2008

The Importance of Values-Alignment within a Role-Hierarchy to Foster Teacher's Motivation for Implementing Professional Development

Crissie Mae Grove
THE IMPORTANCE OF VALUES-ALIGNMENT WITHIN A ROLE-HIERARCHY TO FOSTER TEACHER'S MOTIVATION FOR IMPLEMENTING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

By

Crissie Mae Grove

A Dissertation submitted to the Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded: Spring Semester, 2008
The members of the Committee approve the dissertation of Crissie M. Grove defended on Nov. 27, 2007.

__________________________
Jeannine E. Turner
Professor Directing Dissertation

__________________________
Ashby Plant
Outside Committee Member

__________________________
Susan Carol Losh
Committee Member

__________________________
Alysia Roehrig
Committee Member

Approved:

______________________________
Aki Kamata, Chairperson
Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems
The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am so grateful to many people for their support and encouragement of me throughout this process. All of the colleagues and professors who guided me in my learning and provided a listening ear all helped in making this day possible, and I am utterly grateful.

To Alysia Roehrig, Ashby Plant, and Susan Losh, thank you for all of your help and support with my dissertation process.

I want to thank Jeannine Turner who has been an incredible mentor and friend to me throughout my years as a doctoral student. She has been so much more than an advisor, and I appreciate her more than words could express. She has believed in me, cried with me, laughed with me, and talked with me throughout this process, all the while knowing I could do it, even when I wasn’t sure.

I would like to thank the Great Expectations’ director and staff for allowing me to conduct my study and collect information on their professional development and organization.

To my family for all of their loving support, although from afar, I cherished their encouraging words and love.

To Ryan and Margareta, you have both been the “ones just before” and were able to help calm my nerves and answer all my questions. Best of luck in your future endeavors.

Finally, I want to thank James, my best friend, and the love of my life. You have believed in me and been there to support me no matter what. Through the late nights and long days, you have been there to anchor my life and hold my hand. Thank you for your support and continual belief in me.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables ............................................................................................................................. vi  
Abstract ..................................................................................................................................... vii  
Research Questions .................................................................................................................. viii  

**Chapter One** .......................................................................................................................... 1  
Introduction .................................................................................................................................. 1  
  *Professional Development for Teachers* .......................................................... 2  
  *Teachers Motivation for Implementation* .................................................. 2  
  *Great Expectations of Oklahoma’s Professional Development Model* .................. 3  
  *Overview of the Study* ....................................................................................... 8  
  *Research Questions* ............................................................................................ 10  
  *Purpose of Study* ................................................................................................. 11  

**Chapter Two** ......................................................................................................................... 13  
Literature Review and Theoretical Framework ........................................................................ 13  
  *School Reform and Professional Development* ........................................ 13  
  *Whole School Reform* ..................................................................................... 14  
  *Why Teachers Must Attend* ................................................................. 14  
  *Motivation* ........................................................................................................ 15  
  *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation* .......................................................... 16  
  *Self Determination Theory* ....................................................................... 18  

**Chapter Three** ....................................................................................................................... 28  
Method ....................................................................................................................................... 28  
  *Research Questions* ............................................................................................ 28  
  *Overview of Data Collected: Interviews, Observations, and Field Notes* ....... 29  
  *Procedures* .......................................................................................................... 29  

**Chapter Four** ........................................................................................................................ 37  
Analysis and Results .................................................................................................................. 37  
  *Data Analysis* ....................................................................................................... 37  
  *Data Analysis for Questions One and Two* .................................................. 37  
  *Data Analysis for Question Three* ................................................................. 38  
  *Results* .................................................................................................................. 42  
  *Support for Model* .............................................................................................. 54  

**Chapter Five** ........................................................................................................................ 70  
Discussion ................................................................................................................................. 70  
  *Mastery to Intrinsic: Performance to Extrinsic* ........................................... 70  
  *Leadership Styles* ............................................................................................... 72  
  *Authoritative vs. Authoritarian Parenting Styles* ...................................... 72  
  *Transactional vs. Transformational Leaders* ............................................... 72  
  *The Model* .......................................................................................................... 74  
  *Value-Control* ..................................................................................................... 75  
  *Perceptions of Control* .................................................................................... 76  
  *The Importance of Relationships* ............................................................... 77  
  *Contributions* ...................................................................................................... 79  
  *Alternative Applicable Contexts* ................................................................. 80
Additional Avenues for Future Research ........................................................................................................ 80
Limitations ........................................................................................................................................................... 81
Conclusions .......................................................................................................................................................... 82
Appendix A: IRB Approval .................................................................................................................................. 86
Appendix B: Consent Form .................................................................................................................................. 89
Appendix C: Interview Questions ...................................................................................................................... 89
Appendix D: Observation Protocol .................................................................................................................... 93
References .......................................................................................................................................................... 99
Biographical Sketch .......................................................................................................................................... 109
# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Elementary school participants ......................................................... 33  
Table 2: High school participants ................................................................. 33  
Table 3: GE participants ............................................................................. 35  
Table 4: Categories and elementary teacher comments ............................... 39  
Table 5: Categories and high school teacher comments ............................... 46  
Table 6: Observations of Elementary School and High School Teachers .... 47
ABSTRACT

This study occurred within the context of the professional development program, Great Expectations of Oklahoma (GE). This dissertation study investigated the extent to which participating teachers implemented the GE training. A qualitative design was used to investigate why teachers attended this training and how the school administration fostered greater implementation.

Previous pilot studies provided insight into ways that elements may lead to teachers’ greater implementation of professional development and suggested that Self-Determination Theory would provide a useful framework for the current study’s data collection and findings. Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (1985; 2000) states that autonomy (e.g., choice), competence (e.g., enhancing skills), and relatedness (e.g., collegiality) influence individuals’ intrinsic motivation.

The overarching focus for this qualitative dissertation was to investigate why some teachers are motivated to make changes in their classrooms while others seem to resist change. An underlying premise was that, when teachers feel intrinsically motivated and enthusiastic to attend professional development (through feelings of autonomy), feel competence to implement the professional development strategies and form supportive relationships, greater implementation of professional development may occur. This study investigated how teachers’ intrinsic motivation to attend and implement professional development training was supported by the professional development training and the teachers’ principal upon returning to school. SDT was used as the theoretical framework to investigate this phenomenon. This dissertation used a case study qualitative design (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003) to investigate teachers’ motivation and implementation of professional development.

In this dissertation, I collected and analyzed data in the school to examine the extent to which elements of SDT positively influenced teachers’ motivation to implement the training. Within the school context, I conducted interviews with principals (n= 3) and teachers (n= 8) of GE schools (schools that have attended GE and claim to implement some of its practices) to investigate the extent to which teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness were supported within the schools before the training, and if these elements were increased due to the training.
Additionally, I interviewed the teachers to explore how elements at the school level and the GE level worked together to enhance teachers’ implementation of GE. Finally, I conducted observations of teachers who have attended GE in order to investigate their levels of GE implementation.

Within the training context, I conducted interviews with the director of GE and GE staff to provide insight into how the training supports attendees’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness. I also conducted field notes to provide evidence of SDT elements (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness) at the training. I investigated the relationship among these elements and the characteristics of the training that support and enhance these elements in synergistic ways at the school level.

Specific research questions were:

**Research Questions**

1. In what ways does GE support teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness during the training to foster motivation to implement?
2. How do principals support teachers’ autonomy to support teachers’ decisions to attend GE?
3. What is the process by which principals foster or hinder teachers’ intrinsic motivation to implement professional development?

Research questions One and Two were answered using data that were collected concerning teachers’ perceptions of the professional development and the school employees’ historical decision to attend professional development training and current levels of implementation. Data demonstrated that teachers whose autonomy, competence, and relatedness were supported by principals were more motivated to implement to a high degree. In contrast, teachers whose autonomy, competence, and relatedness were not supported by principals were less likely to implement the training to a high degree, despite considering the training to be of high quality. Additionally, the alignment of values between the principal and teacher was shown to be vital to teachers’ intrinsic motivation to implement the professional development training, regardless of how the teacher felt about the training itself.
The third research question was answered using a grounded theory analysis of the interview data. Analysis revealed a model that highlighted the importance of values-alignment within the role-hierarchy (e.g., principal and teacher) for increasing teachers’ motivation to implement professional development. The analysis also emphasized ways that relationship affiliations are influenced by the values-alignment within a role-hierarchy. Furthermore, perceptions of personal control also influenced the relationship affiliation among role-hierarchy individuals. The model revealed that a combination of SDT (Deci & Ryan, 2000) and Control-Value theory (Pekrun, 2006) elements more fully described the cycle of building and maintenance of relationship affiliation among different role-hierarchy individuals.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

As a Leon County School math teacher (2003-2006), I was expected to complete an Individualized Professional Development Plan (IPDP). An IPDP is a professional growth plan that all in-service teachers must complete each year. Although I was teaching part time, I was still expected to meet this state-mandated requirement. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that teachers remain current in their knowledge of “best” teaching practices. The Florida Professional Development Standards require that teachers attend “effective professional development” (http://www.firn.edu/doe/profdev/pdf/2protocostandards.pdf) and implementation is somewhat expected. However, as past and continuing research demonstrates, teachers’ implementation of professional development programs is not always easy and automatic (Guskey, 2002). In fact, many professional development trainings do not produce any significant changes in teachers’ practices (Guskey, 2002; Loucks-Horsley, 1995).

As a math teacher who was required to develop an IPDP, I was given an outline from my administrator with the exact words I was to include in my plan. I was not asked for any other comments or questions about the plan, but was simply expected to complete the form with the provided words and submit it for district approval. Some of the “provided answers” explained how I would attend several meetings and actively participate in curriculum building workshops and discussions with other teachers. Although I feel that I fulfilled the elements of my professional development plan, I can’t help but wonder, how many teachers complete a similar form but don’t feel compelled to actually make changes to their teaching? I was not given a democratic voice, or a choice in attending the required sessions and workshops. I wasn’t even expected to question the “provided answers” of my own plan. If I had been able to consider my own needs for my classroom, my IPDP may have been an effective tool as it was meant to be. Instead, my plan was simply a fulfillment of a district mandated documentation that, in practice, had little connection to my life as a teacher. Looking back on my experiences of completing IPDPs, I wonder, how does this mandate effectively enhance teaching practices with an overarching goal of improving student achievement? If teachers were able to consider their own classrooms and encouraged to seek training to provide solutions to their own problems, wouldn’t
teachers be more intrinsically motivated to attend professional development, and then, wouldn’t they be more likely to implement the training elements?

Professional Development for Teachers

Professional development plans such as the ones I completed may lead to teachers’ participation in 1-3 day workshops that are often ineffective and, thereby, a waste of time and resources. “One shot” workshops (e.g., a demonstration of a specific new classroom management strategy) are commonly offered through districts and allow for quick and easy fulfillment of professional development requirements. However, research on effective professional development has found that these one-shot workshops are often ineffective at helping to improve teaching practices in the classroom (Guskey, 1986; Loucks-Horsley, 1995). This raises the following questions: What elements of professional development promote changes to teachers’ practices? What elements of choosing and participating in professional development encourage intrinsic motivation among teachers to actively participate and reflect on the training? How can professional development programs be effective in the school (e.g., principals and staff) and for teachers (e.g., teacher-choice)? This study investigated possible answers to these questions.

Professional development training forms a steady part of the professional teacher’s career (e.g., extra courses, onsite workshops, and seminars). All of these post-graduate educational experiences are designed to enhance teachers’ development, and thereby, enhance their students’ motivation and students’ achievement. Yet relatively little is known about teachers’ motivations to implement as teachers implement professional development. Given the costs in money, time, and effort to produce professional development trainings and for teachers to attend them, it is imperative to understand how teachers apply training and the factors that influence their decisions.

