect changes in student achievement (Finnegan, 2013). A teacher's perceptions about their self-efficacy is also affected by the support by that teachers receive from their administrator (Finnegan, 2013). Weisel and Dror (2006) determined that a link existed between teacher self-efficacy and the relationship between a teacher and their administrator.

Statement of the Problem

Danielson and McGreal (2000) suggested that traditional approaches to teacher evaluations were no longer adequate. Goldrick (2002) believed that there was a long history of teacher evaluations not being used to improve student instruction. Evaluation tools, such as the Missouri Educator Evaluation System, may help school administrators discover new ways in which to provide evaluative feedback that can positively increase teacher self-efficacy. With the implementation of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System, it is important for building administrators to understand the relationship between their feedback and the effect of their feedback on teacher efficacy and performance. Understanding teacher perceptions of feedback could help provide evidence of support, or lack thereof, of improved teaching performance.

With the implementation of more rigorous teaching standards comes the belief that students will perform at higher levels when teaching practices are based on continuous improvement (Darling-Hammond, 2000). This level of success is seen

differently based on observations from the building administrator and the perception of the classroom teacher (Scheibenhofer, 2014).

With the Missouri Educator Evaluation System focusing more on the development and growth of teachers, questions arise about the reliability of this model for holding teachers accountable for implementing effective instructional practices (Tucker & Stronge, 2005). Questions also arise about how well this model truly measures accurate perceptions of teachers, based on their performance in the classroom, including student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management (Stephens, 2015). The perceived effectiveness of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System was important to study, as some teachers would have argued that the evaluative feedback that they receive is not a true reflection of how they view themselves and their abilities to affect student achievement.

Purpose of the Study

According to Marzano (2007), the level of student success in schools is influenced by the teacher's performance. This performance is dependent upon a teacher's sense of self-efficacy, which "has been shown to be a powerful construct related to student outcomes such as achievement" (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy & Hoy, 1998, p. 223). Teacher self-efficacy can be improved when building administrators focus on providing teacher feedback aimed at improving student engagement, classroom management, and instructional practices (Killian, 2010). The first purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. The second purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between teacher

self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. The third purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System.

Significance of the Study

With states placing greater emphasis on teacher evaluation processes, teachers must receive quality feedback aimed at promoting higher levels of teacher self-efficacy. Teachers who feel an increase in self-efficacy related to their performance will show a greater improvement in student achievement scores (Finnegan, 2013). The results of this study may not only add to the research on teacher evaluation but also could assist building administrators to identify techniques or delivery methods in which to provide evaluative feedback to teachers. Feedback, when given appropriately, may provide the administration with specific areas in which teacher improvement efforts can be focused. These efforts may positively influence a teacher's sense of self-efficacy. The results of this study could assist school districts in developing teacher evaluation models that promote the self- efficacy.

Delimitations

"Delimitations are self-imposed boundaries set by the researcher on the purpose and scope of the study" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 134). The boundaries used to limit the focus of this study were:

- K-6 teachers employed during the 2016-2017 school year in XYZ School District were surveyed for this study.

- Teacher perceptions were gathered from one survey that was an adaptation of the Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Response Survey (Killian, 2010) and the Teacher Sense of Self-Efficacy Scale Survey (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Assumptions

Assumptions based on research are certain beliefs thought to be true and recognized only as part of the research process (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008). The following were assumed:

- Participants understood and responded to the survey truthfully about their perceptual beliefs related to the Missouri Educator Evaluation System.
- Participants responded to the survey truthfully about their perceptual beliefs related to teacher self-efficacy.
- Participants were evaluated using the Missouri Educator Evaluation System at least one time during the 2016-2017 school year.
- Participants responded to the survey individually and not in partner pairs or small groups.

Research Questions

Research questions are the framework of a study and should be used as a guide for those who review it (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008). The following research questions guided this study:

RQ1. To what extent was there a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System?

RQ2. To what extent was there a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System?

RQ3. To what extent was there a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System?

Definition of Terms

In this section, key terms that were used throughout this study are identified and defined. These definitions are focused on those specific terms related to the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as well as those terms associated with teacher self-efficacy related to teaching performance. The definitions are provided to help the reader understand the scope of the research presented in this study.

Classroom management. Marzano and Marzano (2003) defined classroom management as researched-based strategies that, when used appropriately, foster a positive classroom environment. These strategies could affect student achievement, curriculum, as well as the community and culture of a school or classroom (Marzano and Marzano, 2003). Classroom management relates to clear expectations and procedures while having consequences for negative actions and behaviors (Marzano and Marzano, 2003).

Feedback. Wiggins (2012) described feedback as remarks made about the level of effort put forth, by an individual, to achieve a goal. Feedback has the power to influence a teacher's sense of self-efficacy (Organisation for Economic and Co-operation Development, 2013).

Instructional practices. Instructional practices are "teacher-directed and student-centered strategies to increase a student's involvement in and responsibility for their own learning" (Southern Regional Educational Board, 2001, p. 1).

Perception. Perception is a form of teacher self-efficacy in which one's beliefs, or "personal teaching competence" is influenced by one's experiences (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 233). Bandura (1993) stated that perception is prefaced on one's personal beliefs.

Self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined as a person's perceptual beliefs about their competence rather than their level of actual competence (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as either perceived which correlates to strong behavior, or "locus of control" which is a belief about the actions that affect the behavior.

Student engagement. Schlechty (2002) defined student engagement in terms of five levels; (a) students demonstrate a high commitment level to their work, it is relevant to them and has meaning; (b) students are extrinsically motivated to complete the work (c) students are compliant to avoid extrinsic consequences; (d) students are disengaged, but not causing a disruption to the learning process; and (e) students are refusing to complete the work and is causing a disruption to the learning process.

Organization of the Study

This study is comprised of five chapters. Chapter one included the introduction of the study, background information about XYZ School District, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, delimitations, assumptions, research questions, and definitions of terms. Chapter two is a review of the literature that includes a theoretical framework of teacher self-efficacy, teacher's self-efficacy and

student engagement, teacher's self-efficacy and classroom management, teacher's self-efficacy and instructional strategies, and teacher perceptions of evaluation systems including the Missouri evaluation system. Described in chapter three are the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and the limitations of this study. Chapter four contains a summary of the results, which includes the descriptive statistics and hypothesis testing appropriate to this study. Chapter five includes a study summary, findings related to literature, and conclusions.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Shoulders and Krei (2015) revealed that teachers who model an active sense of self-efficacy are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of effectiveness in the classroom, as they seek to improve student achievement. Shoulders and Krei (2015) also indicated that teachers who display a strong sense of self-efficacy often appear more confident in the classroom, and they promote high expectations for all students regardless of their learning ability or achievement level. These teachers not only adhere to their value and belief systems, they frequently seek out instructional practices that promote a positive climate and culture for learning. Included in this chapter are the theoretical framework of teacher self-efficacy, teacher's self-efficacy and student engagement, teacher's self-efficacy and classroom management, teacher's self-efficacy and instructional strategies, and teacher perceptions of evaluation systems including the Missouri evaluation system.

Theoretical Framework of Teacher Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is the "exercise of influence over one's own motivation, thought processes, emotional states and patterns of behavior" (Bandura, 1994, p. 71). Teachers who exhibit positive attitudes and beliefs toward their instruction promote a greater level of confidence in their students. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy influences one's behaviors, persistence, flexibility, and grit in given situations. Self-efficacy is defined as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute a course of action necessary to produce a given attainment" (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). According to Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998), self-efficacy is the confidence that one has to accomplish

given tasks rather than the consequence felt by someone else's actions. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) went on to further define teacher's self-efficacy "as a teacher's 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" (p. 773). Shaughnessy (2004) felt that "self-efficacy is the most useful self-schema for education because it relates to choices and actions that affect learning such as goal-setting, persistence, resilience, effort, and strategy" (p. 172). A teacher's sense of self-efficacy in the classroom is important because of the potential effect on student achievement. According to Abernathy-Dyer, Ortlieb, and Cheek (2013), "teacher beliefs in effectiveness consistently predict desired student outcomes" (p. 3).

Rotter (1966) conducted a study on the external factors that impact a teacher's ability to work with students exhibiting disruptive behaviors. Rotter sought to understand the correlation between a teacher's confidence level and their ability to control certain types of situations within their classrooms. His study, on internal versus external locus of control, brought about the RAND study, which was designed to evaluate the reading program used by the Los Angeles Unified School District. According to Armor et al. (1976), Rotter's study sought to determine whether student learning and motivation were a result of actions controlled by the teachers and the gains on the standardized reading assessment among minority students. The findings of his study indicated that reading achievement is positively influenced by "program content, implementation strategies, and classroom atmosphere" (as cited in Armor et al., 1976, p. 52). Armor et al. (1976) stated that through Rotter's study, it was determined that differentiating instructional resources

for every student, during reading time, along with efforts to training staff, yielded greater gains in reading instruction.

In 1976, the RAND organization reviewed a variety of reading programs while examining teacher efficacy levels related to student achievement in reading among minority students (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The results of the study indicated that there was a correlation between student performance and a teacher's sense of self-efficacy. As part of this study, teachers were asked to rate their level of agreement on two statements using a five-point Likert scale. The first item on the RAND survey focused on external factors such as the degree of violence, socioeconomic status, and influences of the home environment, or in the community (Armor et al., 1976). This concept would later be known as General Teacher Efficacy or GTE. The results indicated that teachers who were in strong agreement on item one, felt as though factors such as those listed above, negatively affected their ability to educate students effectively. The second item on the RAND survey showed that teachers who were in strong agreement with this item displayed a higher level of confidence in their disposition, which enabled them to work through factors making learning harder for some students. This concept would later be known as Personal Teacher Efficacy or PTE. Teachers who rated this item high felt strongly that they had the necessary skills and training to assist struggling learners effectively.

In a study conducted by Bandura (1977), the cognitive learning theory was conceptualized. Bandura's learning theory implied that there were two types of expectations that led to behavioral change. The first expectation was based on outcome and is related to self-efficacy and certain levels of performance. The second was efficacy

expectation that is related to external influences such as environmental elements, internal forces, external stimuli, or biological factors (Bandura, 1977). He further determined that a teacher's self-efficacy was personally or externally influenced by their attitude (Bandura, 1977). Efficacy expectations are considered actions that an individual believes he or she can do (Bandura, 1986). Outcome expectancy is when a person foresees the results of their actions on the outcome of their performance (Bandura, 1986). Bandura's (1986) results were based upon one's level of perceived ability. Bandura's work, according to Henson, Kogan, and Vacha-Haase (2001), supports the belief that our abilities have an impact on personal achievement or failure.

As an extension of Bandura's (1977) study, Gibson and Dembo (1984) developed an instrument to "measure teacher efficacy, provide construct validation support for the variable, and examine the relationship between teacher efficacy and observable teacher behaviors" (p. 569). This measurement tool combined the work of RAND and Bandura. Gibson and Dembo (1984) wrote the following:

> If we apply Bandura's theory to the construct of teacher efficacy, outcome expectancy would essentially reflect the degree to which teachers believed that environment could be controlled, that is, the extent to which students can be taught given such factors as family background, IQ, and school conditions. Self-efficacy beliefs would be teachers' evaluation of their abilities to bring about positive student change. (p. 570)

Researchers have used Gibson and Dembo's work to examine the correlation between a teacher's attitude or beliefs and increased student achievement. Teachers who display a greater sense of self-efficacy appear more willing to put forth time and energy

when it comes to working with struggling students. These teachers are often able to identify specific strategies related to their work with struggling learners and can de-escalate certain student situations with more confidence (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Tucker and Stronge (2003) stated that teachers who have a strong sense of self-efficacy in their belief to help students succeed, even when obstacles present themselves during learning, are equipped to promote student success by understanding the means necessary to achieve it. Furthermore, Tucker and Stronge (2003) stated: "without high quality evaluation systems, we cannot know if we have high quality teachers" (p. 3).

While there are different instruments claiming to be the best tool for measuring teacher self-efficacy, Bandura sought to expand on his research by looking at more than just single variables affecting efficacy beliefs among teachers. Bandura's measurement scale focused on the averages of scores from seven-subgroup domains: decision-making, influences of school resources, instruction, discipline, parent involvement, community involvement, and school climate (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). One adaptation of Bandura's scale was the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001). This scale encompassed three areas of teaching efficacy that included instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. Teachers were asked to respond to items using a nine-point rating system with a score of one being the anchor for "none at all," and a score of seven being the anchor for "quite a bit" (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, p. 235).

Teacher's Self-Efficacy and Student Engagement

Student learning is impacted when teachers engage their students in lessons aimed at increasing relevance, knowledge, and high expectations (Brown & Cocking, 2000). The way in which teachers understand their belief systems and values can provide meaningful information about their disposition as an instructional leader. Teachers who are aware of their instructional practices or teaching techniques have the potential to affect the learning processes of their students positively. Increased levels of rigor and engagement are necessary for student success to occur (Taylor & Parsons, 2011).

Goddard (2001) conducted a study in which he sampled "91 elementary schools within one large urban Midwestern school district" (p. 469). The focus of his study was on the relationship between social cognitive theory and student mastery experiences in urban elementary schools. Goddard (2001) determined that "mastery experience was found to be a predictor of differences between schools in teacher's collective efficacy perceptions" (p. 467). Goddard (2001) reported that when student performance levels were higher, teachers felt a greater sense of self-efficacy.