Teachers’ Motivation for Implementation

One motivation theory that may explain teachers’ motivation to implement professional development is Self-Determination Theory developed by Deci and Ryan (1985). Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (1985; 2000) states that autonomy (e.g., choice),
competence (e.g., skills), and relatedness (e.g., collegiality) influence one’s intrinsic motivation (i.e., being motivated to perform a task due to an internal desire to carry out the task, not for any external reward). A previous pilot study indicated the importance of teachers’ choice and collegiality for implementing professional development; therefore, the element of competence was added as an important element to consider during this dissertation as SDT suggests (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000). This study investigated the SDT elements at the school (e.g., principals’ practices that facilitate or hinder teachers’ implementation by providing them with autonomy-supports, competence-supports, and positive relationships) and at the professional development training (e.g., the professional development trainers’ practices that facilitate or hinder teachers’ implementation through autonomy-supports, competence-supports, and positive relationships) that may help to produce a high degree of teachers’ intrinsic motivation and implementation, or may hinder teachers’ motivation and implementation (i.e., by using methods of control and coercion, stifling teachers’ professional growth, and fragmenting collegiality).

Great Expectations of Oklahoma’s Professional Development Model

GE’s model for training of teachers is in alignment with professional development research on high quality training for teachers (Fullan, 1991; Guskey, 1986; Loucks-Horsely, et al., 2003). Due to this alignment, GE was selected as the professional development training for this study. Without a high quality professional development, teachers may not be willing to attend, or implement the training, and principals may not desire to send teachers to the training and implement the practices.

GE’s professional development is designed to provide teachers with the knowledge, tools, skills, practice, and support they need to foster a positive school climate, garner high levels of parental involvement, increase attendance, engage students as active participants in their own learning, and improve students’ achievement (Biscoe & Harris, 2004; Turner & Shapley, 2001). The basic methodology is organized in the Great Expectations Handbook (2002) by six foundational tenets, and 17 practices, that GE proposes should guide teachers’ beliefs, attitudes, and instructional strategies. Because this study focuses on teachers’ implementation and not on the specific training itself, the following sections provide an overview of GE, the professional development setting for this study, followed by an overview of the theoretical framework.
Great Expectations Tenets

The GE teaching/professional development model is guided by six basic tenets (principles). These tenets, described below (GE Handbook, 2002), are displayed by exemplary teachers (e.g., Allington & Johnston, 2002; Bogner, Raphael, & Pressley, 2002), and provide guidelines for professional development and teachers’ implementation (Biscoe & Harris, 2004; Turner & Shapley, 2001).

All children can learn. All children can learn, no matter what labels are placed upon them, e.g., learning disabled, low socioeconomic status, bad home life, inner-city, rural, race, etc.

Teacher attitude and responsibility. It is the teacher’s responsibility to find the way to reach every student and to believe in that student’s ability to learn.

Building self-esteem. Building students’ self-esteem is the key to helping the students believe they are capable of learning and motivating them to try.

High expectations. Students must perceive that there are high expectations of them, and when they see those expectations, they will respond to reach upward to those expectations.

Climate of mutual respect. Students are empowered to take risks necessary for growth when encompassed in a climate of mutual respect where mistakes are seen as opportunities to learn, and students’ ideas and efforts are appreciated. Teachers show the respect to students that they desire to receive from the students.

Teachers’ knowledge and skill. The teacher’s attitude is expected to be encouraging, believing in children, caring, and requiring excellence in every detail. In order for teachers to accomplish these lofty goals, they must be knowledgeable and skillful in techniques that enable students, and teachers themselves, to achieve success.

Teachers who implement GE are expected to hold beliefs that all children can learn, that students’ learning should meet high standards, and that it is teachers’ responsibility to ensure students’ learning. Additionally, the GE philosophy integrates the belief that a teacher’s interpersonal relationship with her students is central to students’ academic learning, personal self-esteem building, and students’ development of social competencies. As described in the GE Handbook (2002), GE proposes that a positive, healthy relationship is created by teachers’ positive attitude that facilitates a climate of mutual respect:

The main goal of Great Expectations is to bring success and high expectations into the classroom by ensuring success for every student. Teachers do whatever it takes
to reach the students. An enriched curriculum encourages students to achieve and inspires students to greatness by helping them to believe in themselves. (p. 17).

The main elements of GE have been shown to be aligned with supporting the three elements of Deci and Ryan’s (1985) Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Biscoe, Harris, Turner, Grove, & Wilke, under review; Turner & Shapley, 2001). SDT suggests the importance of autonomy, competence, and relatedness to foster intrinsic motivation in an individual to perform a task. When teachers are intrinsically motivated to implement professional development, perhaps implementation will be to a greater degree and sustained over time.

Autonomy

GE seems to support teachers’ autonomy in several ways. One autonomy support is that GE promotes whole-school “buy-in” when making the choice to attend a GE training and/or professional development activity. When a whole-school chooses to be a “GE School” they can send all of their teachers and staff to a Summer Institute, they can send small groups of teachers over several years, or they can send small groups of teachers who then teach others. The qualitative pilot study conducted during the fall of 2006, suggested that teachers often attend the training in groups of teachers from their school who chose to attend. Their autonomy (i.e., choice) to attend GE was supported by having been given the choice to attend (not mandated) by their principals. The pilot study results also found that, even though the whole school may be committed to implementation of GE, sometimes only a select group of teachers may attend GE training. Lack of money and resources may not always allow every teacher from a school to attend the training. However, results also suggested that, although not all the teachers of a school attend the GE training, those teachers who did attend often teach others from their school about GE, thereby offering the choice (i.e., autonomy) for other teachers to learn about GE through opportunities other than the official GE Institute.

Another way that GE supports teachers’ autonomy is that teachers are given choices (i.e., alternatives) about how to implement GE practices. For example, the GE Methodology Handbook (2002) provides several examples for how teachers can begin to implement GE practices in small steps by beginning to utilize “simple” GE practices, and building on those to eventually implement all of the GE practices. GE encourages whole school reform, yet
concentrates on presenting the competencies of the training in manageable ways (thus promoting autonomy and competence, GE website: greatexpectationsok.org) for attending teachers and staff members. These manageable steps, for implementing GE, is a scaffolding technique (Vygotsky, 1927) that may be a key element of enhancing new learning.

**Competence**

At a minimum, teachers must feel they have the necessary materials and resources to implement changes for which they have received instruction. Perhaps more importantly, the professional development that teachers’ receive must be of sufficient duration so that they may receive adequate instruction. In particular, continued instructional support subsequent to professional development has been shown to be a key aspect of effective implementation (e.g., Barnett, 2003; Guskey, 2002; Loucks-Horsely, et al, 2003, National Research Council, 1999). Continued teacher-support may make the difference between a teacher trying out new techniques on a short-term basis and committing to full implementation. Ongoing follow-up, as well as coaching and/or mentoring, helps to scaffold teachers’ understanding and their use of new instructional practices (Loucks-Horsely, et al., 2003; Teberg, 1999). So, as teachers begin to implement GE, it is important that they receive feedback about their competency (i.e., skills), especially during initial phases of implementation.

In addition to sufficient time and resources, if reform efforts are to make a significant difference in schools, then professional development must address core aspects of teaching and learning (Kent, 2004). Recently, scholars have suggested that teachers will not teach differently until their instructional models or pedagogical understandings have been elaborated or changed (Hashweh, 2003; Leinhardt, 2001). In support of this claim, Haim, Strauss, and Ravid (2004) found that, although the depth of subject matter knowledge differed across the teachers in their study, it was the teachers’ instructional models, rather than their level of content knowledge, that influenced their instructional choices. Therefore, some scholars contend that professional development attention should focus on shifting teachers’ models of instruction to more complex, effective models of teaching and learning. Taken together, theory and research suggest that, when designing professional development programs, developers should include strategies that aim to broaden the instructional models and pedagogical understandings that teachers hold. GE
supports teachers’ competence by: providing time and resources, content knowledge and pedagogical strategies, and follow up opportunities.

Support during training. Professional development training includes new learning for teachers. With this in mind, teachers are learners during professional development training, and the research about students’ acquisition of new knowledge should also be considered by trainers of teacher professional development.

As learners, teachers’ acquisition of new teaching practices and beliefs may need to be scaffolded. As Vygotsky (1978) theorized, learners need to be assisted in the learning of new knowledge until the learner has the ability to continue the practice on his/her own. Students are often scaffolded through the assistance of the teacher or a more capable peer. Teacher trainings should be conducted with this knowledge in mind so teachers may feel more supported and relate to other peers in more effective ways. Scaffolding could include demonstration of instructional strategies, discussion among peers of implementation in the classroom, and even practice of the new strategies with other attendees of the training. GE considers the importance of scaffolding by providing meaningful training including modeling of GE practices, and allowing teachers a chance to implement the strategies during the training to receive feedback and build relationships to help foster intrinsic motivation to implement GE practices (Deci & Ryan, 1985; GE Handbook, 2002). GE also offers an implementation schedule which outlines which GE practices to implement first (at the beginning of the year), followed by sets of practices implemented throughout the first part of the year until all GE practices are in place (GE Handbook, 2002). This demonstrates understanding of the importance of scaffolding teachers’ knowledge and ability to implement GE strategies to provide competency beliefs in teachers.

Relatedness

SDT suggests that relationships may foster intrinsic motivation for the implementation of the training elements. GE supports teachers’ relatedness through collaboration during the initial training and through follow up after the training.

Summer institute collaboration. Because teachers usually have committed to implementing GE as a school, they most often attend GE summer institutes with colleagues from their schools.
Additionally, teachers often reside in college dorms while attending the training, where they have time, and fewer distractions, to reflect, plan, and collaborate about ways to incorporate specific GE practices in their school and classrooms (Turner & Shapley, 2001).

Another way that GE promotes relatedness is that GE professional development instructors model GE practices. In this way, GE instructors promote collegiality and collaborative learning among teacher-participants within their sessions. Teachers are provided with opportunities to share, learn, and reflect with teachers from their own schools, as well as with teachers from other schools. This approach assists in the creation of additional supportive contacts for teachers as well as providing teachers with experiences for understanding the importance of providing students with opportunities for sharing, learning, and reflecting.

Because of the processes teachers engage throughout their involvement with GE professional development, including having teachers commit to attend GE professional development as a whole-school effort, their simultaneous GE professional development experiences with many occasions for collaboration, teachers have multiple opportunities to experience and enhance their relatedness.

Following support. GE offers follow up for attending teachers and schools after attendance of GE training. GE has “mentors” who perform site visits and assist teachers and/or other staff members who are implementing GE practices to be more successful and to continue implementation. Along with the follow up to support competencies, the follow up also allows for collaboration to develop between attending teachers to GE and GE mentors. For example, if teachers are struggling with implementation, GE mentors can provide suggestions and support so implementation can continue to increase.

Overview of Study

This dissertation study explored the following contextual descriptions and flow of events. First, an organization (e.g., an educational environment) contains a hierarchy of roles that involve numerous individuals (i.e., principals and teachers) and implied levels of power and authority associated with each role; some roles with more power than others. To initiate the intention to attend professional development, the school (i.e., often an individual with higher power within the organization) identifies a need for which the school perceives that additional teacher-competence would fill. The teachers in the school may, or may not, have feelings of
personal agency (autonomy) and concurrence (collegiality/relatedness) regarding the decision to
attend the professional development training. However, even though the school (represented by
the principal) may have determined specific competency needs, individual teachers may have
other needs for which they seek to find solutions through attending professional development
training. Subsequent to the selection of professional development, some, or all, of the teachers
from the school attend the training. Some teachers may gain solutions to their own competency
needs as well as the needs identified by the school. However, other teachers may not find the
answers for which they were searching, and may therefore be less motivated to implement the
professional development strategies.

During the training, the teachers may, or may not, feel their autonomy is supported by the
trainers. They may, or may not, obtain answers to their own competency needs, as well as those
identified by the school. The teachers may also form positive relationships with other attending
teachers as well as with their instructors at the training, which can serve to promote their
motivation to implement the training elements. When the teachers return to their schools and
implement the elements of the training, their autonomy may increase as they feel their
competence increase and they feel more control over the implementation. The teachers may also
collaborate with others and discuss their implementation with their peers, which may further
build their positive relationships and support their individual perceptions of autonomy and
competence. Additionally, the professional development training—individuals involved with the
training and with follow-up support, may also facilitate teachers’ perceptions of their developing
autonomy, competence, and positive relatedness.

SDT states that an individual’s intrinsic motivation is guided by three elements:
autonomy-supports, competence-supports, and relatedness-supports. In this case, those supports
are provided through the school (e.g., principal and supporting staff) and professional
development training (e.g., GE staff). These three elements may be present at both the school
and training settings to enhance the degree of teachers’ motivation to implement GE.

In this qualitative dissertation study, I collected and analyzed data from both the training
and the school. At the school, I conducted interviews with principals and teachers of GE schools
(schools that have attended GE and claim to implement at least some of its practices). At the
training, I conducted interviews with the director of GE and GE staff members. The interviews I
conducted investigated the extent to which autonomy (e.g., choice), competence (e.g., enhancing
skills), and relatedness (e.g., collegiality) existed within the schools before the training, and if these elements were increased due to the training. Additionally, I conducted observations of teachers who have attended GE in order to investigate their level of GE implementation (as an indicator of this motivation and as an outcome measure) and interviewed the teachers to explore how SDT elements at the school level and the GE level may work together to enhance teachers’ motivation and implementation of GE. The teacher and principal interviews investigated the school’s goals and needs for seeking GE training. Analyses revealed that, the relationships between the principals and teachers greatly contributed to teachers’ motivation to attend the training and to implement the training. Analyses also revealed that the modeling teachers receive from their principal, district leader, and other teachers also contributed to the practices and attitudes that the teachers demonstrated. For example, if the principal and other teachers from the school model a positive attitude toward attending professional development trainings and making changes to classroom practices, other teachers are more likely to take on these attitudes and behaviors as well (Loucks-Horsely, et al., 2003).

At the training, I conducted interviews with the GE director and GE staff (i.e., GE mentors and GE instructors) to provide insight into if, and how, the training supports teachers’ autonomy, developing competence, and enhances relatedness among the attendees. I also conducted field notes (via observations) to document evidence of SDT elements (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness) at the training. I investigated the relationship among these elements as characteristics of the training that support and enhance teachers’ motivation to implement the training once returning to their school.

Research Questions

1) In what ways does GE support teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness during the training to foster motivation to implement?
2) How do principals support teachers’ autonomy to support teachers’ decisions to attend GE?
3) What is the process by which principals foster or hinder teachers’ intrinsic motivation to implement professional development?
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate how teachers’ motivation to implement professional development is influenced by the support by the principal. The two previous pilot studies provided insight into possible elements that may lead to greater implementation. There were two contexts of investigation for this study: the training and school context. At the training (GE), professional development instructors may enhance teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness to provide solutions to the school as well as to the teachers. When all of the SDT elements from both contexts (training and school) come together to foster teachers’ feelings of autonomy, competence, and relatedness thus promoting cascading intrinsic motivation for implementation of the training. As general practice, the school (usually through the principal’s decision making) seeks a professional development program for a specific purpose. That purpose may vary by school, but the initiative to seek training implies autonomy from some person(s). If the principal decides the teachers will attend training, the principal’s autonomy is being demonstrated, but not the teachers’. However, if teachers from the school decide to attend training on their own, the teachers’ autonomy is being demonstrated. On the other hand, as the data from this study demonstrates, implementation may be hindered when teachers’ feelings of autonomy, competence, and relatedness are not supported by the principal initially.

The results of this study provide insights into why teachers may implement professional development training elements instead of resisting changes. Professional development trainings, which can be quite costly to teachers and their schools, can be ineffective and tend to demonstrate a low percentage of change to teachers’ practices (Chance & Chance, 2001). If teachers have more choice in attending such professional development programs, perhaps professional development can be reconsidered to achieve more successful implementation rates.

The findings from this study are important because all too often teacher trainings are unsuccessful (Chance & Chance, 2001). One possible factor in trainings’ ineffectiveness may be that teachers are reluctant to change their practices, especially when they are forced to attend a training that the teachers know little about. When teachers feel they have autonomy to attend the training, and consider their own needs and seek training to provide answers, perhaps motivation for change will be increased. Also, the results of this dissertation study suggest that, if the
relationship affiliation between a principal and teachers is positive, teachers are more likely to be motivated to implement the training.

The following chapter explains the literature that provides the framework for this study. The literature includes an explanation of whole school reform, professional development, motivation (including both intrinsic and extrinsic), and descriptions of self-determination theory and expectancy-value theory.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

School Reform and Professional Development

To enhance teachers’ effectiveness, the primary mechanism is their attendance at professional development trainings. Professional development is an organized effort targeted towards changing teachers’ behaviors with an expectation that these changes will improve teachers’ instructional practices and, subsequently, students’ learning (Guskey, 1986). In this sense, professional development is seen as the catalyst for transforming research-based theory and findings into best teaching-practices and increased student-achievement. Because of the increased pressures placed on schools to have their teachers and students perform at high levels of “quality,” (NCLB, 2001) professional development activities are common in all schools (Brooks, 2006; Fullan 1993; Jacob & Lefgren, 2004).

Schools seek to implement change through professional development trainings that may provide teachers with new ideas and strategies. The goal for professional development programs is, generally, an enhancement of more effective teacher-practices (Abdal-Haqq, 1998), but may also be a way to ensure all teachers are implementing a new strategy or practice seen as necessary to the school or district. Administrators often promote the message that teachers must attend teacher trainings, and often mandate teachers’ attendance at trainings and/or workshops. However, some administrators and school board members serve elected positions with little knowledge of effective teaching or professional development (Chance & Chance, 2001), so not all mandated and/or suggested training sessions may be effective or useful for the teachers. For example, in Brook’s (2006) research, administrators admitted to seeking a professional development training only due to suggestions from a fellow administrator from another district or school who spoke highly of the training elements, and not necessarily because the training was appropriate for their school or district.

For professional development to be effective, teachers must be motivated to implement the learned strategies acquired during training. Unfortunately, low motivation and low implementation is common following teachers’ professional development (Guskey, 2001). I am
proposing that a motivational theory may assist the understanding of teachers’ low motivation and low implementation that is oftentimes demonstrated after professional development trainings. Understanding elements that lower teachers’ motivation and implementation may provide insights into ways that may enhance teachers’ motivation and implementation.

**Whole School Reform**

Whole school reform methods are continuing to be more popular as the need to achieve “high quality teachers” and to improve students’ achievement continues to be at the forefront of U.S. Policy (NCLB, 2002). However, research suggests that whole school reform models are often difficult to replicate without leaving teachers and staff members feeling like “trained monkeys” in an already set program (Craig, 2001, p. 36; Datnow, 2000). A lack of feelings of autonomy and competence in the new reform method may be to blame for some of the negative feelings of teachers toward whole school reform.

Schools often adopt or are chosen to implement a whole school reform method that does not allow for sufficient training of all teachers and staff. This lack of time and training leaves the teachers feeling confused and reluctant to make significant changes to teaching practices based on a program they know relatively little about. To confound this issue, many schools adopt reform models based on success of the program in another school. However, different schools have demographic, geographic, teacher, and administrative differences that make replication and guaranteed success in another school difficult to expect (Brooks, 2006; Chance & Chance, 2001; Craig, 2001).

**Why Teachers Must Attend**

Why is professional development necessary? There are many reasons why professional development is important for teachers. Guskey (2001) provides several reasons for professional development for teachers. First of all, the knowledge and literature in education changes often and rapidly and teachers need to be kept informed of new developments. Secondly, roles in a school often change and modify; teachers (and administrators) need to be trained to handle these new responsibilities. These are a couple of reasons why teachers “must” attend. Teachers often
attend professional development because they desire to learn new ways to improve their own teaching and training offers them that opportunity. Many state and district policies have led to professional development being a “requirement” for retaining teacher certification. This ensures that all teachers attend, whether or not they want to or are motivated to modify their teaching.

This requirement may be one extrinsic incentive for teachers to attend professional development trainings. However, studies on professional development consistently demonstrate that if teachers are mandated to attend a training based on being mandated by administration, the likelihood of teacher practices reflecting the learned knowledge is slim (Chance & Chance, 2001; Guskey, 2002; Leithwood Menzies & Janzi, 1994) despite being mandated to attend to re-certify. Additionally, research on motivation demonstrates that lack of personal causality also hinders intrinsic motivation to perform a behavior (Deci, 1975) (such as attending professional development (Deci, 1975). This demonstrates the importance of giving teachers a choice, or at least allowing them to play an active role in deciding to attend professional development to support teachers’ autonomy, which may lead to intrinsic motivation to implement the training.

Motivation

Woolfolk (2007) defines motivation as “an internal state that arouses, directs, and maintains behavior” (p. 372). Determining what motivates someone to work hard to learn to read, to write a paper for a class, or to modify teaching practices may all be behaviors educational psychologists may be interested in. In this study, I am interested in what motivates teachers to attend, participate in, and implement a professional development program. The questions most psychologists connect with motivation is “what” and “why” (Deci & Ryan, 2000b). The whats (e. g., What is this?, Aristotle, 980) and whys (Why do people do things?, Deci, 1975) that drive teachers’ behaviors to attend a professional development program, listen and participate in such a way that they are able to implement training elements once they return to their school, began the focus of this study.
Motivation can be broadly categorized as either intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. Deci (1975), in his book *Intrinsic Motivation*, states that intrinsically motivated behaviors are “behaviors which a person engages in to feel competent and self-determined” (p. 61) without external rewards. An individual is more likely to feel intrinsic motivation if he/she feels competent (i.e., able) and self determined (i.e., have internal locus of causality) to perform the behavior. Locus of causality means that a person assumes intention; thus has control and self-agency over the effects of behavior. In a sense, the person is in control of his/her own actions and therefore, the outcomes of those actions (Deci, 1975; 2000a). For example, if students feel they have the ability and the locus of causality (i.e., control) over learning to read, they will more likely have intrinsic motivation to learn to read. If a teacher feels she has the ability to make changes to her classroom practice after attending a professional development training that she had personal causality to attend, she will more likely feel intrinsic motivation to perform the behaviors of that training.

In the past, intrinsic motivation as it relates to learning mostly focused on students (Deci & Ryan, 2000a; Nicholls & Burton, 1982). When teachers attend professional development training, they are now in the “learner” role as they acquire new information about teaching and classroom practices. However, as research about intrinsic motivation demonstrates (Deci, 1975, Deci & Ryan, 2000a), a person must feel competent and self-determined in order to feel intrinsic motivation to perform a behavior (such as implementation of professional development). But why must a person feel intrinsic motivation? Why can’t a person feel extrinsic motivation if that causes the behavior to change in a desired way?

Much work was done in the early days of motivation research to demonstrate that extrinsic motivation (“motivation created by external factors such as rewards and punishments”, Woolfolk, 2007, p. 373), would also produce the desired behavior, so what did it matter that the person was rewarded (Allport, 1937; Woodworth, 1918)? These classical studies showed that when a person participated in an activity that was provided with an external reward (such as pay), that person might develop intrinsic motivation for that activity. However, these studies failed to make a direct link that the presence of an external reward actually increased intrinsic motivation to perform the activity. In fact, Deci (1975) later demonstrated that when rewards are
removed, individuals may continue the behavior because they are expecting that their additional performance would result in receiving the reward once more, rather than increasing their intrinsic motivation.