Using the Gibson and Dembo (1984) Teacher Efficacy Scale, Brouwers and Tomic (2003) mailed the Teacher Efficacy questionnaire to 540 participants. This questionnaire was used to determine the four domains of "teachers' aims and behaviours" (Brouwers & Tomic, 2003, p. 76). The four domains of efficacy that were represented by Brouwers and Tomic (2003) were classroom management efficacy, personal efficacy, outcome efficacy, and teaching efficacy. The results of their research indicated that when students demonstrated higher levels of performance, teachers were more likely to devote an ample amount of time and energy teaching in even the most stressful situations.

Classroom instruction can affect the level of student participation and engagement during classroom learning time (Brewster & Bowen, 2004; Finn & Voelkl, 1993; H. Marks, 2000; Skinner & Belmont, 1993). Students were more likely to participate in classroom activities when the teacher selected course content that incorporated high levels of student engagement (Connor, 2003; Prince, 2004). Levy and Peters (2002) conducted a similar study in which undergraduate students were surveyed either in first or second-year psychology courses and were administered a perceptual questionnaire about the best college courses. Students were asked about their perceptions based upon the course, the professor, and their role as a student in the class.

Klem and Connell (2004) suggested that higher achievement correlates to increased levels of engagement in the classroom. Klem and Connell (2004) analyzed student records and survey data from six elementary schools within an urban school district. The hope was to use the Student Performance and Commitment Index (SPCI) to identify the effects that student engagement in the classroom, has on later successes in schooling for students in urban educational settings. This survey specifically looked at student behavior and achievement data. Student records were studied to categorize students as having optimal levels of development or risk levels of development (Klem & Connell, 2004). Students were either at school and did well academically or they missed school and did poorly academically (Klem & Connell, 2004). While Klem and Connell's results were similar to Levy and Peter's (2002) results, both studies indicated that students were more likely to participate in classroom discussions and learning activities when regularly presented with hands-on learning opportunities. The results of this study provided evidence that a relationship exists between student engagement and student

achievement (Klem & Connell, 2004). Basow, Phelan, and Capotosto (2006) conducted a study on gender issues and its influence on "effective teaching" (p. 25). Two-hundred twenty undergraduate students were surveyed using a two-question survey. Study participants were asked to "Think of the best professor you've had in college and describe what made him or her the best in your opinion" (Basow et al., 2006, p. 27).

For teachers to increase the level of engagement in their classrooms, they must first be aware of factors that exist causing their students to disengage in their learning. Disengagement often occurs when there is an absence of the teacher providing positive motivation during active learning opportunities. According to Ravet (2007), teachers often perceived student engagement as reactive was made worse due to influences such as family, peers, school, and the development, or lack of personal relationships. Teachers might argue that disengagement such as this occurs due to increased pressure on them to implement more rigorous teaching standards along with an increasing number of students needing more differentiated levels of support in their learning (Persinski, 2015).

Li and Learner (2013) conducted a study in which they assessed the relationship between the emotional, cognitive, and behavioral engagement of students in high school to determine whether there was a connection between each of these areas over time. Li and Learner (2013) sought to determine whether a correlation existed between each of the three variables and the effect each variable had on the development of students. While they noted that the results of previous research had suggested each variable does rely on one another, their research established that cognitive and emotional engagement were the most dependent on each other. A significant relationship was not found between cognitive engagement and behavioral engagement of students over time (Li & Learner,

2013). They felt strongly that in order "to maximize the schooling experience of all youth, educators and practitioners need to devote effort to create nurturing and developmentally appropriate school environments, so students are emotionally connected to school activities and personnel" (Li & Lerner, 2013, p. 31).

Schools must consider the effects of teacher self-efficacy and its relationship to student engagement. Not only does this set the tone for positive learning experiences to occur, but also higher levels of student achievement can be the result (Appleton, Christenson, & Furlong, 2008). Psychological factors such as the culture and climate of a classroom set the tone for increased levels of engagement to occur (Dotterer & Lowe, 2011).

Chandler (2014) conducted a study in which he sought to determine if the ways in which teachers have the ability to engage their students was affected by their collective efficacy beliefs. Specifically, his study used previously collected data from the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project from 262 teachers in a large urban school district located in the United States. Chandler's (2014) research focused on teacher perceptions about their collective efficacy beliefs and how professional development, building leadership, and evaluative feedback affected student engagement. Through this research, Chandler (2014) determined that professional development was a significant predictor of teacher collective efficacy in student engagement. Consistent with Chandler (2014), Brinson and Steiner (2007) have suggested that when schools maintain a focus on instructional practices through the use of professional development opportunities, teacher effectiveness is greater. In addition, when teachers are provided with professional

development activities aimed at instructional practices, teacher self-efficacy is likely to be greater (Ross & Bruce, 2007).

Persinski (2015) conducted a similar study to Li and Learner in which he researched eleventh-grade end of course (EOC) exams from a school district in the Piedmont region of South Carolina. He sought to determine the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and student engagement. According to Persinski (2015), results indicated, "the creation of a quality learning environment that is emotionally stable facilitates student engagement and therefore student achievement" (p. 23). His research is consistent with that of Li and Learner (2013) in which they indicated, "caring school environments in turn motivate students not only to try harder but also commit to go further" (p. 31).

Similar to Chandler (2014), A. Marks (2016) conducted a study in which she explored whether there was an association between teacher self-efficacy and teacher perceptions of the Illinois teacher evaluation. Elementary teachers from two suburban school districts were surveyed (A. Marks, 2016). Study results indicated "teachers who reported using a high-quality teacher evaluation process also reported greater levels of self-efficacy" (A. Marks, 2016, Abstract). Furthermore, when it came to the evaluation tool that was used, there was not a connection between the tool and self-efficacy in student engagement and classroom management; however, there was a connection reported between the evaluation tool and self-efficacy in instructional practices (A. Marks, 2016).

Teacher's Self-Efficacy and Instructional Practices

Schools are often faced with the challenge of determining the most appropriate form of instruction for their students. Schools not only have to consider whole group methods versus individual methods, but must also focus on ways in which to increase the level of student engagement so that all students are involved in the learning process. Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences is just one example of this. In his book, Gardner (1993) invited educators to consider ways in which students get excited about their learning. His theory considers that students are very different in how they learn (Gardner, 1993). Students have different learning styles, and their learning should be based on individual interests and needs of the entire classroom as a whole (Gardner, 1993).

When teachers exhibit high levels of teacher self-efficacy, according to Wilson and Wineburg (1988), they are more likely to adapt to given classroom situations and to keep students continually engaged in their learning. While research supports the positive impact that instructional strategies have on student achievement, according to Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000), "there is no universal best teaching practice" (p. 22). Tomlinson (2000) purported the importance of teachers using a variety of instructional strategies and techniques to meet the needs of students so that the impact on student learning is greater. Teaching efficacy related to instructional strategies is focused on the types of instructional methods that teachers use to differentiate lessons and activities based on the needs of students in their classrooms (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Marzano and Marzano (2003) stated that instructional strategies are the single, most important factor related to student achievement. Effective use of instructional strategies requires that teachers have high levels of confidence in their capacity to instruct students effectively. Marzano and Marzano (2003) reported when teachers effectively implement instructional strategies, student achievement gains of 53% could be attained compared to 14% gains of least effective teachers. With the rigors of educational standards continuing to rise and the focus on deeper content understanding is more demanding, it becomes critical for teachers to be equipped with knowing multiple ways to present instruction. Teachers should focus on understanding multiple ways for students to work out problems in the classroom rather than one way for completing their work (Leinwand & Fleishman, 2004).

With the implementation of instructional strategies comes the barriers that teachers feel inhibit the success of instruction in their classrooms (Schmoker, 2006). Such obstacles have included a lack of time and training necessary to implement instructional strategies, large class sizes, inadequate curriculum and resources, and a lack of support from fellow team teachers (Western Michigan University Science and Mathematics Program Improvement, 2001; Henderson & Dancy, 2007). Spellings (2007) affirmed that teachers are important to schools and helping to close the achievement gap. She wrote, "They must be equipped with the most current, research-based instructional tools to help them do their jobs" (Spellings, 2007, p. 11). Schmoker and Allington (2007) noted that underachieving students showed observed academic improvement when provided with consistent instruction using instructional strategies for three consecutive years. According to Dyer, Ortlieb, and Cheek (2013), teachers who display a

greater sense of self-efficacy in the classroom have the ability to foster improved student self-efficacy, especially with lower performing students. According to Gibson and Dembo (1984), teachers that feel a greater sense of self-efficacy spend more time monitoring their students' progress and appear more engaged during instructional activities.

Teachers should learn to differentiate lesson designs and strategies so that they meet the needs of all students, individually, rather than just the whole group (Tamilselvi & Geetha, 2015). Thomas and Green (2015) agreed that it is important for teachers to be able to address the needs of their students by aligning the instructional strategies with what is developmentally appropriate for individual students. Thomas and Green (2015) stated that is critical for teachers to be able to implement strategies and know how and when to use them. Thomas and Green (2015) conducted a study with seven schools located in the Southeastern part of the United States. The purpose of their research was to determine the frequency that all seven schools utilized Marzano's 21 researched-based strategies and to determine whether the school's frequency of using the strategies had an impact on their overall effectiveness rating. While Thomas and Green (2015) revealed that it is important "for teachers to be situational in their application of instructional strategies," their research provided little to no significant bearing on whether a school's effectiveness rating was higher, depending on the frequency in their use of Marzano's strategies (p. 16). Thomas and Green (2015) determined that,

> As standards, competencies, and accountability measures are reviewed and refined, emphases will necessarily have to be placed on assessing students' needs, aligning instructional strategies with those needs, engaging students in their own

> learning, and focusing professional development on the instructional needs of teachers. (p. 15)

Results of Thomas and Green's (2015) study concluded that when teachers employ instructional strategies in their classroom, they should choose strategies based on specific needs of students and the circumstances related to teaching progressions as they occur.

Teacher's Self-Efficacy and Classroom Management

Teaching experience and professional development related to classroom management have the potential to increase the level of confidence that a teacher has when working with students who display challenging behaviors. The tone of the learning environment is an example of one way in which teacher self-efficacy contributes to "positive reinforcement and desired outcomes" (Abernathy et al., 2013, p. 3). Student behaviors can be affected when the right conditions for learning are not available. Abernathy et al. (2013) stated, "A learned behavior often cannot be performed unless there is the right environment" (p. 3).

Woolfolk-Hoy and Hoy (1990) determined that a teacher's level of confidence influenced the teacher's effectiveness; however, there was not a correlation between a teacher's level of confidence and specific management techniques used to address student behaviors. The results of Stronge, Ward, and Grant's (2011) study of fifth grade teachers in the Southeastern United States indicated that teachers who confidently manage their classrooms often demonstrated a greater sense of self-efficacy leading to increased motivation in their classrooms. Motivation by the teacher is critical to effectively managing a classroom (Strong et al., 2011). Teacher self-efficacy is a predictor a teacher's level of effectiveness as it relates to classroom management (Gordon, 2001).

The level of teacher self-efficacy does affect how a teacher responds to different student situations. According to Gibson and Dembo (1984), teachers that displayed higher levels of self-efficacy were less likely to react in a negative way to difficult student behaviors. Furthermore, the results of Capara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, and Steca's (2003) study involving 2,184 Italian junior high school teachers suggested that when teachers have higher levels of perceived self-efficacy, they are more resilient when it comes to meeting the needs of challenging student behaviors. Gibson and Dembo (1984) and Capara et al. (2003) found that a correlation does exist between teacher satisfaction in their positions and the amount of effort they are willing to put forth in high-pressure student situations. Successful teachers are more likely to work with struggling students and are more motivated to manage the day-to-day disruptions within the learning environment (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

Lower levels of perceived self-efficacy can negatively affect positive student outcomes (McDaniel & Dibella-McCarthy, 1989). Teacher efficacy can be diminished when students fail to meet expectations set by the classroom teacher (McDaniel & Dibella-McCarthy, 1989). The lack of perceived success in the classroom could be correlated to a teacher lacking the understanding of being able to choose and use appropriate learning strategies to ensure positive student outcomes (Capara et al., 2003). Cochran-Smith (2002) explained that well-prepared teachers are vital to ensuring high-quality learning is taking place in the classroom. This knowledge is detrimental to skill development of all students (Cochran-Smith, 2002). According to Morris-Rothschild and Brassard (2006), personal teacher self-efficacy affects the behavior of the teacher's performance in the classroom. Teachers with high levels of perceived teaching efficacy

have shown greater influence on motivating their students to succeed, through engaging learning opportunities (Smitta Dibapilo, 2012).

The results of research studies continue to reveal differences in how teachers supervise and organize personal instruction leading to a relationship between classroom management and student engagement. Shaukat and Muhammad (2012) surveyed 108 male teachers and 90 female teachers from Model Town Lahore to examine teacher self-efficacy and its relationship to classroom management. The purpose of their study was to evaluate the efficacy beliefs of teachers in relation to given variables such as age, gender, and qualifications. Each participant was asked to rate their views using the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale. Each participant rated themselves on the following three subscales: "Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Strategies, and Efficacy in Classroom Management" (Shaukat & Muhammad, 2012, p. 83). First, there was a noticeable difference between elementary and secondary teachers when it came to classroom management (Shaukat & Muhammad, 2012). Elementary teachers demonstrated greater control when managing their classrooms. According to Shaukat and Muhammad (2012), one reason for such difference could be the belief that secondary teachers hold greater responsibilities in their roles, including required leadership and after school duties. Simply stated, classroom management is not easy (Smitta Dibapilo, 2012). Shaukat and Muhammad (2012) also considered whether age was a related factor to better classroom management. Results of their study revealed evidence to support that younger teachers were often found to excel in management skills compared to peers who were older (Shaukat & Muhammad, 2012). Similarly, the same held true that male teaching staff far exceeded their female counterparts in self-efficacy in classroom

management. Finally, the results of this study revealed differences between temporary teaching staff and staff that have been permanently teaching in the same position for an extensive amount of time. Temporary teaching staff often displayed greater student engagement that led to improved classroom management (Shaukat & Muhammad, 2012). This finding by Shaukat and Muhammad (2012) was attributed to the fact that tenured teachers often feel more secure in their roles whereas they do not have to prove their level of performance to those around them. Temporary teachers on the other hand, often try harder to prove their performance.