Later studies such as those by DeCharms (1968) and Festinger (1967) demonstrated that external rewards presented to a person for performing an activity made that person to feel as if they were performing that activity simply to receive a reward, and thus lowered their intrinsic motivation. Studies by Deci (1971) also supported the notion that when external rewards (such as monetary incentives) were presented to people even for doing activities that were intrinsically motivated, their intrinsic motivation decreased for performing that activity (Deci, 1975, p. 132). Still, a question remaining, why can’t teachers be extrinsically motivated to implement professional development? Indeed, there is still some debate on this issue, but according to research by Deci (1971), Deci, Koestner, and Ryan (1999) and others (e.g., Cameron, 2001), when a teacher (or student) is motivated to perform classroom duties solely based on external rewards, these rewards may undermine the quality of the behavior. Additionally, the behavior that is initiated by extrinsic rewards will often not be sustained over time, and could therefore make professional development a waste of time. Therefore, for activities such as teachers implementing a professional development training that may take effort and commitment to those activities, intrinsic motivation may be necessary to ensure that those behaviors continue over time. Research demonstrates that implementing professional development and making changes to classroom practices often takes more time than expected (Guskey, 2001, Fullan, 1991). The more a person takes responsibility and ownership of the changes, the more likely those behaviors will continue so that the classroom strategies can lead to influencing students’ achievement in the classroom.

Continued research on intrinsic motivation and factors such as competence and feeling self-determined led to the development of Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory (1991; 2000a, 2000b) discussed in the following section.
Self-Determination Theory

Autonomy

The teachers who participated in my study all made the choice to attend the training to some degree, so I wanted to investigate the degree to which teachers had autonomy in this choice, how they made this choice, and find possible connections to how this choice impacted their motivation and implementation of the professional development training. The schools (i.e., principals) may have decided that teachers would attend the professional development, but what motivated individual teachers to attend? Did the teachers have their own goals for attending a professional development that differed from the needs of the school? How might these differences have motivated or hindered a teacher’s implementation of the training? These questions were investigated during this study. The following sections investigate past research on these topics.

Much research has been conducted on professional development, including those that found that professional development trainings are often negative and ineffective (Corcoran, 1995; Guskey, 1986; Guskey & Huberman, 1995; Cooley, 1997) as well as studies that have found professional development to be positive and effective (Sparks & Hirsh, 1997). Although there is still much debate on what qualities are necessary for effective professional development, similarities of research include (1) providing sufficient time and resources (2) enhancing teachers’ content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge (i.e., competence), and (3) promoting collegiality (i.e., relatedness) and collaborative interactions, (Guskey, 2003). Research on qualities of effective professional development include competence and relatedness, which are two elements of SDT which may lead to intrinsic motivation. This research further supports using SDT to frame this study.

To support the notion that a key element to promote intrinsic motivation in teachers’ willingness to attend a training, teachers must feel autonomous (personal locus of causality) to decide to attend a training. First, I will discuss why teachers must attend professional development, why it may be important to give teachers a choice to attend training, and lastly how teachers’ attitudes may influence their behaviors when attending a training.
Giving Teachers a Choice

Although professional development training is familiar to teachers, in my experience, news of upcoming professional development plans are often met with sighs of frustration or feelings of annoyance among teachers. Why do teachers experience negative feelings toward professional development? One reason is that teachers often feel that they are not given a democratic voice in attending teacher training (Brooks, 2006; Guskey, 1986; Teberg, 1999). This democratic voice is part of a teacher’s perception of autonomy to decide whether or not he/she attends a professional development training.

Providing teachers with a choice in attending professional development reflects an understanding of the importance of providing autonomy to support teachers’ intrinsic motivation concerning professional development. If teachers are forced to attend a training, they may attend the training with a resentful attitude and not be willing to listen to new ideas (Leithwood, et al., 1994). One such study that demonstrated the need for giving teachers a choice to attend was a study conducted by Brooks (2006). Over the course of two school years, Brooks (2006) conducted a qualitative, grounded theory study to determine issues that affect school reform. Brooks spent two school years participating in a high school’s events, meetings, and classroom observations of teachers and administration, investigating the school reform process. He discovered that, while teachers may have limited choice on the trainings they attend, some schools require that teachers attend specific sessions as dictated by the administration. Therefore, teachers felt they are being coerced to attend, and feel little autonomy, and as a result, these trainings are often unsuccessful in changing teachers’ behaviors. Such studies demonstrate the importance of giving teachers a choice to attend professional development trainings so teachers will implement the training due to a feeling of autonomy.

Giving teachers a choice in attending professional development has also been shown to play a key role in earning teachers’ commitment to school reform. Research has demonstrated the importance of earning teachers’ commitment to school reform (i.e., professional development) to ensure high implementation by the teachers and “demonstrated willingness to innovate” (Leithwood, et al., 1994, p. 42; Coleman & LaRocque, 1990; Kushman, 1992).
Leithwood, et al, (1994) defined teachers’ commitment to change to include “their identification with and desire to be involved in efforts to implement changes in school and classroom structures and processes” (p. 42). When teachers have this type of commitment, they are more likely to be motivated to attend and implement changes to their classroom practices, as well, as sustain these changes over time. Indeed, as SDT proposes, the commitment to change demonstrates teachers’ feelings of autonomy, which is more likely to foster their intrinsic motivation to change.

In addition to having commitment to attend professional development, a teacher’s personal goals may also influence feelings of commitment to reform (Ames, 1992; Fullan, 1991; Leithwood, et al, 1994). A school may develop “school-wide” goals in which a particular professional development is sought to provide answers. A teacher may even go along with these goals and see the goals as important for the school as a whole. However, only when a teacher sets personal goals that are aligned to a professional development training that she/he is attending, will intrinsic motivation and commitment be attained (Ames, 1992; Leithwood, et al, 1994). These personal goals must relate to the needs teachers feel they have for their classrooms. For example, if a teacher feels that her classroom management is fine and not in need of change, however, she feels that her class needs smoother transitions, she is more likely to develop a personal goal of seeking to correct transitions as opposed to classroom management. Even if the school as a whole is seeking professional development to correct classroom management, this teacher will be more committed to the professional development if she feels her need of smoother transitions will be gained from the training (Ford, 1992; Kushman, 1992; Leithwood, et al, 1994).

However, in addition to feeling autonomy (and commitment) to attend and implement professional development training, teachers must also believe they have the ability to implement the strategies learned at a training. If teachers learn strategies that they believe may be useful, but that they simply do not have the ability to perform, feelings of intrinsic motivation will be hindered as a result of feeling low competence to implement (Deci & Ryan, 2000).
Competence

Competence is one’s ability to deal effectively with his/her surroundings (Deci, 1975). Feelings of competence have been shown to influence one’s intrinsic motivation for a particular activity (Deci & Ryan, 1985). If teachers do not feel competent in their abilities to perform the training elements, or do not know how to go about implementing the new strategies in their classrooms, intrinsic motivation will likely be low. Leithwood, et al, (1994) describe competence as “capacity beliefs” (p. 46). Capacity beliefs are personal beliefs that interact with teachers’ goals that foster feelings of motivation to implement professional development strategies. Capacity beliefs are similar to feelings of self-efficacy (Leithwood, et al, 1994). Not only must teachers have personal goals that promote commitment (i.e., autonomy) towards attending and implementing professional development, but they must also feel able to accomplish these goals (Chase, 1992; Kemis & Warren, 1991). Teachers’ perceptions concerning their capacity beliefs to accomplish personal goals (i.e., competence) relates to their feelings of intrinsic motivation and effort to implement. Such feelings of competence must be provided during a training as well as during implementation to ensure a teacher will continue to feel intrinsically motivated to implement changes (Bandura, 1986; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Guskey, 2002; Leithwood, et al., 1994). Feelings of competence are also related to teachers’ feelings of self-efficacy concerning their teaching abilities. Self-efficacy has been shown to be related to teachers’ intrinsic motivation to implement changes to classroom practices (Chester & Baudin, 1996; Kermis & Warren, 1991).

Teachers’ Self Efficacy Beliefs

Self-efficacy beliefs are a person’s beliefs in personal ability (i.e., competence) to perform a behavior (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy beliefs have been shown to predict the amount of coping someone (e. g., a teacher) will exhibit concerning an activity (e. g., implementing professional development), how much effort a person will put forth in performing that activity, and if that behavior will be sustained over time (Bandura, 1977; 1986). If a teacher has high self-efficacy beliefs about his ability to implement strategies learned at professional development training, research suggests that her intrinsic motivation to implement to a high degree, and over a period of time may be increased (Bandura, 1986; Chase, 1992; Leithwood, et al., 1994; Pajares, 1996). Vicarious experiences, such as receiving knowledge through a secondary source, or a
professional development trainer, has also shown to be influenced by a teachers’ sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986; Leithwood, et al., 1994). If a trainer promotes the teachers’ feelings of competence (i.e., self-efficacy) by providing scaffolding to implement the new strategies and feedback so teachers feel they have the ability to implement the strategies on their own, self-efficacy (i.e., competency) beliefs may be increased, therefore, increasing intrinsic motivation to implement and continue to implement over a period of time (Bandura, 1977; 1986; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Pajares, 1996).

Ultimately, teachers hold the power to implement pedagogical change or not (Fullan, 1993; Eisenhart, Cuthbert, Shrum, Harding, 1988; Solomon, 2003; Wineburg & Grossman, 2000). In such studies, teachers attended a professional development but often failed to implement the strategies learned for a variety of reasons, including not feeling that the training aligned to their classroom needs, and not having their learning scaffolded to be implemented in the classroom. Teachers do have a great amount of autonomy for the activities in their classroom (Fullan, 1993), and if they don’t want to implement a change, they can chose not to. Teachers’ power and perceptions of whether or not to implement professional development in their classrooms may be related to teachers’ self-efficacy concerning their ability (i.e., competence) to implement the changes (Bandura, 1993; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Guskey, 2000).

Teacher’s Low Implementation

Teachers can and do prevent the implementation of new training based on their own attitudes concerning the training (Brown & McIntyre, 1982; Eisenhart et al., 1988). For example, a teacher may not be motivated to listen to and understand the new teaching practices presented during professional development training. If teachers are uncommitted to the training, or to an innovative strategy, they may simply not implement the ideas from the training in their classrooms (Brown & McIntyre, 1982; Common, 1983). This may be particularly true when teachers attend professional development only because the training was mandated by administration.

Implementation of new teaching practices often requires a effort. If teachers do not see a need for change in their own practices, how can they be expected to have a motivation to implement changes? This question was investigated during this study. In addition to a lack of confidence and value in the training, many new teaching practices are not presented in a
manageable implementation process (Leithwood et al., 1994). Changing teaching strategies is difficult, and implementation may not be immediate. However, the strategies need to be presented in manageable steps, and teachers need to be mentored in order to see “how” to implement these changes, especially when the new practices conflict with their current beliefs and instructional strategies (Chance & Chance, 2001; Fullan, 1993). In addition to feelings of autonomy and competence, SDT proposes that teachers must also feel relatedness to reach a state of intrinsic motivation to modify behavior (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000).

**Relatedness**

Relatedness refers to the connections with other people partaking in the same activity (Ryan & Deci, 2000). I used relatedness (i.e., peer support and collegiality) as a way to investigate reasons that teachers’ motivation is facilitated or hindered to implement the professional development strategies.

**Collegiality.** Collegiality among teachers has been shown to influence the implementation of professional development (Clement & Vandenherghe, 1999). Clement and Vandenherghe (1999) investigated how collegiality (i.e., relatedness) and autonomy influences elementary teachers’ professional development. In their study, mostly qualitative methods were used to collect data; however questionnaires were also used to confirm the findings from interviews and observations. Findings from Clement and Vandenherghe consisted of the confirmation that collegiality includes “stories” and sharing of ideas leading to “joint work” (Clement & Vandenherghe, 1999, p. 10). The teachers shared stories of success and failure of teaching practices as well as engaged in small talk to produce a meaningful relationship with each other. Teachers used these stories to offer feedback and advice on situations. Also, the offering of help between teachers often led to the sharing of ideas that sometimes led to combined effort between the teachers.

**Teachers’ Professional Communities.** As teachers’ organization groups focus their attention on teachers being regarded as professionals, studies have been conducted to investigate what assists teachers’ in feelings of professionalism and respect (e.g., Louis & Marks, 1998). Professional development has become a part of collaboration to assist teachers in developing as
professionals and creating relationships with other educators to share ideas and become as effective as possible. A study by Louis and Marks (1998) focused on teachers’ professional communities as it relates to students’ achievement. Professional communities, as stated by Louis and Marks (1998) state that when teachers are able to collaborate, the collegiality (i.e., relatedness) and sharing of ideas will create “better teachers” (p. 534).

When teachers encounter problems or needs in the classroom, they often turn to other teachers for guidance (Louis & Marks, 1998). This sharing reinforces the relationships between teachers and demonstrates a need for collegiality for high quality teaching. According to SDT, through the building of relationships (collegiality) teachers may build intrinsic motivation for implementing change in their classrooms. The discussing and sharing of ideas helps teachers address specific problems in the classroom, while continuing to build relationships with other teachers. Research also suggests that the building of relationships and discussing of ideas for instructional strategies may also support teachers’ feelings of competence to implement changes which further promotes intrinsic motivation as it relates to professional development (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Not only is relatedness (collegiality) important from teacher to teacher, but Louis and Marks (1998) found that school-wide professional community is also important for school reform. When teachers are supported by the entire school, including administration, collegiality (i.e., relatedness) can continue to develop with other teachers that may not occur otherwise.

The following section describes how the role of the principal as the leader of the school may influence a teachers’ motivation to implement changes to classroom practices due to professional development training.

The Role of the Principal as Leader

Just as teachers conduct their classrooms in various ways and still experience success, principals may also lead their schools in ways that differ from other principals, even within the same district. However, some principals’ personality and leadership style may hinder positive relationship affiliations from being formed with teachers (and staff) that may create an atmosphere where teachers have low motivation to seek growth opportunities as professional educators (Brooks, 2006; Chance & Chance, 2002; Leithwood, et al., 1994).
If a principal chooses to make decisions for the school as he sees fit, without discussing the issue with teachers and staff, the teachers may feel resentment and even anger toward the principal (Brooks, 2006). Changes may be seen as dictated by the principal and may not be embraced by the teachers when teachers feel they do not have autonomy in the decisions of the school (Brooks, 2006; Guskey, 1986; Marzano, 2003). This situation may worsen if there is a negative relationship affiliation between the principal and teachers based on the principal not providing teachers with autonomy support. On the other hand, if there are positive relationship affiliations between the principal and teachers and the principal makes a change to policy the teachers may better embrace the change because of their trust and respect for their leader (Fullan, 1993).

Research has shown that teachers’ perceptions about the school climate, working conditions and school leadership may influence how they feel about reform (such as implementing professional development) (Kushman, 1992; Louis & Smith, 1991). There may be numerous types of successful leaders, but two main types that have been identified (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987) are: transactional and transformational leaders.

*Other Factors to Support Autonomy, Competence, and Relatedness*

In addition to the above mentioned research and questions to be answered during this study, other research related to motivation, SDT and self-efficacy such as value alignment (as shown in Expectancy-Value Theory) may help in providing understanding concerning the phenomenon of teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness as they implement professional development.

**Expectancy-Value Theory**

Expectancy-Value Theory is based on the notion that a person’s motivation to perform a behavior is the product of expectations about his/her own ability (i.e., competence) to perform the task (i.e., meet a goal) and the value of that goal to the person (Eccles, et al., 1983). Expectancy-Value suggests that the product of these two forces equal the individual’s motivation to achieve that goal. If one or the other force was zero, than the motivation to achieve that goal would also be zero. For example, if a teacher had high expectations concerning her ability to
implement changes to her classroom practices based on a professional development training, but did not value those changes or strategies, her motivation to implement the strategies would be zero, despite the fact that she had the expectation (i.e., competence) to perform the goal. Wigfield and Eccles (2000) researched the concept further to explain that a person’s choice (i.e., autonomy) of tasks or goals, persistence on those tasks, and performance on those tasks can be explained by determining the individual’s expectancy and value concerning the task or goal. Other theorists in this area (Atkinson, 1957; Eccles, et al., 1983) “argue that individuals’ choice, persistence, and performance can be explained by their beliefs about how well they will do on the activity and the extent to which they value the activity” (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000, p. 68).

Wigfield and Eccles (2000) conducted a study to assess children’s ability beliefs and subjective task values concerning their expectancies and values about their math ability. This study also included items to students concerning their ability beliefs, expectancies and feelings of usefulness (importance, i.e., value) to determine students’ motivation to perform math tasks in their classrooms. Their study (and more to follow) continues to demonstrate the importance of a person’s ability beliefs (i.e., self-efficacy, or competence) that focus more on present day, specific task related beliefs, along with expectations for future performance in that area (e.g., “How well do you expect to do in math this year?”) and how much that person values the task does influence motivation to perform that task.

Expectancy-Value Theory suggests that a person’s expectations or competency beliefs (also related to self-efficacy beliefs) along with personal values for that task or goal, determines their motivation to perform the task. This relates to SDT by suggesting that a teacher who has high (i.e., competency) beliefs in ability to implement the professional development, plus values the professional development, then intrinsic motivation to implement the professional development should also be fostered.

Other research by Wigfield, Eccles, and Rodriguez (1998) suggest that, in addition to expectancies and values that influence a person’s motivation to perform a task or goal, there may be social influences on learning and motivation (Eccles, et al., 1983; 1998). SDT states that relatedness is vital to foster intrinsic motivation for an individual to perform a task. Other theorists have also demonstrated the importance of social factors in learning and motivation to change (such as Vygotsky, 1978). Wigfield, et al’s., (1998) review of research demonstrated that the third element of SDT, relatedness, may also be a key determinant to motivation to perform a
task or achieve a goal, in addition to self-efficacy beliefs concerning performance (i.e., competence) and control elements (i.e., autonomy).

The above described research and theories led to the development of the research questions for this study: 1) In what ways does GE support teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness during the training to foster motivation to implement? 2) How do principals support teachers’ autonomy to support teachers’ decisions to attend GE? 3) What is the process by which principals foster or hinder teachers’ intrinsic motivation to implement professional development?

The following chapters describe (1) my methods used in this study (2) theory-driven and grounded theory analysis of the data collected, (3) results from the theory-driven and grounded theory analysis, and (4) a discussion of the results of this study related to current literature.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

The overarching focus for this qualitative dissertation was to investigate why some teachers are motivated to make changes in their classrooms while others seem to resist change. An underlying premise was that, when teachers feel intrinsically motivated and enthusiastic to attend professional development (through feelings of autonomy), feel competence to implement the professional development strategies and form supportive relationships, greater implementation of professional development may occur. This study investigated how teachers’ intrinsic motivation to attend and implement professional development training was supported by the professional development training and the teachers’ principal upon returning to school. SDT was used as the theoretical framework to investigate this phenomenon. This dissertation used a case study qualitative design (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003) to investigate teachers’ motivation and implementation of professional development.

The following research questions guided the investigation of elements that may foster or hinder teachers’ motivation to change classroom practices.

Research Questions

1. In what ways does GE support teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness during the training to foster motivation to implement?
2. How do principals support teachers’ autonomy to support teachers’ decisions to attend GE?
3. What is the process by which principals foster or hinder teachers’ intrinsic motivation to implement professional development?
Overview of Data Collection

Data were collected within two contextual settings of investigation for this study: the training, and the school. Data collected from these contexts included interviews, observations, and field notes. In the training context, data were collected from the GE director and GE staff. In the school context, data were collected from the role-hierarchies of district staff (former principal), principals, and teachers.

Types of Data Collected: Interviews, Observations, and Field Notes

Interviews

Consent forms from each participant were obtained at the time of interviews and/or observations. The full consent form can be found in Appendix B. All interviews were semi-structured (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and followed the same series of questions (see Appendix C). However, if needed, additional follow-up questions were asked of the participants to obtain detailed information for answering the research questions posed by this dissertation study. The interviews ranged in length (most were approximately 20 minutes), depending on the amount of time the participant was willing to spend, and were recorded on a digital recording device.

Interviews of teachers, principals, GE staff, and the GE director began with questioning participants about their background including how long each participant had held his/her position, years of teaching experience, and years of association with GE. After background information was collected, interview questions focused on obtaining information to answer the research questions.

Teacher Observations

As an indication of teachers’ motivation to implement GE, observations of both high school teachers and elementary school teachers were conducted to see the extent to which implementation of GE elements were being practices by the teachers. An observation instrument was used to determine teachers’ levels of implementation of GE practices (see Appendix D). The observation instrument was modified from an observation instrument used to evaluate Great Expectations of Arkansas (Turner, Bowman, & McCann, 2004), which is a similar professional development program as Great Expectations of Oklahoma.
For the current study, face validity (Miles & Huberman, 1994) for the GE observation instrument was obtained from the GE director and a GE mentor (who regularly observes and evaluates GE teachers). Both the GE director and GE mentor agreed that the GE observation instrument adequately assesses the extent to which teachers implement GE practices. To determine reliability of the observations, a GE mentor simultaneously conducted one of the teacher observations with the primary researcher. Both observers recorded written accounts of the classroom activities and, at the conclusion of the observation, both researchers individually completed the observation instrument, rating the teacher’s degree of GE implementation. Ratings were subsequently discussed until 100% agreement was reached between both observers. The remaining teacher observations were conducted by the primary researcher.

Field Notes

In addition to field notes taken during classroom observations of teachers, written descriptions of events of the GE training classroom, settings, instructional strategies, activities, and dialogues were collected. Also collected during the field notes, were evidence of the professional development’s support for teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness, and for instructional strategies for attending teachers to support their own students’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Similar to the observation notes taken during teacher observations, GE training observations were collected as written accounts of classroom activities.

Field notes were collected in two GE training classrooms by two researchers to ensure collection validity (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994). At the conclusion of simultaneously writing observation field notes for two GE training classroom, both researchers met and discussed their observations. Discussions revealed that both researchers were in complete agreement of all events of both observed training-classrooms. With interrater reliability established, the remaining two GE training-classrooms were then observed solely by the primary researcher (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Triangulation was ensured through the collection of multiple sources of data (interview, observations) and through the use of different levels of participants within an organization (principals and teachers; GE mentors and GE staff). Also, since interviews and observations were made at both an elementary and high school within the same district, a more thorough
understanding of the differences that may exist between grade levels was captured during this study.

**Procedures**

**Setting and Timeline**

The timeline for this study is divided into three phases. Each phase is described in the sections below.

*Phase I.* Phase I of this dissertation study was part of a larger study investigating the teachers’ attitudes and emotions about implementing GE practices, that occurred during the summer of 2006. Participants of the initial study were asked if they would be willing to be interviewed concerning their implementation process. If willing, participants were asked to leave their names and phone numbers for follow-up contact during the spring. Sixty-seven participants (out of about 400 summer 2006 attendees) agreed to be interviewed and left their names and numbers on the consent forms. Three of these consenting participants were interviewed during an exploratory qualitative pilot study conducted during fall of 2006. Additional consenting participants were selected for interviews and/or observations for this dissertation study.

*Phase II.* Phase II of this study was conducted during the spring of 2007 and included interviews of teachers who had attended GE in the past and their principals, as well as observations of the interviewed teachers’ classroom instruction. An interview with the director of GE was also conducted via phone during phase II of spring of 2007.

*Phase III.* Phase III of this study was conducted during the summer of 2007. Interviews of GE staff were conducted during the summer of 2007 during the site visit to the GE Summer Training Institute. Initial field notes of the GE training were collected during Phase I; however, these field notes were not collected to specifically analyze the data using the framework of Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Although the initial field notes provided some evidence that the GE training included SDT elements of autonomy, competence, and relatedness, further observations and field notes were collected during the GE training of summer 2007, specifically noting SDT elements of autonomy, competence, and relatedness.
Context and Participants: Schools

During phase I of this study (fall 2006), contact was made with Mrs. P., a high school mathematics teacher who had attended GE training the previous summer. Although she could not participate in the pilot study, she agreed to be a participant during phase 2 of the study, agreeing to be interviewed and have her teaching observed at her school. She mentioned that four (total) teachers at her high school had attended GE in the past. I contacted the principal and asked for his permission to conduct a site visit of the high school in order to interview and observe those teachers. Three teachers who had attended GE gave verbal agreement to be participants when I arrived (spring 2007).