While further research is necessary related to teacher self-efficacy for classroom management, available research supports that increased levels of teacher self-efficacy is greater when "a sense of personal efficacy becomes related to beliefs about control only after some years of experience in the classroom" (Woolfolk Hoy, Rosoff, & Hoy, 1990, p. 146). While some findings indicated there is a connection to better management structures and styles, teachers with low teaching self-efficacy lack the knowledge and skillset to manage difficult student behaviors (Woolfolk Hoy, Rosoff, & Hoy, 1990).

History of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation systems have continued to evolve over the course of the last 60 years. According to Stronge (2006), teacher evaluation should be "first, about documenting the quality of teacher performance; then, its focus shifts to helping teachers improve their performance as well as holding them accountable for their work" (p. 1). Goe, Bell, and Little (2008) summarized similar thinking related to Stronge about how teacher effectiveness should be determined by evidence or proof of professional practice

rather than how well students are performing. Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, and Keeling (2009) stated,

> an evaluation system should identify and measure individual teachers' strengths and weaknesses accurately and consistently, so that teachers get the feedback they need to improve their practice and so that schools can determine how best to allocate resources and provide support. (p. 10)

While evaluation systems were meant to improve teacher performance, the reality exists that quality teaching is not acknowledged, growth is ignored, and weak teaching performance fails to be addressed (Weisberg et al., 2009, p. 10).

Beginning as early as the 1950s, school districts were challenged with developing standards for measuring teacher effectiveness. According to Goe, Holdheide, and Miller (2011), teacher evaluation was more the responsibility of individual school districts. In the early 1950s, teacher evaluation was based on individual character traits that were thought to be possessed by model teachers (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Although there was no evidence to support a link between one's character traits and increased student achievement, teachers during this time were evaluated based upon their level of enthusiasm in the classroom, tone of voice, outward appearances, and emotional stability around their students, other staff members, and the community (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). During this era, major shifts in education became crucial. The one significant change that came from this era was a greater emphasis on teacher observation.

The early 1960s brought the development of a clinical evaluation type system for teacher appraisal. While teachers were charged with the task of selecting their professional areas of focus, it was the responsibility of building supervisors or

administration, to determine the level of progress that was made in meeting professional improvement goals (Wood & Pohland, 1983). Donaldson & Stobbe (2000) wrote that this type of teacher evaluation was collaborative and encouraged ongoing professional dialogue. During this era, more responsibility was assigned to a building administrator as the teacher supervisor. Though observational practice was mostly limited to classroom drop-ins and observations, there was limited formal feedback provided to the teacher during this time to help improve educator practice. By the end of this era, a majority of school administrators were using this type of model for teacher evaluation. This model was the basis for one of the biggest efforts related to management of teachers (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011).

The 1980s continued to bring about improvements related to clinical supervision models that were used as a tool to improve teacher effectiveness. Though this model originated from the clinical supervisory model most notably used with nursing school students, Goldhammer was one of the first to develop a clinical supervisory model specific for teachers. His model continued to emphasize specific phases, or steps, to "involve teachers and supervisors in a reflective dialogue" (Marzano et al., 2011, p. 18). Goldhammer's phases, according to Marzano et al. (2011), included (a) pre-observation conference, (b) classroom observation, (c) analysis, (d) a supervision conference, and (e) analysis of the analysis.

During this era, Hunter's work began to surface and become widely known. Though she is most noted for her contributions to lesson plan design, she was instrumental in her work with supervision (Marzano et al., 2011). Hunter's supervisory practices emphasized aligning instructional behaviors of the teacher to specific research-

based strategies. Evaluations using Hunter's model "resulted from a series of instructional conferences supportable by objective evidence rather than based on subjective opinion" (Hunter, 1984, p. 409).

About this same time, many other education practitioners began to evolve with their model of differentiation. Differentiation came from the evaluative process based upon what different teachers need. According to Marzano et al. (2011), Glatthorn emphasized this model, which allows teacher control over professional development. The McGreal model emphasized intensive evaluative programming aimed at continued employment (Marzano et al., 2011). Glickman was another researcher that encouraged administrators to focus their efforts with teachers on instruction (Marzano et al., 2011). "This era also set the stage for an emphasis on teacher evaluation" (Marzano et al., 2011, p. 22).

It was not until the late 1990s that Danielson's work became the prominent focus for what supervision and evaluation continue to align with today. The Danielson (2007) model includes four specific domains in which teaching can be categorized. The domains are "(a) Planning and Preparation, (b) The Classroom Environment, (c) Instruction, and (d) Professional Responsibilities" (Danielson, 2007, p. 1). She refers to her work as a "road map through the territory, structured around a shared understanding of teaching" (Danielson, 2007, p. 2). Her Framework for Teaching has been used as a model for teachers "to improve their effectiveness and help their colleagues do so as well" (Danielson, 2007, p. 2).

The 21st century has brought about stricter standards for district and teacher accountability. Teacher evaluation processes have shifted away from the supervision of

teaching staff towards placing greater emphasis on linking student achievement to educator performance (Raiber, 2012). Marzano (2012) stated, "We are entering a new era of teacher evaluations. The expectation is that all teachers can increase their expertise from year to year and thereby produce gains in student achievement, with a powerful cumulative effect" (p. 6). Changes during this century focus more on teacher strengths and weaknesses. Attention has been placed on coaching teaching staff while providing specifically targeted feedback (Taylor & Tyler, 2011). This model promotes authentic feedback as a way for teachers to grow continually in their craft of teaching. According to Marzano (2012), "as teachers become better teachers, their students become better students" (p. 23). With standards of education constantly changing, teachers are becoming more pressured to prove that they are knowledgeable and can handle the rigors of an ever-changing system.

Teacher Perceptions of Evaluation Systems

Regardless of a student's ability level, teachers are expected to model instruction and provide support to their students, more so now than has been expected of them in the past. This prevailing change has increased teachers' level of awareness regarding educational standards and the principles that encompass their work with students (Coulter, 2013). Today's teaching standards are more focused on the impact of teacher effectiveness in relation to student achievement (Coulter, 2013). Morelock (2008) stated that if teacher performance is influenced by student achievement, evaluation systems should be comprehensive and collective regarding determining overall teacher effectiveness.

Taylor (1989) purported that primitive evaluation systems emphasized amenable responsibilities, which teachers found beneficial when going through the observations and post conference with their administrator. Taylor (1989), in his study of 233 teachers from two suburban school districts in Portland, Oregon, found that a relationship did exist between the significance that teachers placed on the evaluation process and the characteristics contained within the evaluation system itself. Teachers indicated that feedback was better received when a working relationship with their evaluator existed leading to a greater level of commitment, dependence, mutually agreed upon goals, as well as feedback was correlated to a teacher's increased sense of self-efficacy in the classroom (Taylor, 1989).

Coleman (1992) conducted a similar study to determine if a teacher's attitude towards their evaluation was directly related to their evaluator and the type of evaluation tool used to measure their teaching performance. Two hundred twenty-five teachers in four districts in southeast Phoenix were included in this study. Findings implied that "teachers who trust and respect their evaluator are more likely to benefit from the evaluation process" (Coleman, 1992, p. 117).

Through a study of a rural Missouri public school, Zalis (2001) sought to determine what evidence existed from the teacher evaluation process that led to educator growth. Zalis (2001) found, that when a relationship was present between a teacher and their administrator, teachers often perceived the evaluation system to be effective and impactful to their performance in the classroom. The results of the study indicated that most teachers had positive perceptions about the evaluation process and felt that evaluative feedback was beneficial (Zalis, 2001).

McCall (2011) sampled 234 teachers from two high schools in Indiana of which 130 participated in the study. McCall (2011) determined that "When teachers feel as if they can make a difference in areas of teaching such as instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement, student achievement can increase" (p. 87). Furthermore, McCall (2011) determined through his research that a teacher's sense of self-efficacy is greater the more involved they are in the evaluation process.

Curran (2014) conducted a study with 94 participants, from 14 North Texas elementary schools, that was aimed at understanding the value of feedback related to teacher self-efficacy in in-service teachers. The types of feedback provided by administration that positively or negatively shaped teachers' attitudes towards the evaluation process were addressed. Curran (2014) found that there was a correlation between a teacher's view of the evaluation process and the feedback they received that positively impacted their sense of self-efficacy. Throughout this study, "the participants stated on several occasions that they perceive a need for feedback data to be very specific" (Curran, 2014, p. 109). Participants stated that when there is a lack of feedback, they are left to make assumptions about their teaching.

Studies such as the one conducted in Fort Zumwalt, Missouri, showed a strong agreement amongst study participants that the current educational system has many flaws (Tripamer, 2013). Teachers indicated varying levels of frustration when it came to Missouri's evaluation model particularly related to "lack of quality feedback some teachers received from their principals, especially when they are trying to grow as professionals" (Tripamer, 2013, p. 33). Teachers argued that Missouri standards are lengthy and require a significant amount time and preparation to complete, but in the end,

it all is subjective (Tripamer, 2013). One teacher from Fort Zumwalt shared that "if you have a good relationship with your administrator, then you'll probably end up with a better evaluation" (Tripamer, 2013, p. 34).

While some studies have indicated that there is a lack of growth in teacher performance, based on evaluative standards, Katnik (2014) conducted a pilot project in which he measured participant growth over selected quality indicators as part of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. The findings of this study supported that "growth in professional performance did occur throughout the pilot project" (p. 57). Furthermore, Katnik (2014) sought to collect teachers' perceptions about their personal experiences, and the level of support teachers felt they received from their administration throughout the evaluation process. Study participants commented that they felt their growth plans, while geared towards increasing student achievement, did allow them to obtain the help and necessary resources to continue to grow professionally as an educator (Katnik, 2014).

In a study conducted by Albanese (2014), veteran teacher self-efficacy was analyzed based upon leadership styles of administration as a factor supporting teacher performance. Teachers that feel more confident in their use of instructional strategies are more likely to report that they feel a greater sense of self-efficacy in their classrooms (Albanese, 2014). These teachers are also more likely to set higher expectations for students.

Ladd (2016) discovered similar findings through her research of approximately 1,100 K-12 teachers from suburban school districts in or around Monmouth and Ocean Counties, New Jersey. Ladd (2016) found that professional development related to evaluation criteria is essential so that teachers recognize a correlation between teaching

practices and improved student performance. Furthermore, Ladd (2016) stated, "because indicators are aligned to practices that are highly effective in improving student achievement, teachers need to be held accountable for implementing instructional practices in the classroom" (p. 114). In Weisberg et al. (2009), reported that teacher evaluation systems often lack consistency in identifying teacher competencies that focus on student performance using evaluative feedback. These teachers are also more likely to set higher expectations for students.

According to Pisciotta (2014), as teacher accountability continues to grow so does the impact of evaluation tools on teacher self-efficacy beliefs. Teacher evaluations can only be effective when teachers and administrators work together to improve classroom instruction and provide professional development to staff that are identified as underperforming as well as those that are identified as high performing (Sheppard, 2013). Teachers that feel a greater sense of self-efficacy in their teaching abilities "can make a difference in areas of teaching such as instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement" (Pisciotta, 2014, p. 87). Teachers that feel a sense of worth and value towards their teaching will have greater efficacy beliefs towards their profession (Pisciotta, 2014). Teachers that receive frequent observations along with formative goal-setting conferences are more likely to display a greater sense of self-efficacy compared to peers who are subjected to more traditional evaluative processes (Pisciotta, 2014). With greater demands being placed on teachers and students, it becomes important for leaders to look for ways to engage their staffs so that teaching and learning can be positively impacted and student growth achieved (Guenzler, 2016). When teachers feel supported through building leadership, teachers have a heightened sense of self-efficacy in their

teaching practices (Guenzler, 2016). Teacher evaluations can only be effective when teachers and administrators work together to improve classroom instruction and provide professional development to staff that underperforming as well as high performing (Sheppard, 2013).

Summary

The content in this chapter provided the theoretical framework for teacher self-efficacy. The research related to historical influences on teacher evaluations was presented including the effects of teacher self-efficacy on student engagement, classroom management, and instructional strategies. Finally, research was presented that considered the historical perspectives of teacher evaluation systems. The research included teacher perceptions about current and former evaluation systems along with specific research linked to the current Missouri Educator Evaluation System. Chapter three includes specific information related to the methodology used in this study.

Chapter Three

Methods

This study was conducted to determine if a teacher's sense of self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management was related to their perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. Chapter three includes research design, selection of participants and measurement. Additionally, this chapter includes the data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and the limitations.

Research Design

A quantitative research design guided this study. Specifically, a correlational study using survey data was conducted. Elementary teachers who were evaluated using the Missouri Educator Evaluation System in District XYZ were administered a survey to determine if a relationship existed between a teacher's sense of self-efficacy and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. Variables for this study included the perceptions of teachers related to their sense of self-efficacy in student engagement, classroom management, instructional practices, and perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System.

Selection of Participants

Per Lunenburg and Irby (2008), "purposive sampling involves selecting a sample based on the researcher's experience or knowledge of the group sampled" (p. 175). The sample selected for this study were K-6 elementary teachers, who completed at least one observation with their administrator in the XYZ School District and taught core subject areas, which included English Language Arts (ELA), mathematics, science, social

studies, or special classes that included fine arts, physical education, or library media were included in this study. Teachers chosen for this study were certified and had knowledge of the district's evaluation process and procedures related to the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. The potential sample size for this study was approximately 140 certified staff members in grades K-6.