The high school is approximately 45 minutes from the location of the summer GE training. The high school is part of a small school district consisting of two elementary schools (one contains grades K-2, the other grades 3-5), one middle school (grades 6-8), and one high school (grades 9-12). To not introduce regional effects, I contacted the principal of the elementary school (grades 3-5) to request a site visit there. Although the selection of teachers who have attended GE is part of purposeful sampling crucial to qualitative research (Creswell, 2005), choosing both a high school and elementary school helped ensure maximal variation sampling (Creswell, 2005). The elementary principal gave permission for me to visit the school and mentioned that most of the teachers had attended GE at some time in the past, so I could interview and observe whoever was willing.

Once I arrived for the site visit, I visited the elementary school first (per their preference for the beginning of the week). I spoke with the principal first, at which point he introduced me to several teachers and gave me a tour of the school. He introduced me to every teacher that we met on the tour. As I met teachers on my tour of the school, I asked several teachers if I could observe and interview them. Every teacher agreed, but I only had a chance to observe four in order to have enough time to observe a complete lesson (approximately 45 minutes).

Each school had only one principal, so both of the principals were asked to be interviewed, and gave their consent. Numerous teachers mentioned Mrs. O, a former principal of the primary elementary school in town (grades K-2) and now a district staff person. The high school principal also mentioned her and suggested I speak with her about her knowledge and experience with GE. The principal called Mrs. O and set up a time for me to interview her. She gave her consent and I interviewed her during the same site visit of the schools.
**Principals.** Semi-structured interviews of both school principals were conducted regarding their perceptions of providing supports for teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness to foster motivation concerning teachers’ decision to attend GE, the GE training, and the implementation processes. The principals’ interviews provided insight into the extent to which the principals’ supported or hindered their teachers to feel intrinsically motivated in ways that may foster implementation of GE. Interviews with principals also revealed the principals’ values concerning professional development in general, and how much each valued GE specifically.

**Teachers.** Semi-structured interviews were conducted with teachers whose classrooms were also observed. Interviews of teachers investigated individual teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ facilitation or hindrance of their intrinsic motivation for attending GE training and implementing of GE practices. Interviews of teachers also investigated teachers’ perspectives of how GE training encouraged their intrinsic motivation during the training, and how both the principal and GE staff have continued to foster teachers’ intrinsic motivation for implementation of GE by way of supporting their autonomy, competence, and relatedness, after the training.

The following tables show the demographic information of all the school participants in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Grade level</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. E</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>math &amp; social studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. K</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>math, science, &amp; spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. D</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>reading &amp; social studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. H</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>reading &amp; social studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5 (in current position)</td>
<td>Elementary School, grades 3-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

High school participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Grade level/subject</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. M</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>reading, literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. P</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. D</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>language arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. G</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. F</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4 (in current position)</td>
<td>High School, grades 9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. O</td>
<td>Former elementary principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14 as principal in district</td>
<td>Former elementary principal, grades K-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context and Participants: Professional Development

Participants of data collected at the GE training level included two sub-levels, the GE director and staff members.

Director of GE. The interview of the director of GE was conducted to provide insights into ways GE promotes choice in teachers’ attendance of the training. The interview of the GE director also provided insights into ways the GE organization fosters intrinsic motivation for attending teachers to implement GE practices by supporting teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness before, during, and after the training. The GE director also provided information about the application process of schools and teachers to attend GE summer training as well as information about the process of choosing attendees. She also assists principals and teachers who attend and/or plan to attend GE training and supervises GE mentors and instructors. Regarding the responsibilities of the GE director, personal correspondence (March 2007) revealed that …the program director is responsible for assisting the founder/board chairman and board of directors in providing effective leadership for developing, achieving, and maintaining a superior educational training program. The program director is responsible for implementing and providing direction for the program. He/she supervises mentors. He/she meets with program staff regularly to plan, discuss, and problem solve. The program director plans all program activities, provides public awareness of the GE program, works with College of Education to promote the program, and works with
administrators to help them provide the leadership necessary to create a systematic change using GE as the change agent. The program director is supervised by the CEO.

**GE staff.** The GE staff consists of GE mentors and GE instructors. GE mentors support other GE instructors and also provide follow-up to schools by visiting teachers who have attended GE professional development. Both GE mentors and GE instructors (2 of each) were interviewed during this dissertation study to provide a range of viewpoints concerning the trainings’ support of participating teachers’ feelings of autonomy, competence, and relatedness to increase motivation to implement GE practices. Personal correspondence (March 2007) with the GE director revealed that GE mentors

…facilitate on-site GE implementation in the schools during the school year. They also recruit, train, and supervise Summer Institute instructors. They teach Summer Institute courses. They work with the program director to plan and conduct sessions for follow-up training. They work with schools and districts to develop model programs, provide professional development sessions for requesting schools, and provide GE awareness sessions for schools, civic groups, and state organizations. They work with the program director, and program coordinator to develop program guidelines, forms, and standard procedures to insure program efficiency and quality. The mentors are supervised by the program director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Grade level/subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Q</td>
<td>Teacher/GE instructor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher:15 GE instructor:8</td>
<td>K/all subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. I</td>
<td>Teacher/GE instructor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher/Principal:11 GE instructor:1</td>
<td>High school/former assistant principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. T</td>
<td>GE Mentor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5 (in current position)</td>
<td>Taught elementary school in past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Q</td>
<td>GE Mentor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7 (in current position)</td>
<td>Taught middle school in past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Q</td>
<td>GE Director</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11 (in current position)</td>
<td>Former elementary principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The GE instructors, however, are the leaders of the GE training where the participating teachers attend professional development. All GE instructors are current teachers in classrooms. The above chart shows the demographic information of all GE staff who were participants for this study.
CHAPTER FOUR
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This study began as an investigation into why some teachers are motivated to make changes in their classrooms, while others seem to resist change. Although this study focused on a particular professional development program, the professional development contains qualities that are aligned with successful teacher trainings (Biscoe, Harris, Turner, Grove, & Wilke, manuscript under review; Turner, Biscoe, & Harris, 2005). After interviews and observations of both the training and school settings, the following results were found. Interviews and written accounts from observations were included in these results.

Data Analysis

Interviews of all participants were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim into text. Data were then analyzed using (1) a theory based approach (looking for elements of SDT) to answer research questions one and two, and (2) a grounded theory approach to answer research question three.

Data Analysis for Questions One and Two

To answer Research Questions One and Two, (investigating how GE training supported SDT elements to promote teachers’ implementation and how principals’ supported the teachers’ autonomy to foster motivation to attend GE and implement GE), I coded the interviews for examples of teachers’ descriptions that were aligned with SDT elements. Additionally, I observed the GE training to determine in what ways GE supported SDT elements, and interviewed GE staff to investigate additional ways GE supports SDT elements to foster teachers’ motivation to implement. This theory-driven analysis began with the main categories in mind (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness) for coding data, but allowed additional subcategories to emerge that could provide more details and further explanations of the answers to the research questions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Categories and number of participants who made comments within each category is displayed in Table 4 below.
Observation data of teachers’ classrooms were also used to answer research question number two. This data included information concerning teachers’ degree of implementation. Interviews helped to further explain why some GE practices were not seen during observations.

Data Analysis for Question Three

To answer Research Questions Three, I reanalyzed the interview data using line-by-line, open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Open coding refers to “the analytic process through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions are discovered in the data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 101). Although open coding can refer to discovering categories within the data, in this case, the categories of SDT were already in place as the theoretical framework. The SDT elements (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness) were used as the initial codes during the first phase of coding.

Once open coding was completed for all of the data, axial coding began. Axial coding refers to “the process of relating categories to their subcategories” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 123). Following the processes of axial coding, a general descriptive overview of the “story” line (“a descriptive narrative about the central phenomenon of the study” pg. 116, Strauss & Corbin, 1998) was developed. However, not all data were explained by the SDT elements so further analysis occurred that will be explained later in this section.

Thematic Coding

Larger, higher-order categories were constructed from the numerous sub-categories that emerged from the data. For example, when coding an interview with a teacher, a teacher expressed feelings of support of her autonomy from her principal stating, “I think [attending GE] was just a conversation [with principal] and then I said ‘well I’d like to go’ and then I went.” The teacher’s feelings as to the extent the principal supported autonomy for implementation of GE was coded as “principal support of autonomy for GE.” However, the teacher also mentioned how GE staff or mentors supported her feelings of autonomy for attending the training and subsequently for implementing GE elements. Another teacher stated “I have [attended] GE probably 8 or 9 times. I have done it several times. Yes...I call them ‘yearly checkups’ [GE
vocabulary]. We’ll go a couple of times during the year, we’ll have a day to go up and have a refresher.” These comments were coded as “GE support of autonomy for GE”. Categories and number of participants who made comments in each category is displayed in table 4 below.

Table 4
Categories and counts of teacher comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does your principal and GE support or hinder your autonomy, competence, and relatedness?</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/teachers autonomy supportive</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/teachers autonomy inhibitive</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE autonomy supportive</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/teachers competence supportive</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/teachers competence inhibitive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE competence supportive</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/teachers relatedness supportive</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE competence supportive</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do teacher’s values align with values of principal and GE?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher values aligned to values of principal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher values misaligned to values of principal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher values misaligned to values of GE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments about GE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive emotions/feelings about GE (fun, motivating, exciting)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE supports classroom management</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE looks different in different classrooms, grades, etc.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE supports other professional development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership styles (Mastery vs. Performance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher has mastery leadership style</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher has performance leadership style</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to open and axial coding used to answer research questions one and two, to answer research question three, additional grounded theory analysis was used. Although grounded theory researchers promote the notion that grounded theory analysis and results should emerge without a priori categories, Glaser and Strauss (1967) have stated that categories from existing theories can be “borrowed” (p. 36). Emergent categories for grounded theory is
considered ideal so that the researcher is “theoretically sensitive” (p. 46) to new emergent
categories to conceptualize and develop a theory from the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This
study was conducted and analyzed in a manner appropriate to give rise to a grounded theory
development of an emergent model. Qualitative data, by its very nature, is conducive to
grounded theory analysis. Multiple perspectives and rich descriptions aid the researcher in
allowing theory to emerge from the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Also, a variety of types of
data were collected for this study (i.e., interviews from multiple teachers of different grade
levels, principals, GE director, GE staff), which assists the grounded theory development to
include all perspectives and categories that may arise from the situation (Dey, 1999).

Although useful, SDT did not capture the complexity of the data collected to answer
question three. Remaining data seemed to be unexplained by the categories of SDT. Upon further
examination, analysis revealed that “values” also emerged as a central category from the data
and a model was developed. Once the model could be applied for all the data, I reached
theoretical saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in which all the data were described and analyzed
into existing codes with no new codes were emerging. The model includes the SDT elements
along with elements of Control-Value Theory (Pekrun, 2000) to describe the central phenomena
of this study.

*Inter-rater Reliability*

Since this dissertation study utilized a theoretical framework (i.e., SDT), the data were
initially coded using the three aspects of SDT (autonomy, competence, and relatedness). After
initial coding of all the interviews a second researcher coded a subset of the interviews to support
validity, interrater reliability of data coding was established. The interviews, coded by both
researchers, represented a wide range of interviews and observations including those from both
elementary and high school teachers to provide a representative sample of coded interviews. I
explained how to use these codes and provided background literature to the assisting researcher
to ensure shared meaning about the definitions of these constructs and how they might be seen in
the data for this dissertation. However, the second researcher was encouraged to identify
emerging codes as well.
The second researcher coded a subset of the interviews \((n=4)\) and then met with me to discuss existing and emergent codes. When comparing my coding of the data to that of the assisting researcher’s coding, both sets matched codes in the majority of the data coded. The only differences occurred in two areas: the use of “autonomy” to include classroom activities provided to the students by the teacher and the use of “relatedness” referring to the teacher connecting to the students in a personal way. After clarification and discussion, the assisting researcher agreed with the codings of data among these four sets. Analysis of data continued using axial coding to better refine the results.

**Axial Coding**

Because three elements of SDT were used as initial categories for data analysis, subcategories such as “principal support of teachers’ autonomy to implement GE” vs. “GE support of teachers’ autonomy to implement GE” were all considered related to autonomy support for the teacher. These subcategories were related to each other and used to develop the model as a way to understand the overall phenomenon occurring in the schools, not just one participant. The analysis of the SDT elements (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness) revealed an additional category of “values.” Subcategories such as “values alignment between principal and teacher” and “values alignment between teacher and GE practices” lead to the development of a model that included SDT elements and those of Control-Value theory (Pekrun, 2006). Continuation of the analysis of coded data from subcategories into categories continued until the answers to the first two research questions were complete.
Results

Research Question Number One: In what ways does GE support teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness during the training to foster motivation to implement?

Although there is much debate on what constitutes “high quality professional development,” however, at the least, professional development must be liked by the teachers. If teachers attend a training that they feel is a waste of their time, or does not pertain to their classroom or teaching, little motivation for implementation can be expected (Guskey, 2003; Fullan, 1993). All of the interviewed teachers in this study mentioned that they liked attending GE training and that it was enjoyable for them. Most of the teachers in this study also expressed that they developed connections with other participants and the instructor, and that they felt rejuvenated to go back to school to teach in the fall. In this study, many of the teachers expressed excitement about attending GE and learning of its practices. One teacher discussed how she was “highly impressed”, explaining, “I remember … saying to the other ladies ‘isn’t this the greatest workshop you have ever been to!’”

All of the interviewed teachers in this study mentioned that they enjoyed attending GE training and found it to be very useful. One elementary teacher mentioned how useful GE can be, especially to new teachers. She explained:

GE addresses…strongly the climate of mutual respect…and I just know that if these young teachers had that advantage of [GE training] they could step into their classrooms and [implement those same ideas]…where now they come in to watch me, they’ll sit in my classroom and I just keep thinking ‘if you’d just go to GE’…”

One interviewed teacher considered GE to be of high quality due to the format of “immersing teachers” in the modeled practices. A high school teacher described the training as being of high quality “Because it’s hands-on training. …you don’t just go to a lecture. You actually sit down as a student and do … GE. You’ll actually have celebrations; you’ll actually participate in a class where you are a student immersed in GE’s philosophy. You live it and learn it.” This level of immersion helps build attending teachers’ understanding for how GE should look and feel within their own classrooms, thus supporting their sense of competence.
Many of the teachers described how the GE training helped them in their teaching in numerous ways. Teacher interviews suggested that GE training promoted teachers’ autonomy, provided them with opportunities for developing competence, and facilitated collegial relatedness. The following sections describes ways GE is a high quality professional development that also supports attending teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness, and may foster teachers’ desire of high implementation of GE practices gathered via interview and observation data.

**GE supports autonomy.** GE supports teachers’ autonomy during the trainings by ensuring that teachers are shown multiple alternatives to implement GE practices in their classroom. Although there are basic GE elements that are promoted during the training, there are alternatives and many ways to implement the same general GE practice to appeal to a wide range of classrooms, students, and teachers to provide choice to teachers as they implement GE. Also, the GE training promotes teachers’ offering choices to students by discussing the importance of choice with attending teachers and even speaking of choice as an important element in promoting intrinsic motivation during their training. GE practices and training promote offering choice through practices such as providing a climate of mutual respect and allowing students’ choices to determine consequences.

**GE supports competency.** Many of the interviewed teachers were observed to be moderate to high implementers of GE practices. An elementary teacher described how he believed the training had supported his competency so that implementing GE practices “has become second nature. It is not like I have to think ‘okay, I am doing this GE principal’. It just has become applied and imbedded in what I do.” Similar to research on people who have obtained a high level of expertise (Hinds & Pfeffer, 2003), he had difficulty describing the specific GE practices that he did as they had become such an automated part of his teaching practices.

One way that teachers’ competence is supported for implementing GE practices is by having the training taught by current classroom teachers. This shows attending teachers that GE can be implemented successfully and works for these instructors. This knowledge may promote their feelings of competence to implement GE in their own classrooms. For example, during the training, many GE instructors discussed how implementing GE looks in their own classrooms and offered to discuss alternatives as well as provide tips about implementing GE in various
classrooms. Attending teachers see how to implement GE in their own classrooms by seeing GE practices modeled within the training. GE training is delivered by current classroom teachers who provide credibility and competency-supports that other teacher trainings may lack. One high school teacher mentioned this specifically during an interview saying that she found the GE training very helpful since “it was by…teachers who were still teaching in the classroom. I thought that was really helpful, because they are still there, they are still teaching in the classroom, they still know what the classroom setting is like, they still know what is going on and I found that really helpful.” Another high school teacher talked about the GE training approach saying “…oh, I love it! It is absolutely great … because it models what you are supposed to do in the classroom. So it practices what it preaches.” In addition to the GE instructors, all GE mentors are former GE classroom teachers and former GE instructors. This enables the mentors to visit schools and provide teachers’ with real world advice for scaffolding their GE implementation, thus supplying additional competency supports.

GE supports relatedness. Another way that GE training builds teachers’ competencies is by facilitating the sharing of ideas. GE instruction is delivered in such a way that teachers learn from other teacher-participants. One high school teacher described how GE “gives you good camaraderie and provides an opportunity to meet with people who are uplifting…” In addition to providing supports for building relationships with peers, teachers’ talked about learning how to support relationship-building with students. For example, one high school teacher mentioned that GE training “gave us some ideas about interactions with students and some ideas about how to make learning fun.” Additionally, because of the modeling, one teacher explained that by attending GE, and implementing the practices, she believes that GE “helped [her] build a rapport…” with her students.

Implementation of GE. As an indication of teachers’ motivation to implement GE, observations of both high school teachers and elementary school teachers were conducted to see the extent to which implementation of GE elements were being practiced by the teachers.

The observation rubric was used to rate the extent to which all (n = 8) participating teachers in this study implemented GE (See Appendix D). The scoring rated evidence of teachers’ implementation of the 17 GE practices. Teachers who receive ratings of 1-3 are considered to demonstrate “Low implementation”, teachers who receive ratings of 3-5 are considered to demonstrate “medium-low implementation”, teachers who receive ratings of 5-7
are considered to demonstrate “medium-high implementation”, and teachers who receive ratings of 7-9 are considered to demonstrate “high implementation” with the ratings between considered “on the line” between the two ratings. Each teacher was rated based on the extent to which GE practices were observed to be used during instruction. The scores for each teacher’s level of GE practice was totaled to give an implementation score for each observed teacher. However, interviews revealed that the observations were not always straightforward. Many of the observed teachers provided reasons why implementation was not as high as expected. For example, one teacher explained that she only teaches math and science so she does not implement the use of including classical literature in her classroom. Another teacher was observed during a particular difficult class period and an interview revealed that she normally implements more GE in her other classes. Also, GE practices such as “reciting of the creed” may not have taken place during the observation, but often the creed was posted in the classroom. Taking these types of circumstances into consideration, the total implementation score did not seem to depict an accurate picture of implementation of GE by each teacher. Teachers similar to each other in grade-level-taught and subject-area seemed to implement similar practices and will be compared to other teachers of similar grade level and subject area. A summary of the observation rubric according to GE practice follows:

1: teacher integrates life principals/quotes
2: students and teacher speak in complete sentences
3: frequent feedback, questioning
4: teacher provides “hook” to connect content, related to real world
5: promotes students critical thinking
6: non-threatening environment, mistakes are okay, warm
7: recitations, character building
8: uses excerpts from classic literature
9: positive caring environment
10: all students’ work is displayed
11: use of multiple work skills (phonics cards)
12: students assume responsibility of behavior
13: all students memorize and recite creed
14: teacher compares students to self, not to others
Mrs. E and Mr. K, both math teachers, implemented much of the caring and positive learning environment that is promoted by GE. Both had very student-led classrooms and celebrated students’ success. One used a door greeter, but not very effectively. Neither implemented the classic literature or use of complete sentences. Two reading teachers implemented some of the positive environment aspects, but still had very teacher-led lessons. Students did not misbehave, but did not seem excited about the lesson.

When compared to interview statements of autonomy, competence, and relatedness for attending and implementing GE, Mrs. E and Mr. K both had much support to attend and implement GE in the initial stages. Observations demonstrated that both participants also implemented to a higher degree compared with the other two participants who expressed less feelings of autonomy, competence, and relatedness to attend and implement GE.
Table 6
Observations of High School Teachers’ Implementation of GE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>GE Practices Implemented to high or medium-high degree</th>
<th>GE Practices Implemented to low degree</th>
<th>Overall impression of class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. M</td>
<td>11-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15</td>
<td>2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17</td>
<td>Teacher engaged students in active learning, positive environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. P</td>
<td>10-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14</td>
<td>1, 2, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17</td>
<td>Teacher was caring, upbeat, and positive, students seemed engaged in material and willing to take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. D</td>
<td>10-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17</td>
<td>Students were actively engaged in material, teacher was positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. G</td>
<td>11-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4, 5, 6</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 7-17 (although much of GE displayed in room)</td>
<td>Teacher led reading lesson, interview revealed that teacher implements little with this particular class only, more with others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs. M and Mrs. P both implemented very positive and caring environment aspects. Both had very well behaved students who were actively engaged in the material. Mrs. D also had a positive classroom, but some of the creeds and recitation material was posted, but not mentioned during the observation. Mrs. P (math) did not use complete sentences, but Mrs. M and Mrs. D did mention the importance of them to the students. Mrs. G had much of GE elements displayed in the room and the interview revealed that the lesson observed was the class that allows for little GE implementation. Mrs. G teaches a GE class to students during the summer and implements much during other classes. None of the high school teachers implemented the use of a door greeter. One interview revealed that this was just “too much time and effort” and was easier for the teacher to answer the door herself.

When compared with interview statements, all four high school teachers mentioned feelings of autonomy, competence, and relatedness to attend and implement GE both at the
professional development and school levels. Observation results indicated that all four teachers implemented GE to a large extent and especially focused on implementing a positive, caring environment for students.

Research Question Number Two: How do principals support teachers’ autonomy to support teachers’ decisions to attend GE?

The data analysis to answer research question number two, demonstrated that school and district administrators assisted teachers’ autonomy to attend GE in two ways. The first way was how teachers in the district (two schools) decided to attend GE in the past (historically). Secondly, implementation was supported by how teachers decided to attend GE now (the present). Although all three SDT elements were investigated during this study, this portion of the results will focus on how teachers’ autonomy was supported to attend the training.

Schools support autonomy. Interviews revealed that, historically, principals in this district supported teachers’ autonomy to attend GE. Teachers from both schools commented that their principals encouraged them to attend GE, but did not mandate that they attend. For example, when asked if the principal offered teachers a choice to attend GE, one teacher responded, “She did. It was a choice, [and] she was very encouraging.” Another teacher at the same school, when asked why he attended GE, mentioned that the former principal “had stepped up and said ‘hey you need to go to this’. I mean, it wasn’t mandatory but she mentioned it…”

Every interviewed teacher from both schools mentioned that they had choice in attending GE. Some mentioned that they were encouraged by their principal, or former principal to attend, but that they did not feel mandated to attend. A former elementary principal is now a district staff person and continues to seek scholarships and funds to send a group of teachers each year to GE training. From the former elementary principal being so positive and encouraging of GE, plus “hearing” from other teachers that GE is positive, teachers volunteer to attend.