Measurement

In the following sections, two surveys are described in depth. Participants in the current study were administered one survey, which was a combination of two distinct surveys. The first survey, the Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Response Survey (Killian, 2010), was modified and used in this study. The second survey utilized was the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Response Survey. This survey was used to focus on the variables related to RQ1-RQ3 regarding teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. Scores from the Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Response Survey (see Appendix A) were used to measure a teacher's perceived performance related to evaluative criteria provided by building administration. Evaluative criteria related to the Missouri Educator Evaluation system included

> causing students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom; helping students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems; helping students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society; use of various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction; providing continuous feedback to students and family; assisting students in the development

> of self-assessment skills; aligning the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides; using assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students; demonstrating appropriate preparation for instruction; choosing and implementing appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners; creating a positive learning environment; effectively manage student behaviors; communicating effectively with students, parents, community, and staff; engaging in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff; engaging in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state; engage in professional development; adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district; assisting in maintaining a safe and orderly environment; collaborating in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals; providing the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement; modeling the behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement; providing the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community; and causing students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas. (p. 15)

The Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Response Survey, developed by Killian (2010), is a 28-item survey based on the Missouri Performance Based Teacher Evaluation

Model, which in 2013 became known as the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. For this study, the Performance Based Teacher Evaluation survey was modified to 25-items. Questions 2, 27, and 28 were not used as part of this study. Question 2 related to identifying the student population of the schools where the teachers taught. This question does not relate to the outcome of this research study. Question 27 and 28 from the original survey were not used as they were constructed response items and for this study; only Likert-type rating scales were used. The final version of the survey used to collect data for this study included 25 of the original 28 items. The teachers evaluated each item using embedded anchor responses on a Likert-type rating scale from one to six (*1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Disagree, 4=Somewhat Agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly Agree*).

A reliability analysis was not needed because a scale was not constructed from the survey items. The researcher used single-item measurement.

> Most commonly used single-item measures can be divided into two categories: (a) those measuring self-reported facts ... and (b) those measuring psychological constructs, e.g., aspects of personality ... measuring the former with single items is common practice. However, using a single-item measure for the latter is considered to be a "fatal error" in research. If the construct being measured is sufficiently narrow or is unambiguous to the respondent, a single item may suffice. (Sackett & Larson, 1990, p. 631)

Therefore, a pilot study was conducted using a panel of eight Missouri teachers who were knowledgeable of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. Participants in the pilot study were asked to review questions from the original survey and consider the following

criteria when reviewing the survey: (1) Is the wording of the items clear and easy to understand; (2) suggestions for revising the items to make them more understandable to participants; (3) based on your knowledge and expertise; and (4) do the items seem to measure teacher perceptions about the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. Participants rated the clarity and validity of each survey item at a six or a seven on a scale of one through seven. Based on the feedback received, it was decided that the wording of the questions in this survey would not be changed or modified.

TSES. This survey, also known as the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (OSTES), was used to focus on the variables related to RQ1-RQ3 in order to gain insight into the types of things that pose challenges for teachers related to perceived self-efficacy in student engagement, perceived self-efficacy in instructional strategies, and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. The TSES (see Appendix B), developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001), is a 24-item Likert-type rating scale aimed at obtaining teachers' perceptions about factors related to instructional practices, classroom management, and student engagement. Scores from the TSES were adapted from the Bandura Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (BTS-ES) which utilized a similar Likert-type rating scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Respondents were asked to rate 24 items related to teacher beliefs and their perceived self-efficacy about their performance as a teacher. A rating of 1 indicated that the respondent strongly disagreed with the item and felt that the item had no value in relation to their perceived experience. A rating of 3 or 4 indicated that the respondent was neutral while a rating of a 6 or greater indicated that the respondent felt strongly about this question in relation to them, personally, and their experiences as a classroom teacher *(1 = none at all, 2 = none at*

all/very little, 3 = very little, 4 = very little/some degree, 5 = some degree, 6 = some degree/quite a bit, 7 = quite a bit, 8 = quite a bit/a great deal, 9=a great deal). Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) created the following three subscales: self-efficacy in student engagement (measured by items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 22); self-efficacy in instructional strategies (measured by items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24); and self-efficacy in classroom management (measured by items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21). The three subscales, not the survey as a single 24-item scale were used to examine the three variables. The subscales scores were calculated based on the unweighted means of each survey item.

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) examined their Teachers' Self-Efficacy Scale in three studies. In the first study, 224 participants completed the 52-item survey (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The results of this study found that all 52-items were equally "important to critical for effective teaching" (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001, p. 797). Survey items with load values of .60 or greater resulted in additional testing being conducted (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Thirty-one survey items fell within this range resulting in a total of 32-items being sent for further testing for the second part of this study.

In the second study, 217 participants were asked to evaluate the 32-item survey (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Through factor analysis and reliability testing, results indicated that there was a 63% variation in participant scores (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Eight factors were detected as a result of the analysis. These factors were noted as producing eigenvalues greater than one (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Further analysis was conducted that eliminated factor solutions with low values.

Through these results, the scale was further reduced to 18 questions. This study resulted in 18 items being labeled into the following subscales: efficacy for student engagement, efficacy for instructional strategies, and efficacy for classroom management with a reliability of 0.95. (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Due to weaknesses noted in classroom management with strengths identified in student engagement and instructional practices, a third study was proposed (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Table 3

Reliability Subscale Score for Study 2

Subscale	No. of items	Cronbach's alpha coefficient
Engagement	8	0.82
Instruction	7	0.81
Management	3	0.72

Note. Obtained from the research results provided by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001

The 18 items were further examined through a factor analysis (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The reliability was measured at .95. According to Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001), participants were asked to respond to not only the OSTES scale, but also the "RAND Items, the Hoy and Woolfolk 10-item adaptation of the Gibson and Dembo TES, the pupil control ideology form, and the work alienation scale" (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, p. 798). Findings of the second study were conclusive with validity measures being positive with weaknesses noted in management (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). These results led to enhancements made for Study 3.

According to Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001), study three limited the scope of the Ohio State Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (OSTES). Three researchers agreed that while the second instrument was deemed reliable, there were concerns with the factor related to classroom management. Rather than eliminating this altogether, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), decided that it was best to write more questions to "capture this potentially important dimension of teacher efficacy" for study three (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001, p. 798).

The third study involved a sample of 410 participants from three different universities. Participants were asked to take surveys using the OSTES long form of 24 items and the OSTES short form of 12 items. Reliability measures for this study indicated that the OSTES was a reliable and valid tool (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Table 4

The Reliability Subscale for Study 3

Subscale	No. of items	Cronbach's alpha coefficient
Engagement	12	.87
Instruction	15	.91
Management	9	.90

Note. Obtained from the research results provided by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001

According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), "the strongest correlations between the OSTES and other measures are with scales that assess personal teacher efficacy" (p. 801). While scales such as the RAND and Gibson and Dembo instruments were thought to focus more on student behaviors, the OSTES scale is said to capture what efficacy is by

including a broader range of teaching responsibilities (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Data Collection Procedures

Before data collection began, consent from XYZ School District was sought through email submission of a research proposal. This request was made to the superintendent of XYZ School District. An email with consent to conduct this study was conditionally approved on November 30, 2015, with the understanding that individual and identifiable names would not be shared (see Appendix C). Next, permission was obtained to use the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) on December 17, 2015, and the Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Response Survey on December 21, 2015. In July of 2016, an application to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Baker University was then requested for permission to conduct the study (see Appendix D) and to begin data collection once approval was granted (see Appendix E).

Upon request from the Human Resource Director of the XYZ School District, certified teaching staff contact information was received. During March and April 2017, emails were sent to potential participants. All responses from participants were collected electronically using the online survey tool, SurveyMonkey. Completion of the survey indicated consent to participate. Initial requests to complete the survey were sent in March 2017 with one follow-up request sent in April 2017. Electronic results were collected and stored using the SurveyMonkey database. Respondents' data were uploaded into IBM® SPSS® Statistics Faculty Pack 24 for Windows.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

The current study used quantitative methods of data analysis. The quantitative analysis focused on three research questions. Each question is presented below with the

hypothesis followed by the hypothesis testing method.

RQ1. To what extent was there a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System?

H1. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms.

H2. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

H3. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

H4. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

H5. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family.

H6. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

H7. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

H8. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students.

H9. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

H10. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

H11. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers create a positive learning environment.

H12. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors.

H13. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

H14. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

H15. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

H16. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development.

H17. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

H18. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

H19. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

H20. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provides the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

H21. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

H22. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community.

H23. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator

Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers: to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom; help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems; help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society; use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction; provide continuous feedback to students and family; assist students in the development of self-assessment skills; align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides; use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students; demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction; choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners; create a positive learning environment; effectively manage student behaviors; communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff; engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff; engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state; engage in professional development; adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district; assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment; collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's

vision, mission, and goals; provides the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement; to model the behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement; provides the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community; and cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance for each correlation coefficient. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ2. To what extent was there a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System?

H24. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms.

H25. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

H26. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

H27. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

H28. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family.

H29. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

H30. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

H31. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students.

H32. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

H33. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation

System helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

H34. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers create a positive learning environment.

H35. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors.

H36. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

H37. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

H38. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

H39. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development.

H40. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

H41. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

H42. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

H43. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provides the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

H44. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

H45. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community.

H46. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers: to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom; helps students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems; helps students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society; use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction; provide continuous feedback to students and family; assist students in the development of self-assessment skills; align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides; use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students; demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction; choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners; create a positive learning environment; effectively manage student behaviors; communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff; engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff; engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state; engage in professional development; adhere to all the policies, procedures, and

regulations of the building and district; assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment; collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals; provides the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement; to model the behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement; provides the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community; and cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance for each correlation coefficient. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ3. To what extent was there a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System?

H47. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms.

H48. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

H49. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator

Evaluation System helps teachers help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

H50. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

H51. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family.

H52. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

H53. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

H54. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students.

H55. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

H56. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

H57. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers create a positive learning environment.

H58. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors.

H59. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

H60. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

H61. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator

Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

H62. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development.

H63. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

H64. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

H65. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

H66. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provides the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

H67. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator

Evaluation System helps teachers with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

H68. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community.

H69. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers: to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom; helps students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems; helps students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society; use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction; provide continuous feedback to students and family; assist students in the development of self-assessment skills; align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides; use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students; demonstrate appropriate

preparation for instruction; choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners; create a positive learning environment; effectively manage student behaviors; communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff; engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff; engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state; engage in professional development; adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district; assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment; collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals; provides the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement; model the behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement; provides the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community; and cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance for each correlation coefficient. The level of significance was set at .05.

Limitations

Limitations of a study can influence the results obtained in this research (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008). The limitations of this study included the following:

1. Participants' responses were limited based upon how each respondent interpreted survey items.

2. Participant responses could have been influenced based upon their relationship with and perceptions of their building's administrator.

3. Participant responses could have been influenced based on the frequency of evaluative feedback received.

4. Results of this study should not be generalized to middle school teachers, high school teachers, or to teachers teaching in other areas.

Summary

Described in this chapter was the research design of the study. This chapter included the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations of this study. Chapter four includes the results of hypothesis testing to determine whether a relationship exists between teacher self-efficacy beliefs and teacher perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System.

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management and teachers' perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. In this study, 23 performance-based criteria related to teacher evaluation were measured. This chapter presents the results of this study including descriptive statistics and results of the hypothesis testing.

Descriptive Statistics

The population for this study was elementary educators in the XYZ School Distict. A letter including a survey link was sent to 180 teachers. Of the 180 teachers, 81 participants attempted the survey with 25 surveys being incomplete and not used in the final analyses. The incomplete surveys included portions of survey items being partially completed or left blank by participants. Of the 56 participants, the response of one participant was considered an outlier, so the participant was removed from the analyses. Therefore, 55 participants were included in this analysis. Of the 55 participants, seven taught kindergarten, seven taught first grade, two taught second grade, two taught third grade, five taught fourth grade, nine taught fifth grade, and 11 taught sixth grade. Of the 55 participants, six taught a combination of students in kindergarten through fourth grades, three taught a combination of students in kindergarten through sixth grades, and four taught a combination of students in fifth and sixth grades. Twenty-five participants of the survey were in their first five years of teaching experience, 15 participants had six to ten years of teaching experience, three were between 11 to 15 years of teaching

experience, seven were within 16 to 20 years of teaching experience, and six had 21 or more years of teaching experience.

Hypothesis Testing

This section includes the three research questions for this study followed by the results of the analyses obtained. Each research question is followed by 23 hypotheses that include specific results of the analyses. The summary of findings revealed support or lack of support for each hypothesis as it related to teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and the 23 performance-based criteria topics correlated to the Missouri Educator Evaluation System.

RQ1. To what extent was there a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System?

Twenty-three Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers in each of the 23 areas. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance for each correlation coefficient. The level of significance was set at .05.

***H1*.** There was a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .383) provided

evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom, $df = 53$, $p = .004$. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms.

H2. There was a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient ($r = .374$) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems, $df = 53$, $p = .005$ Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

H3. There was a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .333) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society, df = 53, p = .014. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to help students acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

H4. There was a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .268) provided evidence for a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-

efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction, $df = 53$, $p = .050$. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

H5. There was a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .261$) between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to provide continuous feedback to students and family, $df = 53$, $p = 0.056$. Teachers self-efficacy in student engagement had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them to provide continuous feedback to students and family.

H6. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient ($r = .278$) provided

evidence for a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them to assist students in the development of self-assessment skills, $df = 53$, $p = .042$. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

H7. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient ($r = .353$) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides, $df = 53$, $p = .008$. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

H8. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .300) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students, df = 53, p = 0.028. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students.

H9. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .328) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which

the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them to demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction, $df = 53$, $p = .014$. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

H10. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient ($r = .272$) provided evidence for a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners, $df = 53$, $p = .047$. Teachers who tended to rate themselves with higher self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

H11. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers create a positive learning environment.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .322) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to create a positive learning environment, df = 53, p = .018. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to create a positive learning environment.

H12. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .325) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to effectively manage student behaviors, df = 53, p = .017. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to manage student behaviors effectively.

H13. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator

Evaluation System helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .314) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff, df = 53, p = .020. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

H14. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .424) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff, df = 53, p = .001.

Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

H15. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .281) provided evidence for a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state, df = 53, p = .042. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

H16. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .370) provided

evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to engage in professional development, $df = 53$, $p = .005$. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to engage in professional development.

H17. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient ($r = .411$) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district, $df = 53$, $p = .002$. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

H18. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .446) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment, df = 53, p = .001. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

H19. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .293) provided evidence for a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals, $df = 53$, p = .030.

Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

H20. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provides the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .399) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to provide the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement, df = 53, p = .003. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them provide the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

H21. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .410) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to model the behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement, df = 53, p = .002. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to model the behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

H22. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .333) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs

of the school community, $df = 53$, $p = .014$. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community.

H23. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient ($r = .428$) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas, $df = 53$, $p = .001$. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to promote collaborative decision making to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

The analyses of RQ1 indicated that self-efficacy related to student engagement showed statistically significant relationships amongst all hypotheses examined except for one. Teachers did not feel that self-efficacy related to student engagement helped them

to provide continuous feedback to students and their families. Summaries of the results related to RQ1 are found in Table F1 (see Appendix F).

RQ2. To what extent was there a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System?

Twenty-three Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers in 23 areas. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance for each correlation coefficient. The level of significance was set at .05.

H24. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .300) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom, df = 53, p = .026. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-

efficacy in instructional practices also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom.

H25. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .265) provided evidence for a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems, df = 53, p = .050. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in instructional practices also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

H26. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample t test indicated that

there was not a statistically significant relationship (r = .216) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society, df = 53, p = .116. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

H27. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample t test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (r = .224) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction, df = 53, p = .103. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

H28. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .221$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family, $df = 53$, $p = .109$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them provide continuous feedback to students and family.

H29. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .164$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills, $df = 53$, $p = .237$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

H30. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .181$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides, $df = 53$, $p = .185$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

H31. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .151$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use assessment techniques that are

appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students, *df* = 53, *p* = .274. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students.

H32. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (*r* = .158) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction, *df* = 53, *p* = .251. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

H33. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (*r* = .091) between teacher self-

efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners, $df = 53$, $p = .513$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

H34. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers create a positive learning environment.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .168$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers create a positive learning environment, $df = 53$, $p = .224$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them create a positive learning environment.

H35. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that

there was not a statistically significant relationship (r = .132) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors, df = 53, p = .343. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them effectively manage student behaviors.

H36. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample t test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (r = .188) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff, df = 53, p = .170. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

H37. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .259$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff, $df = 53$, $p = .056$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

H38. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .121$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state, $df = 53$, $p = .390$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

H39. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .175$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development, $df = 53$, $p = .203$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them engage in professional development.

H40. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient ($r = .264$) provided evidence for a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was a marginal statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district, $df = 53$, $p = .051$. Teachers who rated themselves with higher self-efficacy in instructional

practices also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

H41. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .249$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment, $df = 53$, $p = .067$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

H42. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .072$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals, $df = 53$, $p = .599$.

Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

H43. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provides the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .249$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement, $df = 53$, $p = .067$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them provide the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

H44. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .237$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement, $df = 53$, $p = .081$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

H45. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .227$) between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision-making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community, $df = 53$, $p = .099$. Teachers self-efficacy in instructional practices had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator

Evaluation System helps them provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision-making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community.

H46. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .279) provided evidence for a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas, df = 53, p = .039. Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in instructional practices also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

The analyses of RQ2 indicated that when it comes to self-efficacy related to instructional practices, teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in instructional practices also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom; help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems; adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of

the building and district; and cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas. Summaries of the results related to RQ2 are found in Table F2 (see Appendix F).

RQ3. To what extent was there a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System?

Twenty-three Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers in 23 areas. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance for each correlation coefficient. The level of significance was set at .05.

H47. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .210$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms, $df = 53$, $p = .124$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with

their perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms.

H48. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .200$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems, $df = 53$, $p = .143$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

H49. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .194$) between teacher self-

efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers to help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society, *df* = 53, *p* = .160. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

H50. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (*r* = .116) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction, *df* = 53, *p* = .402. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

H51. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .163$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family, $df = 53$, $p = .240$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family.

H52. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .085$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills, $df = 53$, $p = .540$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

H53. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator

Evaluation System helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .155$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides, $df = 53$, $p = .259$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

H54. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .044$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students, $df = 53$, $p = .753$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher

perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of students.

H55. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .158$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction, $df = 53$, $p = .250$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

H56. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .047$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers choose and implement appropriate

methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners, *df* = 53, *p* = .734. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

H57. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers create a positive learning environment.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (*r* = .163) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers create a positive learning environment, *df* = 53, *p* = .238. Teacher self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them create a positive learning environment.

H58. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (*r* = .139) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the

Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors, $df = 53$, $p = .315$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them effectively manage student behaviors.

H59. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .174$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff, $df = 53$, $p = .205$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

H60. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that

there was not a statistically significant relationship (r = .256) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff, df = 53, p = .59. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with their perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

H61. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample t test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (r = .067) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state, df = 53, p = .631. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

H62. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .157$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers engage in professional development, $df = 53$, $p = .253$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them engage in professional development.

H63. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .158$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district, $df = 53$, $p = .248$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the

extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

H64. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .260$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment, $df = 53$, $p = .055$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

H65. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .072$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals, $df = 53$, $p = .600$.

Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

H66. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .226$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement, $df = 53$, $p = .097$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them provide the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

H67. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .309) provided evidence for a moderate positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement, df = 53, p = .022. Teachers who tended to rate themselves with higher self-efficacy in classroom management also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

H68. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The correlation coefficient (r = .268) provided evidence for a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and

groups needs of the school community, $df = 53$, $p = .050$. Teachers who tended to rate themselves with higher self-efficacy in classroom management also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community.

H69. There was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

The data was analyzed for outliers and one outlier was found. The outlier was excluded from the following analysis. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($r = .224$) between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas, $df = 53$, $p = .100$. Teachers self-efficacy in classroom management had no relationship with teacher perceptions of the extent to which the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

Findings related to RQ3 revealed that teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in classroom management also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and it invited a level of risk-taking for their improvement. Additionally,

teachers who rate themselves higher on self-efficacy related to classroom management also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System helping them to provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision-making to meet the needs of the school community. Summaries of the results related to RQ3 are found in Table F3 (see Appendix F).

Summary

Chapter four included the results of the data analysis for each hypothesis to determine if a relationship existed between teachers' sense of self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helpful. The summaries of results related to RQ1, RQ2, and RQ3 can be found in Appendix F. Chapter five includes a summary of the study, findings related to the literature, and concluding remarks that contain implications for action and recommendations for future research.

Chapter Five

Interpretation and Recommendations

The previous chapter presented the results of the data analyses for this study. Chapter five includes a summary of this study including an overview of the problem statement, the purpose of the study, a review of methodology, and the major findings. Next, major findings of this research will be examined including findings related to the literature review are provided. Lastly, this chapter will conclude with the implications for action, recommendations for future research, and the concluding remarks.

Study Summary

With many states moving toward a growth model for teacher evaluation, there is potential for these models to impact the instructional performance of teachers. Feedback from building leadership is crucial not only to forming professional relationships with staff, but it can have a positive impact on student learning and achievement as well as a teacher's sense of self-efficacy (Finnegan, 2013). Included in this section are the overview of the problem, the purpose of this study, and the research questions. The summary concludes with a review of the methodology and the study's major findings.

Overview of the problem. Several researchers have suggested that teacher evaluations are not adequately adept in ensuring that teachers effectively implement instructional practices aimed at improving student achievement (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Goldrick, 2002 Tucker & Stronge, 2005). Furthermore, questions arise about the perceived reliability of models, such as the Missouri Educator Evaluation System, and the importance of building administrators being able to understand the relationship between their feedback and the effect of their feedback on a teacher's self-efficacy and

performance. The effectiveness of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System was important to study as some teachers would argue that evaluative feedback that is received is not a true reflection of their perceived abilities to affect student achievement (Stephens, 2015). Building leaders have the power to positively influence a teacher's sense of self-efficacy when evaluation models provide relevant feedback related to expectations for performance and timeliness of improving instructional tasks (Finnegan, 2013). Furthermore, when evaluation models provide unclear expectations and associated tasks for teachers, their sense of self-efficacy can be compromised (Finnegan, 2013).

Purpose statement and research questions. The first purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. The second purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. The third purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. To achieve the purposes of this study, three research questions were addressed, and 69 hypotheses were tested.

Review of the methodology. This study involved a quantitative research design using survey data. The sample was 180 K-6 teachers with 56 participants in the XYZ School District that taught core subject areas, which included English Language Arts (ELA), mathematics, science, social studies, or special classes that included fine arts, physical education, or library media. Additionally, teachers who participated in this study were certified and had knowledge of the district's evaluation process and

procedures related to the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. Participants in this study were administered a survey that was a combination of two surveys 1) the Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Response Survey, and 2) the Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy Scales (TSES). The quantitative analysis focused on three research questions and 69 hypotheses that were analyzed using Pearson product moment correlation coefficients that were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management and teacher perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System.

Major findings. Major findings of this study were derived from three research questions. Sixty-nine hypotheses were tested to determine if a relationship existed between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classoom management and teacher perception of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. Overall, of the 69 hypotheses that were tested, statistically significant relationships were revealed in 22 areas related to student engagement, four areas related to instructional practices, and two areas related to classroom management.

Of the 23 hypotheses related to research question one, there were statistically significant relationships in 22 out of 23 hypotheses that were tested. The study results showed that teachers who reported that their self-efficacy in student engagement was greater also reported that the teacher evaluation process was helpful to them. Teachers however, did not associate the evaluation process as being beneficial when related to helping them provide continuous feedback to students and their families.

Of the 23 hypotheses related to research question two, findings revealed that there were statistically significant relationships in four out of 23 hypotheses that were tested.

Teachers who rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in instructional practices also rated the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helping them to cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom; help students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems; adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district; and cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

Of the 23 hypotheses related to research question three, findings revealed that there were statistically significant relationships in two out of 23 hypothesis that were tested. Based on these findings, there was not a statistically significant relationship between a teachers' sense of self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them unless it relates to helping them with modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement, and helping them provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and groups needs of the school community.

Findings Related to the Literature

Included in this section are the current study's findings related to literature. Since there was very little research that existed exploring whether there was a relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management and teacher perceptions of the teacher evaluation system, the findings of the current study could only be compared to a few studies in the literature. Since the inception of ESSA, state evaluation systems are in their infancy. As a result,

there are few studies related to the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teacher perception of the evaluation system.

The first research question examined the relationship between a teacher's sense of self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as being helpful to them. Teachers in this study reported that their self-efficacy in student engagement was greater due to the teacher evaluation process. These findings could suggest that teachers' perceptions of the evaluation system are related to their self-efficacy in student engagement. Teachers may also view the evaluation process as being helpful to them as their sense of self-efficacy is greater leading them to feel more successful in being able to select and use strategies that employ higher levels of student engagement in their classrooms. Findings from Li and Lerner's (2013) research highlighted that "caring school environments in turn motivate students not only to try harder, but commit to go further" (p. 31). Teachers could work to try hard when there is consistency in feedback that is provided by their administrator. Through the evaluation system, Curran (2014) found that a teacher's attitude about the feedback that they received, from their administrator, had a greater influence on their teacher sense of self-efficacy.

The second and third research questions examined a similar correlation between a teacher's sense of self-efficacy in instructional practices and classroom management, and the evaluation system. While the hypotheses related to RQ2 predicted that teachers would report that their self-efficacy in instructional practices would be greater due to their perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System, this study did not find that a relationship existed between these variables except in four out of the 23 hypothesis that

were tested. Similarly, hypotheses related to RQ3 predicted that teachers would report that their self-efficacy in classroom management would be greater as a result of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System, this study did not find that a relationship existed between these variables except in two out of the 23 hypothesis that were tested. While the results of the current study do not support the predictions that were made, the current study revealed positive relationships between classroom management and the evaluation system when it came to modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies, and teachers reported that the evaluation system helped them provide the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and group needs of the school community. Teachers who feel they are effective in the classroom, often have a greater sense of self-efficacy about their instructional practices while teachers who often lack confidence in their performance have a lower sense of perceived self-efficacy (Artino, 2012). Additionally, Morelock (2008) stated that if teacher performance is influenced by student achievement, evaluation systems should be comprehensive and collective regarding determining overall teacher effectiveness.

The results of RQ2 and RQ3 could suggest that teacher self-efficacy was reticent due to lack of teacher involvement or connection in the evaluation process, lack of quality feedback as a measure impacting teacher self-efficacy, lack of specificity of the evaluative criteria, or lack of a relationship between the teacher and his, or her evaluator. Morelock (2008) stated that if teacher performance is influenced by student achievement, evaluation systems should be comprehensive and collective regarding determining overall teacher effectiveness. A. Marks (2016) found that teacher self-efficacy was greater when there were high-quality evaluation processes implemented. Weisberg et al.

(2009), purported that teacher evaluation systems often lack coherence in this area. These reasons could relate to why teacher perceptions of the evaluation system were not positively impactful to teacher self-efficacy as reported in this study.

Other reasons for these findings not being in support of the researcher's predictions could be that certain types of teacher evaluation systems lack overall effectiveness to support teacher growth in self-efficacy specifically in the areas of instructional practices and classroom management. According to Randall (1999), teacher self-efficacy must be nurtured through feedback that is received during the teacher evaluation process. Zalis (2001) found, that when a relationship was present between a teacher and their administrator, teachers often perceived the evaluation system to be effective and impactful to their performance in the classroom. Additionally, teachers indicated varying levels of frustration when it came to Missouri's evaluation model particularly related to "lack of quality feedback some teachers received from their principals, especially when they are trying to grow as professionals" (Tripamer, 2013, p. 33). Curran (2014) found that there was a correlation between a teacher's view of the evaluation process and the feedback they received that positively impacted their sense of self-efficacy.

Conclusions

This section includes conclusions drawn from this study related to teachers' sense of self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management and their perceptions of the extent to which Missouri Educator Evaluation System helps them. Implications for action and recommendations for future research are included. Concluding remarks complete the study.

Implications for action. Katnik (2014) reported that while Missouri continues to grow when it comes to improving the evaluation model for teachers and leaders, there is still work to be done to improve educator effectiveness. Based on the findings of the current study, only one of the three areas tested showed significant relationships between teacher self-efficacy and teacher perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. With greater demands being placed on teacher and students, it becomes important for school leaders to look for ways to engage their staff so that teaching and learning can be positively impacted and student growth achieved (Guenzler, 2016). Stronge, Ward, and Grant (2011) determined in their study that when teachers exhibit confidence in their classroom management, student success is greater. One way to engage staff could be through the use of evaluative feedback. Current research is suggestive of evaluative feedback being provided to teachers based upon how they respond to different situations that arise in their classroom. An implication for building leadership would be to consistently incorporate time for teachers to reflect on their management practices through post-observation conferences with their administrator.

While the present study found an association between self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System, it lacked finding a relationship between instructional strategies and classroom management. This could imply that the evaluation model itself needs to be revised to make the model more useful for teachers. Furthermore, this could be an implication for district and building leaders interested in looking for ways to improve upon teacher self-efficacy through the use of performance evaluation measures. For district and building leaders this study offers an understanding of the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and

teacher perception of the current evaluation tool. There are implications from this study for district leaders to provide professional development related to ways in which principals and teachers use the evaluation system that could support teacher self-efficacy in instructional strategies and classroom management.

Recommendations for future research. While there is variability within the body of research available, related to teacher self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management, there are few studies about the relationships between those areas and teacher perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. While the current study added to the body of research related to this topic, there are several recommendations for future research.

The first recommendation would be to administer the survey to all early childhood and secondary teachers within the same district, not just teachers at the elementary level. This would support or negate the current findings and provide evidence since little is known about the impact of teacher self-efficacy related to the Missouri Educator Evaluation System.

The second recommendation would be to administer the survey to elementary teachers in a comparably sized urban Missouri school district. The results of the current study could then be compared to analyze differences between urban and suburban elementary teacher perceptions to determine if a relationship exists between self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management and teacher perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. The results of this study would allow district and building leaders to know the extent to which self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management and teacher perceptions

of the Missouri Educator Evaluation as being helpful to them could be perceived differently based upon district location.

The third recommendation would be to use a mixed method approach by adding a qualitative component to the research. A mixed method approach would allow researchers to compare the survey data with findings acquired from the interviews to gather specific feedback regarding the Missouri Educator Evaluation system. In return, this would also help districts identify areas within local evaluation systems, aligning professional development practices targeting specific support and resources for the professional growth of teachers.

Lastly, while this study addressed teacher perceptions related to their self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management, future studies could be enhanced by comparing administrator perceptions to teacher perceptions as they relate to the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. This comparison could provide district and building leaders with data to support improvements related to the types of evaluative feedback that administrators provide to their teachers. Furthermore, future studies could aim to look at administrator self-efficacy related to feedback, staff relationships, and the Missouri Educator Evaluation Model.

Concluding remarks. The results of the current study added additional research and knowledge relating to teacher self-efficacy and the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. The current study determined that when teachers rated themselves higher on self-efficacy in student engagement, they also tended to rate the Missouri Educator Evaluation System as helpful to them. The findings related to self-efficacy in

instructional strategies and classroom management did not conclusively indicate a strong relationship therefore, further research should be conducted.

While there is the potential for evaluation systems have the potential to impact teacher self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management when combined with evaluative feedback that is specific to each teacher's competencies. Toch (2008) stated, "Through their focus on the quality of teaching, teacher evaluations are at the very center of the educational enterprise and can be catalysts for teacher and school improvement" (p. 32). By structuring and aligning professional development practices within a district, or school, these competencies could be cultivated. With teacher accountability efforts on the rise, "teacher's sense of efficacy is an idea that neither researchers nor practitioners can afford to ignore" (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, p. 803).

References

Abernathy-Dyer, J., Ortlieb, E., & Cheek Jr., E. H. (2013). An analysis of teacher efficacy and perspectives about elementary literacy instruction. *Current Issues in Education, 16*(3), 1-14. Retrieved from https://cie.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/cieatasu/article/viewFile/1290/522

Albanese, K. A. (2014). *The impact of the teacher evaluation process on building veteran teacher self-efficacy* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3580436)

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of construct. *Psychology in Schools, 45*(5), 369-386.

Armor, D., Conry-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1976). *Analysis of the school preferred reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Artino, A. R. (2012). Academic self-efficacy; from educational theory to instructional practice. *Perspect Med Educ, 1*, 76-85.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117-148. Retrieved from https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/Bandura1993EP.pdf

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, New York, NY: Academic Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

Basow, S. A., Phelan, J. E., & Capotosto, L. (2006). Gender patterns in college students' choices of their best and worst professors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*, 25-35. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00259.x

Becchio, J. A. (2016). *Teacher evaluation and its impact on teacher self-efficacy* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 10055816)

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, School.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brewster, A., & Bowen, G. (2004). Teacher support and school engagement of Latino middle and high school students at risk of school failure. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 21*(1), 47-67. doi:10.1023/B:CASW.0000012348.83939.6b

Brinson, D., & Steiner, L. (2007). Building collective efficacy: How leaders inspire teachers to achieve. The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. October Issue Brief. Retrieved from ERIC Database (ED499254)

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2003). A test of the factorial validity of the teacher efficacy scale. *Research in Education, 69*, 67-80. doi:10.7227/RIE.69.6

Capara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., & Steca, P. (2003). Efficacy beliefs as determinants of teacher's job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 821-832. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.001

Chandler, C. (2014). *The influence of school factors on teacher efficacy in student engagement (*Doctoral dissertation*).* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3680666)

Cochran-Smith, M. (2002). What's preparation got to do with it? *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*, 99-101. doi:10.1177/0022487102053002001

Coleman, K. K. (1992). *Teachers' perceptions of evaluation systems* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9307072)

Connor, J. M. (2003). Making statistics come alive: Using space and students' bodies to illustrate statistical concepts. *Teaching of Psychology, 30*(2), 141-143. ISSN: 00986283

Coulter, M. P. (2013). *Qualitative study of teacher and principal perceptions of Washington state teacher evaluation instruments: Danielson, Marzano, and Cel 5D+* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3587064)

Curran, C. L. (2014). *In-service teacher perception of feedback from formative evaluation within the teacher appraisal process and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (ProQuest No. 3727260)

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*(1), 1-44. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000

Danielson, C. (2016). Commentary: Charlotte Danielson on rethinking teacher evaluation. *Education Week.* Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/04/20/charlotte-danielson-on-rethinking-teacher-evaluation.html

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice.* Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Donaldson, C., & Stobbe, C. (2000). Teacher evaluation. *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 29*(3), 30-34. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ599093).

Dotterer, A. M., & Lowe, K. (2011). Classroom context, school engagement, and academic achievement in early adolescence. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 40,* 1649-1660. doi:10.1007/s10964-011-9647-5

Edelman, D. (2016). Teacher evaluation that goes beyond check boxes. *Education Week Teacher.* Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/tm/articles/2016/05/23/teacher-evaluation-that-goes-beyond-check-boxes.html

Finn, J. D., & Voelkl, K. E. (1993). School characteristics related to student engagement. *The Journal of Negro Education, 62*(3), 249-268. doi:10.2307/2295464

Finnegan, S. R. (2013). Linking teacher self-efficacy to teacher evaluations. *Journal of Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives in Education, 6*(1), 18-25. Retrieved from https://jcpe.wmwikis.net/file/view/Finnegan_Linking_Efficacy_to_Evaluations.pdf.

Gardner, H. (1993), *Frames of Mind.* New York: Basic Book Inc.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher Efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(4), 569-582. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ306050)

Goddard, R. D. (2001). Collective efficacy: A neglected construct in the study of schools and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*(3), 467-476. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.93.3.467

Goe, L., Bell, C. & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Goe, L., Holdheide, L., & Miller, T. (2011). *A practical guide to designing comprehensive teacher evaluation systems*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from http://www.tqsource.org/publications/practicalGuideEvalSystems.pdf

Goldrick, L. (2002). Improving teacher evaluation to improve teacher quality. *Issue brief from the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices.* Retrieved from http://www.nga.org/common/issueBriefDetailPrint/html.

Gordon, L. M. (2001). High teacher efficacy as a marker of teacher effectiveness in the domain of classroom management. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the California Council on Teacher Education, San Diego, CA. Retrieved from ERIC Database (ED465731)

Guenzler, A. M. (2016). *Teacher leadership and teacher efficacy: A correlational study comparing teacher perceptions of leadership and efficacy and teacher evaluation scores from the North Carolina educator evaluation system* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 10119014)

Hattie, J. (2013). Visible learning for teachers. New York, NY: Routledge.

Henderson, C., & Dancy, M. H. (2007). Barriers to the use of research-based instructional strategies: The influence of both individual and situational characteristics. Ph*ysical Review Special Topics, Physics Education Research, 5*(020102), 1-14. doi:10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.3.020102

Henson, R. K., Kogan, L. R., & Vacha-Haase, T. (2001). *A reliability generalization study of the teacher efficacy scale and related instruments: Educational and psychological measurement.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Hunter, M. (1984). Knowing teaching and supervising. In P. Hosford (Ed.), *Using what we know about teaching* (169-203). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Katnik, P. (2014). *A study of Missouri's educator evaluation system and its efforts to increase teacher and leader effectiveness*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3621214)

Killian, B. (2010). *Administrators' and teachers' perceptions of the efficacy of the Missouri performance-based teacher evaluation model.* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3419724)

Klem, A., & Connell, J. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health, 74*, 262-273.

Levy, G. D., & Peters, W. W. (2002). Undergraduates' views of best college courses. *Teaching of Psychology, 29*, 46-48. ISSN: ISSN-0098-6283. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2004.tb08283.x

Li, Y., & Learner, R. M. (2013). Interrelations of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive school engagement in high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 42*(1), 20-32. doi:10.1007/s10964-012-9857-5

Leinwand, S., & Fleischman, S. (2004). Teach mathematics right the first time. *Educational Leadership, 62*(1), 88-90. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept04/vol62/num01/-Teach-Mathematics-Right-the-First-Time.aspx

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Marks, A. (2016). *Teacher perceptions of performance evaluations and teacher self-efficacy in Illinois public elementary and middle schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (ProQuest Number: 10195136)

Marks, H. M. (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: Patterns in the elementary, middle and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(1), 153-184. Retrieved from http://gtnpd46.ncdpi.wikispaces.net/file/view/Marks.pdf/538414934/Marks.pdf

Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The keys to classroom management. *Educational Leadership, 61*(1), 6-13. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept03/vol61/num01/The-Key-to-Classroom-Management.aspx

Marzano, R. J., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McCall, J. P. (2011). *Teachers' perceptions of evaluation and teachers' sense of self-efficacy in high-performing high schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3507267)

McDaniel, E. A., & Dibella-McCarthy, H. (1989). Enhancing teacher efficacy in special education. *Teaching Exceptional Children,* 34-38. (EJ392155)

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2013). *Teacher evaluation: Missouri educator evaluation system.* Retrieved from http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/00-TeacherEvaluation-CompleteDoc.pdf

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2016a). *Missouri comprehensive data system.* Retrieved from https://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/DistrictInfo.aspx?[redacted]

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (2016b). *Highly qualified teachers.* Retrieved from https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/HQ_defined.pdf

Morelock, M. L. (2008). *Investigating promising practice of teacher evaluation in two California charter schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3324990).

Morris-Rothschild, B. K., & Brassard, M. R. (2006). Teachers' conflict management styles: The role of attachment styles and classroom management efficacy. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(2), 105-121. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.01.004

Noakes, L. (2009). Adapting the utilization-focused approach for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation, 6*(11), 83-88. Retrieved from http://www.jmde.com

Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (2013). How can teacher feedback be used to improve the classroom disciplinary climate. Retrieved from http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/5k4220vrjxs8-en.pdf?expires=1499885744&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=C67FDC358C837582ADBC02837EDBE379

Ortlieb, E. (2010). Beyond just books: Sparking students' interest in reading. *International Journal of Education, 2*(2), E9. Retrieved from http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/ije/article/viewFile/539/376

Ovando, M. N., & Ramirez, A. (2007). Principals' instructional leadership within a teacher performance appraisal system: Enhancing students' academic success. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 20*(1-2), 85-110. doi:10.1007/s11092-007-9048-1

Patterson, J. E. (2012). *The effect of collective teacher efficacy and expectations on students in high-poverty elementary schools in the state of Missouri*. Retrieved from http://www.bakeru.edu/images/pdf/SOE/EdD_Theses/Patterson_Jennifer.pdf

Persinski, J. L. (2015). *The impact of teacher efficacy and student engagement on eleventh-grade South Carolina U.S. history and constitution end-of-course state exam scores* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis Database. (UMI No. 10023687)

Pisciotta, S. (2014). *Relationship between teacher self-efficacy and the teacher evaluation process* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3615125)

Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*, 223-231. Retrieved from http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/Prince_AL.pdf

Raiber, M. A. (2012). Teacher evaluation: A national perspective. *Kansas Music Review, 75*(3). Retrieved from http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/Prince_AL.pdf

Randall, C. L. (1999). *The effect of supervisor-to-teacher feedback on teacher performance, perceived self-efficacy, and attitude* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9944072)

Ravet, J. (2007). Enabling pupil participation in a study of perceptions of disengagement: Methodical matters. *British Journal of Special Education, 34*(4), p. 234-242. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8578.2007.00484.x

Rotter, G. S. (1966). Effects of class and racial bias on teacher evaluation of pupils. Retrieved Cooperative Research Project No. 5-8013-2-12-1 from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED010092.pdf

Scarpello, G. (2010). Tips for teaching math to elementary students. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review, 76*(1), 59-60. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ898753)

Shaughnessy, M. F. (2004). An interview with Anita Woolfolk: The educational psychology of teacher efficacy. *Educational Psychology Review, 16*(2), 153-176. Retrieved from https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/WoolfolkEPRInt.pdf

Scheibenhofer, K. R. (2014). *A case study of teaching principals, administrators with class, examining the perceptions of administrators and teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3646938)

Schlechty, P. (2002). *Working on the work: An action plan for teachers, principals, and superintendents.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schmoker, M. (2006). *Results now: How we can achieve unprecedented improvement in teaching and learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Schmoker, M. & Allington, R. (2007). The gift of bleak research. *Education Week, 26*(37), 28-29. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2007/05/16/37allington.h26.html

Shaukat, S., & Muhammad, I. (2012). Teacher self-efficacy as a function of student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 10*(2), 82-85. Retrieved from http://www.gcu.edu.pk/FullTextJour/PJSCS/2012july/13.pdf

Sheppard, J. (2013). *Perceptions of teachers and administrators regarding the teacher evaluation process* (Doctoral dissertation). (Paper 852). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1856&context=etd

Shoulders, T. L. & Krei, M. S. (2015). Rural high school teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. *American Secondary Education, 44*(1), 50-61. Retrieved from ERIC database, (EJ1083932)

Skinner, E. & Belmont, M. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: reciprocal effects of teacher behaviour and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of 105 Educational Psychology, 85*(4), 571-581. Retrieved from http://www.oit.edu/docs/default-source/institutional-research-documents/other/motivation-in-the-classroom-reciprocal-effects-of-teacher-behavior.pdf?sfvrsn=2

Smitta Dibapilo, W. T. (2012). A review of literature on teacher efficacy and classroom management. *Journal of College and Teaching & Learning, 9*(2), 79-91. Retrieved from http://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1031&context=utk_educpubs

Southern Regional Education Board. (2001). Instructional Strategies: How teachers teach matters. Retrieved from http://publications.sreb.org/2001/01V23_Instructional_Strategies.pdf

Spellings, M. (2007). *Building on results: A blueprint for strengthening the No Child Left Behind Act.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www.aucd.net/docs/policy/nclb/buildingonresultsO 13107.pdf

Stephens, T. L. (2015). Encouraging positive student engagement and motivation: Tips for teachers. *Review360 Pearson.* Retrieved from http://www.pearsoned.com/education-blog/encouraging-positive-student-engagement-and-motivation-tips-for-teachers/

Stronge, J. H. (2006). *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publishing.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(4), 339-355. Retrieved from https://www.strongeandassociates.com/files/articles/Stronge%20et%20al%202011_What%20makes%20good%20teachers%20good.pdf

Tamilselvi, B. & Geetha, D. (2015). Efficacy in teaching through "multiple intelligence" instructional strategies. *I-manager's Journal of School Educational Technology, 11*(2), 1-10. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ1097414)

Taylor, P. H. (1989). *The characteristics of the teacher evaluation process as perceived by elementary teachers and principals* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9115731)

Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2011). *The effect of evaluation on performance: Evidence from longitudinal student achievement data of mid-career teachers.* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Taylor, L., & Parsons, J. (2011). Improving student engagement. *Current Issues in Education, 14(*1), 1-33. Retrieved from http://cie.asu.edu/

Thomas, I. A., & Green, R. L. (2015). Using instructional strategies to enhance student achievement. *National Forum of Teacher Educational Journal, 25,* 1-19. Retrieved from http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volumes/Thomas,%20Ingrid%20A%20Using%20Instructional%20Strategies%20NFTEJ%20V25%20N%203%202015.pdf

Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). *Rush to judgement: Teacher evaluation in public education*. Washington, D.C.: Education Sector.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2000). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Tripamer, A. J. (2013). *Teacher perceptions of teacher evaluations in the Fort Zumwalt school district* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3572657)

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202-248. Retrieved from http://mxtsch.people.wm.edu/Scholarship/RER_TeacherEfficacy.pdf

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 783-805. Retrieved from http://mxtsch.people.wm.edu/Scholarship/TATE_TSECapturingAnElusiveConstruct.pdf

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 944-956. Retrieved from ERIC Database (EJ769461)

Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *Obama administration proceeds with reform of no child left behind following congressional inaction*. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/obama-administration-proceeds-reformno-child-left-behind-following-congressiona

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act of differences in teacher effectiveness* (2nd ed.). Brooklyn, NY: The New Teacher Project (TNTP). Retrieved from http://tntp.org/ideas-and-innovations/view/the-widget-effect

Western Michigan University Science and Mathematics Program Improvement. (2001). *Michigan teacher perceptions of barriers to implementing high quality mathematics and science curricula*. Retrieved from http://www.wmich.edu/sampi/reports/IKE5.pdf

Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven keys to effective feedback: Feedback for learning. *ASCD, 70*(1), 10-16. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept12/vol70/num01/Seven-Keys-to-Effective-Feedback.aspx

Wilson, S. M., & Wineburg, S. S. (1998). Peering at history through different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. *Teachers College Record, 89*(4), 525-539. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ3782380)

Wood, C. J., & Pohland, P. A. (1983). Teacher evaluation and the hand of history. *Journal of Educational Administration, 21*(2), 169-181. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/eb009876

Woolfolk-Hoy, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs in control. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 81-91. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.81

Woolfolk, A. E., Rosoff, B., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about managing students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 6*, 137-148.

Zalis, A. R. (2001). *An analysis of the perceptions of teachers in a rural Missouri public school district about the relationship between teacher growth and the attributes of a newly implemented teacher evaluation process* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3014296)

Appendices

Appendix A: Performance Based Teacher Evaluation Response Survey

Administrators and Teachers

1. Please check the grade level(s) served in your school.

   7^{th}

   8^{th}

   9^{th}

   10^{th}

   11^{th}

   12^{th}

2. What is the student population of your school?

3. For how many years have you been an administrator or classroom teacher at your current school?

4. The evaluation process helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

5. The evaluation process helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

6. The evaluation process helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

7. The evaluation process helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

8. The evaluation process helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

9. The evaluation process helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

10. The evaluation process helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

11. The evaluation process helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

12. The evaluation process helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of my students.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

13. The evaluation process helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

14. The evaluation process helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

15. The evaluation process helps teachers create a positive learning environment.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

16. The evaluation process helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

17. The evaluation process helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

18. The evaluation process helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

19. The evaluation process helps teachers engage in professional development activit consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

20. The evaluation process helps teachers engage in professional development.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

21. The evaluation process helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

22. The evaluation process helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

23. The evaluation process helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

24. The evaluation process in the area of mentoring provides teachers the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

25. The evaluation process in the area of mentoring provides teachers with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

26. The evaluation process in the area of mentoring provides teachers with the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and group needs of the school community.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

27. Please identify the items of the Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation that have the strongest influence on improving teacher performance in the classroom.

28. Please identify the items on the Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation that have the least influence on improving teacher performance in the classroom.

Appendix B: Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES)

Teacher Beliefs - TSES

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create challenges for teachers. Your answers are confidential.

Directions: Please indicate your opinion about each of the questions below by marking any one of the nine responses in the columns on the right side, ranging from (1) "None at all" to (9) "A Great Deal" as each represents a degree on the continuum.

Please respond to each of the questions by considering the combination of your current ability, resources, and opportunity to do each of the following in your present position.

	None at all		Very Little		Some Degree		Quite A Bit		A Great Deal
1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. How much can you do to help your students value learning?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19. How well can you keep a few problem students form running an entire lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
21. How well can you respond to defiant students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Appendix C: Study Approval from XYZ School District Superintendent

Re: Dissertation Approval

[redacted] <[redacted]@[redacted]> Mon, Nov 30, 2015 at 11:10 PM

To: Deanna Feeback <dfeeback@[redacted]>
Cc: [redacted]

I approve. Best of luck. This should be interesting information.

Sincerely in Education,

[redacted]
Superintendent of Schools
[redacted]

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT:

This e-mail and any attachments are intended only for those to which it is addressed and may contain information which is privileged, confidential and prohibited from disclosure and unauthorized use under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this e-mail or the information contained in this e-mail is strictly prohibited by the sender. If you have received this transmission in error, please return the material received to the sender and delete all copies from your system.

On Dec 1, 2015, at 1:51 AM, Deanna Feeback <dfeeback@[redacted]> wrote:

Dr. [redacted],

Almost a year has passed since my initial request for dissertation approval and as I am sure you know, dissertation topics change along the way which is exactly why I am writing to you again. I have shifted the focus of my dissertation from curriculum to teacher performance evaluations. With the changes made to the teacher evaluation system in Missouri, research indicates a strong correlation between a teacher's professional growth and the feedback that they receive during walkthroughs and classroom observations. This feedback is what leads to increased teacher performance which in essence leads to enhanced student achievement.

For my study, I would like to dig a little deeper in order to determine whether a relationship does exist between evaluative feedback and what teacher's perceive actually leads to improved teacher performance. Do their perceptions mirror that of administration, or are there other factors that exist in relation to the feedback received and what teachers believe either positively or negatively affect their performance.

I will use a quantitative research design to guide my study which will consist of a modified, perceptual survey given to all teachers in grades K-6. The survey created will combine elements from a survey based on the Missouri Performance Based Evaluation Model as well as modifications from a questionnaire aimed at obtaining teachers' perceptions about factors related to instructional practices, classroom management, and student engagement.

As earlier requested, individual and identifiable names and information is will not be shared. I will be happy to share my findings with the district upon completion of this project. Once you

grant approval, I will send you a more formal letter to sign which will also be included as part of my dissertation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Deanna Feeback
[redacted]

On Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 5:47 PM, [redacted] > wrote:

I will approve this as long as individual and identifiable names and information is not shared.

Sincerely in Education,

[redacted]
Superintendent of Schools
[redacted]

On Feb 24, 2015, at 4:17 PM, Deanna Feeback <dfeeback@[redacted]> wrote:

Dr. [redacted],

As you may or may not know, I am currently completing my Ed.D degree through Baker University. While I am still in the early phases of my programming, it is time for me to think about my dissertation topic and begin my research surrounding it. Below is what I have chosen. This has also been approved by my university advisor Dr. Susan Rogers.

- *Relationship between teacher self-efficacy and academic success in 5th and 6th grade mathematics.*

I am emailing you to request approval from the district to complete my research. Since I am specifically focusing on 5th and 6th grade, the data that I collect, examine, and present in my dissertation will include 5th and 6th grade students from [redacted] as well as 5th and 6th grade students at our new [redacted] school opening this fall. I would also like to request approval to access formative assessment data as well as student grades/academic data (letter grades/standards based). My dissertation will, at some point, require me to survey 5th and 6th grade teachers regarding their perceptions and how their strengths contribute to their students' achievement, or detract from it. I may find as I get further in that student surveys may be necessary. I will begin this portion later this summer. Please keep in mind that I am only focusing on mathematics and given that [redacted] has a new math curriculum in place, I feel that this is perfect timing to begin my research in this area.

Please know that I will be happy to share my findings with the district upon completion of this project. If you have any questions at all, certainly let me know. Once you grant approval, I will send you a more formal letter to sign which will also be included as part of my dissertation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Deanna Feeback
[redacted]
dfeeback@[redacted]

Appendix D: IRB Application

BAKER UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
GRADUATE DEPARTMENT

Date:
IRB PROTOCOL NUMBER _____
(IRB USE ONLY)

IRB REQUEST
Proposal for Research
Submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board

I. Research Investigator(s) (Students must list faculty sponsor first)

Department(s) **School of Education Graduate Department**

Name	Signature	
1. Dr. Susan Rogers	Susan K Rogers	Major Advisor
2. Dr. Li Chen-Bouck	Li Chen-B	Research Analyst
3. Dr. James Robins		University Committee Member
4. Dr. Alisa Seidelman		External Committee Member

Principal Investigator: Deanna R. Feeback Deanna Feeback
Phone: (816) 506-7354
Email: dfeeback@bsd124.org
Mailing address: 515 Brookwood Lane,
Raymore, MO 64083

Faculty sponsor: Dr. Susan Rogers
Phone: (913) 344-1226 or (785)-230-2801
Email: srogers@bakeru.edu

Expected Category of Review: ___Exempt __X__ Expedited ___Full

II: Protocol: (Type the title of your study)

Elementary Teacher Perceptions about the Missouri Educator Evaluation System and Teacher Self-Efficacy

Summary

In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

The purpose of this study will be to determine elementary teacher perceptions about the Missouri Educator Evaluator System and its relationship to their teaching self-efficacy in the areas of student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management. The first purpose of this study will be to determine the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and teacher perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. The second purpose of this study will be to determine the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in instructional practices and teacher perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System. The third purpose of this study will be to determine the relationship between teacher self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher perceptions of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System.

Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

There are no conditions or manipulations included within this study.

What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.

For the purposes of this study, the following two surveys will be combined into one survey.

Survey 1: Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (24-questions)

- The purpose of this survey is help gain insight into the types of things that pose challenges for teachers related to perceived self-efficacy and student engagement, perceived self-efficacy and instructional strategies, and perceived self-efficacy and classroom management.
- This survey will not be modified for the purposes of this study.

Survey 2: Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Response Survey (25-questions)

- The purpose of this survey is to determine whether the Missouri Educator Evaluation System is improving elementary (K-6) teaching of students in the classroom.
- This survey will be modified for the purposes of this study.
- Question number 1 will refer to Kindergarten, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th grades only.
- Question number 2 will not be used as part of this study.
- Question number 3 will refer to elementary teachers only.
- Question number 27 will not be used as part of this study.
- Question number 28 will not be used as part of this study.

Copies of the original surveys to be combined are attached

Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical, or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

No subjects will encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical, or legal risks.

Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.

No stress to any subjects will be involved.

Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

No subjects will be deceived or misled in any way

Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

There will be no requests for personal or sensitive information.

Will the subjects be presented with materials which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

No subjects will be presented with any material that would be considered offensive, threatening, or degrading.

Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

It is expected that the combined survey will require 20-30 minutes to complete.

Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information, which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

- Subjects in this study will consist of K-6 elementary teachers in the XYZ School District.
- Subjects will be solicited, or contacted through email addresses that are provided to me by the Human Resource Director or building level administration.
- Subjects will be sent an email with approvals for this study, the purpose of this study, and a link to the online survey tool, SurveyMonkey.

A copy of electronic solicitation is attached.

What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary?

Participation in this survey is voluntary. Participants will have the option not to answer items of the survey if they are uncomfortable or they may discontinue the survey at any time.

What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

No inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation.

How will you insure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

Completion of the survey will indicate consent for participant participation. Participants have the option not to answer items on the survey if they are uncomfortable or they may discontinue the survey at any time.

Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

No aspect of the data will be made part of any permanent record that can be identified with a subject. All responses will be anonymous.

Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? If so, explain.

Whether a subject did or did not participate in this study will not be made public or be part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer.

What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data? Where will it be stored? How long will it be stored? What will be done with it after the study is completed?

1. Identifiable information such as participant names and schools of employment will not be solicited in the survey for this study.
2. Once the data is downloaded through SurveyMonkey, data will be stored on a laptop. The researcher is the only person to have access to this laptop.
3. Survey data will be kept for one-year upon completion of this study.
4. Survey data will be destroyed one-year after the completion of the study.

If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?

There are no risks involved in this study.

Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.
No data from files or archival data will be used.

SURVEY INVITATION EMAIL

August 18, 2016

Dear Participant,

My name is Deanna Feeback and I am a doctoral candidate at Baker University. This email serves as an invitation for you to participate in a leadership research study that I am conducting electronically via SurveyMonkey to complete my Ed. D. program at Baker University. The title of the survey is "Elementary Teacher Perceptions about the Missouri Educator Evaluation System and Teacher Self-Efficacy." The purpose of this study is to determine what elementary teachers perceive about the Missouri Educator Evaluator System that impacts their teaching performance related to student engagement, instructional practices, and classroom management.

Your participation in this study will involve responding to 50 items using a Likert-type rating scales to determine the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement. The approximate time limit to complete this survey is 20-minutes. Completion of this survey will indicate your consent to participate in this study. Your participation is completely voluntary, and responses will be anonymous. You have the right to refuse to respond to particular items that make you feel uncomfortable. Your name will not appear anywhere on the survey. Teacher participation in this survey is extremely important for the completion of my research study.

Once the data is analyzed, I will report all findings in summative form so that no one person can be identified in my reports and, or publications.

Although there may be no direct benefit to you, if you choose to complete this survey, your participation may help solidify or increase your thinking about evaluation criteria and the connection between criteria and potential improvements in teaching. Should you have any questions about this survey, please feel free to contact me at 816-506-7354, or through email at deannarfeeback@stu.bakeru.edu.

Thank you for your time,

Deanna Feeback

Deanna Feeback
Ed. D. Doctoral Candidate
Baker University, Graduate School of Education

Teacher Beliefs - TSES

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create challenges for teachers. Your answers are confidential.

Directions: Please indicate your opinion about each of the questions below by marking any one of the nine responses in the columns on the right side, ranging from (1) "None at all" to (9) "A Great Deal" as each represents a degree on the continuum.

Please respond to each of the questions by considering the combination of your current ability, resources, and opportunity to do each of the following in your present position.

	None at all		Very Little		Some Degree		Quite A Bit		A Great Deal
1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. How much can you do to help your students value learning?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19. How well can you keep a few problem students form ruining an entire lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
21. How well can you respond to defiant students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Administrators and Teachers

1. Please check the grade level(s) served in your school.

   7^{th}

   8^{th}

   9^{th}

   10^{th}

   11^{th}

   12^{th}

2. What is the student population of your school?

3. For how many years have you been an administrator or classroom teacher at your current school?

4. The evaluation process helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

5. The evaluation process helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

6. The evaluation process helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

7. The evaluation process helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

8. The evaluation process helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

9. The evaluation process helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

10. The evaluation process helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

11. The evaluation process helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

12. The evaluation process helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of my students.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

13. The evaluation process helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

14. The evaluation process helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

15. The evaluation process helps teachers create a positive learning environment.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

16. The evaluation process helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

17. The evaluation process helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

18. The evaluation process helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with students, parents, community, and staff.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

19. The evaluation process helps teachers engage in professional development activit consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

20. The evaluation process helps teachers engage in professional development.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

21. The evaluation process helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

22. The evaluation process helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

23. The evaluation process helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

24. The evaluation process in the area of mentoring provides teachers the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

25. The evaluation process in the area of mentoring provides teachers with the modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

26. The evaluation process in the area of mentoring provides teachers with the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the diverse individual and group needs of the school community.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree					Strongly agree

27. Please identify the items of the Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation that have the strongest influence on improving teacher performance in the classroom.

28. Please identify the items on the Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation that have the least influence on improving teacher performance in the classroom.

Appendix E: IRB Approval

Baker University Institutional Review Board

8/4/15

Dear Deanna Feeback and Dr. Rogers,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your research project application and approved this project under Expedited Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.

Please inform this Committee or myself when this project is terminated or completed. As noted above, you must also provide IRB with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If you have any questions, please contact me at CTodden @BakerU.edu or 785.594.8440.

Sincerely,

Chris Todden EdD
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee
Verneda Edwards EdD
Sara Crump PhD
Erin Morris PhD
Scott Crenshaw

Appendix F: Summary of Results

Table F1

Summary Results by Hypothesis for RQ1 (self-efficacy in student engagement)

H#	Construct	Pearson *r*	Relationship	*df*	*p*
1	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms	.383**	moderate positive	53	.004
2	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and problem solve	.374**	moderate positive	53	.005
3	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society	.333*	moderate positive	53	.014
4	helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor effectiveness of instruction	.268	weak positive	53	.050
5	helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family	.261	no statistical significance	53	.056
4	helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills	.278*	weak positive	53	.042
7	helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides	.353**	moderate positive	53	.008
8	helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of my students	.300*	moderate positive	53	.028
9	helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction	.328*	moderate positive	53	.014

10	helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners	.272*	weak positive	53	.047
11	helps teachers create a positive learning environment	.322*	moderate positive	53	.018
12	helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors	.325*	moderate positive	53	.018
13	helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff	.314*	moderate positive	53	.020
14	helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with student, parents, community, and staff	.424**	moderate positive	53	.001
15	helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state	.281*	weak positive	53	.042
16	helps teachers engage in professional development	.370*	moderate positive	53	.005
17	helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district	.411**	moderate positive	53	.002
18	helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment	.446**	moderate positive	53	.001
19	helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals	.293*	weak positive	53	.030
20	provides teachers the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement	.399**	moderate positive	53	.003

21	provides teachers with modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement	.410**	moderate positive	53	.002
22	provides teachers with the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the needs of diverse individual and groups needs of the school community	.333*	moderate positive	53	.014
23	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas	.428**	moderate positive	53	.001

Note. Signs with significant results in the Pearson r column use the following rules: *p<.05, ** p<.01, ***p<.001.

Table F2

Summary Results by Hypothesis for RQ2 (self-efficacy in instructional practices)

H#	construct	Pearson *r*	Relationship	*df*	*p*
24	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms	.300*	moderate positive	53	.026
25	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and problem solve	.265	weak positive	53	.50
26	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society	.216	no statistical significance	53	.116
27	helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor effectiveness of instruction	.224	no statistical significance	53	.103
28	helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family	.221	no statistical significance	53	.109
29	helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills	.164	no statistical significance	53	.237
30	helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides	.181	no statistical significance	53	.185
31	helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of my students	.151	no statistical significance	53	.274
32	helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction	.158	no statistical significance	53	.251
33	helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied	.091	no statistical significance	53	.513

	instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners				
34	helps teachers create a positive learning environment	.168	no statistical significance	53	.224
35	helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors	.132	no statistical significance	53	.343
36	helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff	.188	no statistical significance	53	.170
37	helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with student, parents, community, and staff	.259	no statistical significance	53	.056
38	helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state	.121	no statistical significance	53	.390
39	helps teachers engage in professional development	.175	no statistical significance	53	.203
40	helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district	.264	marginal significance	53	.051
41	helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment	.249	no statistical significance	53	.067
42	helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals	.072	no statistical significance	53	.599
43	provides teachers the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement	.249	no statistical significance	53	.067
44	provides teachers with modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement	.237	no statistical significance	53	.081

45	provides teachers with the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the needs of diverse individual and groups needs of the school community	.227	no statistical significance	53	.099
46	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas	.279	weak positive	53	.039

Note. Signs with significant results in the Pearson r column use the following rules: *p<.05, ** p<.01, ***p<.001.

Table F3

Summary Results by Hypothesis for RQ3 (self-efficacy in classroom management)

H#	construct	Pearson *r*	Relationship	*df*	*p*
47	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classrooms	.210	no statistical significance	53	.124
48	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and problem solve	.200	no statistical significance	53	.143
49	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society	.194	no statistical significance	53	.160
50	helps teachers use various ongoing assessments to monitor effectiveness of instruction	.116	no statistical significance	53	.402
51	helps teachers provide continuous feedback to students and family	.163	no statistical significance	53	.240
52	helps teachers assist students in the development of self-assessment skills	.085	no statistical significance	53	.540
53	helps teachers align the assessment with the goals, objectives, and instructional strategies of the district curriculum guides	.155	no statistical significance	53	.259
54	helps teachers use assessment techniques that are appropriate to the varied characteristics and development needs of my students	.044	no statistical significance	53	.753
55	helps teachers demonstrate appropriate preparation for instruction	.158	no statistical significance	53	.250

56	helps teachers choose and implement appropriate methodology and varied instructional strategies that address the diversity of learners	.047	no statistical significance	53	.734
57	helps teachers create a positive learning environment	.163	no statistical significance	53	.238
58	helps teachers effectively manage student behaviors	.139	no statistical significance	53	.315
59	helps teachers communicate effectively with students, parents, community, and staff	.174	no statistical significance	53	.205
60	helps teachers engage in appropriate interpersonal relationships with student, parents, community, and staff	.256	no statistical significance	53	.059
61	helps teachers engage in professional development activities consistent with the goals and objectives of the building, district, and state	.067	no statistical significance	53	.631
62	helps teachers engage in professional development	.157	no statistical significance	53	.253
63	helps teachers adhere to all the policies, procedures, and regulations of the building and district	.158	no statistical significance	53	.248
64	helps teachers assist in maintaining a safe and orderly environment	.260	no statistical significance	53	.055
65	helps teachers collaborate in the development and/or implementation of the district's vision, mission, and goals	.072	no statistical significance	53	.600
66	provides teachers the opportunity for dialogue that deepens understanding of instructional strategies needed for improvement	.226	no statistical significance	53	.097

67	provides teachers with modeling of behaviors needed for using reflective strategies and invites a level of risk-taking for their improvement	.309*	moderate positive	53	.022
68	provides teachers with the opportunity to promote collaborative decision making to meet the needs of diverse individual and groups needs of the school community	.268	marginally significant	53	.050
69	helps teachers cause students to acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas	.224	no statistical significance	53	.100

Note. Signs with significant results in the Pearson r column use the following rules: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.