At the elementary school, mostly new teachers were attending GE because of encouragement they received from the principal as well as experienced teachers who encourage their attendance of GE. The teachers are still not forced to go; they still have the autonomy to go or not go. An elementary teacher described that his perception of how teachers decided to attend
GE, was that lots of the new teachers coming into the school were given the option to attend GE, but that attending GE was not “pushed” by [the new principal] as it had been by previous principals. However, he did comment that, with the previous two principals being females and the current principal being a male, that maybe it was just a “guy thing” with the [use of GE’s] “celebrations and stuff” being a possible reason that the new principal (a male) did not promote GE.

Additional Themes Emerged

Interviews and observations revealed that GE is a high quality professional development and when teachers value GE practices, they are more willing to implement GE. However, data analysis revealed that if the teacher’s values are misaligned with those of the principal, implementation is difficult, regardless if the teacher values GE or not. The alignment of values between the principal and teacher are a more powerful force to determine implementation of GE rather than the GE training itself.

The high quality professional development training of GE may have assisted in the results of a model that reveals relationships as a key factor to motivation and implementation of change. Many of the participants in this study spoke positively about GE and its practices. If a lesser quality professional development had been used in this study, the results may have been different as the teachers may have not believed in the professional development enough to implement at all. However, as the results in this study demonstrate, when the relationship affiliation between an individual and the context (i.e., teacher and principal) is positive, greater motivation may be found by an individual. A negative relationship affiliation may lower motivation to follow the desires purposed by the context (i.e., principal). In the following section, I will answer research questions three and four and describe the model that emerged from the data analysis.

SDT suggests when a high quality professional development exists that fosters teachers’ motivation to implement, and when those teachers are also supported by the school administrator, teachers are more likely to implement changes to their teaching practices and continue the changes over time. Although the model that emerged from analysis of data still includes all aspects of SDT, additional themes were needed to incorporate and explain the entire
data set. The model that emerged from the grounded theory analysis demonstrated that, although interviews indicated the importance of SDT elements to encourage intrinsic motivation to implement, the central focus of this model was the importance of relationship affiliations.

Additionally, this model expanded the role of relationship affiliations within the elements of SDT. Backgrounds of historical (i.e., relationship history) relationships were based on interview responses by participants. I was able to code the “relationship history” data into additional themes that included the importance of the alignment of values and the perceptions of the support of control within the relationship affiliation (e.g., teacher and principal).

The results in this section support the emergent, grounded theory model titled, “*The importance of values-alignment within a role-hierarchy for increasing motivation to implement professional development.*” The high quality training of GE may have contributed to the results of this study. First, the model will be displayed and described in terms of all the factors and categories included. Then, the model will be described specific to this study including quotes and observational data to support the emergent, grounded theory model. The following sections describe the characteristics of SDT that exist in the school to promote teachers’ implementation of GE and how the alignment of values influence teachers’ motivation to implement as the model answers research questions three and four.

*Research Question Three: What is the process by which principals foster or hinder teachers’ intrinsic motivation to implement professional development?*

A grounded theory model highlights the importance of not only supporting teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness to promote implementation of professional development, but also the importance of the alignment of values within a role-hierarchy (e.g., principal and a teacher). Consistent with this finding, analysis revealed that autonomy, competence, and relatedness do not always exist at the school to promote implementation of professional development by the principal (or district staff), which can hinder teachers’ implementation of change efforts. The answer to the third research question revealed that there is a relationship between the amount of principal support for teachers’ feelings of autonomy and competence and the amount of implementation of GE. However, results also demonstrated that if the teacher had autonomy and competence support by the principal during the initial phases of implementation
of GE, than a change in that support (i.e., a change in the principal) may not have an influence on the amount of implementation by that teacher. The model does demonstrate that when a teacher has an unsupportive principal, the relationship affiliation may be negative in the teacher values the professional development. The model suggested that teachers’ motivation and implementation of change is influenced by the relationship affiliations between individuals within a role-hierarchy, such as the relationship between a teacher and principal. With high quality professional development, such as GE, when teachers have a positive relationship affiliation with their principal, teachers’ motivation to implement professional development is increased. If the training had been ineffective, teachers may still be motivated to make changes to their classroom practices, as long as their relationship affiliation with the principal was positive.

Although this study utilized GE as the basis for the collection of data, the emergent model could be used with any professional development program. This study does not end with the implementation of GE, but begins with a model of understanding what makes teachers implement or not implement professional development programs.

Overview of Relationship Alignment Model

The open coding and axial coding of the data resulted in a model that encompasses data collected in this study and allowed for the development of the model that describes relationships among the categories. The themes that developed placed relationship affiliation as a central core phenomenon, with the alignment of individuals’ values and perceptions of control contributing to the relationship affiliation. The following section provides a general description of the model, followed by detailed descriptions of each category supported by quotes and observations. Figure 1 shows the model that emerged from data called “The importance of values-alignment within the role-hierarchy for increasing motivation to implement professional development.”
The grounded theory analysis led to a model that demonstrates an emergence of relationship affiliation as the central aspect of teachers’ motivation for change. There are numerous roles in an educational setting, e.g., principals, teachers, students, district staff, etc., and although everyone’s role is different, there are various power and control elements connected with each role. For example, the superintendent (and other district staff members) is in a more powerful position than school principals. The principals are in a more powerful position than teachers. Yet, even teachers have power that exists within their own classroom walls. Teachers make the ultimate decision to implement changes in their own classrooms. However, the role hierarchy that exists in an educational setting may create power struggles and control dilemmas between individuals at different levels. Values of an individual shape his/her actions and reactions to events and outcomes (Pekrun, 2006). In this study, the element of values that emerged from the analysis focused on a set of specific values with respect student outcomes. From the analysis of this study, the alignment between context and individual of four specific values seemed to determine the relationship affiliation. Those three values were (1) support of mastery GOALS versus performance goals (2) enactment of authoritarian versus authoritative leadership and (3) valuing of relationships. The relationship between an individual and is largely dependent on the alignment (i.e., match or mismatch) of values. For example, if a teacher values mastery goals, student-centered leadership, and support for students’ control, yet teaches in a
school in which the principal does not hold these same values, then there will be a mismatch in the values and the relationship may hinder the teacher’s motivation to follow the principal’s lead. Additionally, the mismatch in values may further strain the relationship and lead to feelings of negativity (i.e., lower affiliation) of the relationship. The match or mismatch between a teacher’s and principal’s values promotes or hinders the principal’s support for the teacher’s control, including control aspects of autonomy and competence. Finally, the values alignment and support of teachers’ autonomy leads to the relationship affiliation (i.e., positive/negative) between an individual (e.g., teacher) and a context (e.g., principal) based on relationship history (historical background).

The model suggests that after a teacher and principal have a match or mismatch of values, the teacher’s control is supported or unsupported, and the relationship affiliation is positively or negatively initiated or maintained. This leads to the development of or maintenance of the history of the relationship. Depending on how the teacher has interacted with the principal will determine if the relationship continues in a 1) matched-values, supported control, and positive relationship path, or 2) a mismatched-values, unsupported control, and negative relationship path.

Support for Model

In this study, the values that were demonstrated were specific to the field of education in a K-12 setting. In this study, specific types of goals were mentioned and demonstrated by participants (i.e., teachers, principals, district staff, GE staff) and may provide evidence of the individual’s values. In the following section, I describe how values of mastery versus performance were mentioned and demonstrated by teachers, principals, and district staff. The values associated with GE will be presented in a later section.

Mastery Goals versus Performance Goals

Mastery goals are those in which the focus is on the mastery of the material itself (Ames, 1992). For example, if a teacher encourages the students to try their best to learn to read so the students can enjoy books and all the information they can learn from them, this teacher would be considered to have mastery-focused goals for her students. On the other hand, a teacher whose
goals are performance-focused would encourage her students to learn to read so they can receive high test scores for the school (i.e., perform well on the state test).

In this study, many of the participants mentioned in interviews, or demonstrated during observations, whether or not they were more mastery or performance focused. Although this concept could be considered to lie on a continuum, the data in this study demonstrated a clear cut division between the two foci of mastery versus performance values.

*Mastery goals.* The teachers who implemented GE to a moderate or high degree were more mastery focused than those who implemented GE to a low degree. Also, when there was an alignment of values between teacher and principal, the teacher followed in the footsteps of the leader by taking on his focus (whether it be mastery or performance focused). For example, if the teacher had mastery focused goals for her students, and the principal had mastery focused goals for the teachers (and students), this would be an alignment for this value. In this study, one teacher mentioned that she felt it was important to be more mastery focused with students and to “...lighten it up and let them learn naturally… let them want to learn instead of trying to cram it down their throats through structure.” She explained that when she allows students to learn “naturally,” and therefore “…the kids are more open to learn.” A second teacher mentioned that she lets her students “…have an opportunity to be creative…it gives them a feeling of self-esteem, of self-worth and sometimes teachers need that as well as students.”

Another teacher mentioned that she enjoyed the way her students “leave my class pumped”. She mentioned that she might “give them a sticker or give them a high five as they exit the door. Or, you know, I have them begging to get out the white boards...” She enjoys having her students demonstrate such eagerness to learn.

The high school principal stated the importance of, not only mastering material to obtain high test scores from the students at his school, but also needing to help the students master tasks for setting their futures. He mentioned that he had initiated several programs in the school to encourage more participation from teachers and students to be involved in their academic planning, registration for college, and financial aid forms for the future. He understood the school population and the needs of the students, and that he and his fellow administrators saw … that the kids had no ownership in their own graduation plan. They didn’t know what credits were all about, they didn’t know anything about GPAs or anything like that. [He believed] ‘it is time for you all [the students] to take charge.’ So as an end result we have
got sophomores that are coming in saying ‘how do I do a two year plan?’ They are already thinking that far ahead, some of it is because they want to be an honors grad, some of it because they want to be valedictorian…[there is a program in Oklahoma called the] OLAP is the Oklahoma higher learning program that the state of Oklahoma pays for. And if they make a certain GPA, do a certain curriculum, and stay out of trouble with the law, and their parents make under a certain amount of dollars, they get their entire education paid for by the state of Oklahoma…

The principal understood that many of the school’s students may not go to college without additional support from the school, so he devised an advising program having the teachers assist the students in filling out financial aid forms, registration forms, and planning their high school courses to be college bound. His desire was to help the students master the necessary tasks and be prepared for their future. He hoped more of his students would go on to college, but knew that they may need additional advising and assistance to get there so he and his staff helped the students reach their goals.

The former elementary principal also had a more mastery focused value as she mentioned helping the students to plan for their future even though she had been an elementary school principal and that some may considered that too young to discuss college issues. She mentioned how she encouraged the teachers in the primary grade elementary school to help the students with “gaining access to college... we start at 6th grade [with] students really plotting their career path. And we did a lot of that in GE. Just our mission statement and everything with pre-schoolers introducing them to college bound things…”

**Performance goals.** Teachers who were more performance based mentioned and were observed demonstrating their value about the importance of test scores and satisfying the district and school needs for accountability. In this era of accountability, testing and scores does have to be a consideration for teachers, however, when a teacher considers high test scores the main accomplishment in the classroom, that focus may be perceived by the students as the most important aspect of school and the students’ behaviors and actions may also reflect this value. One teacher mentioned that she implemented little of GE practices because of “the testing…pressure”, and stated “it is a lot of pressure”, she went on to say:

… we have a lot to cover and a short time to cover it. That is my pressure! That is my drive, I know I have to cover this, this and this, you know before April. I guess that is my…goal. That is my pressure. I just have to get all that stuff in before testing. I hate to
say that, but that is the real world; of school, of teaching, so…Yeah I guess that is my motivation. Do what I can and be ready for the test…

The elementary principal seemed to be much more focused on the test scores from his school. He proudly displayed his scores to me and mentioned how they had greatly increased since his takeover of the school. Although he did mention the importance of the school’s students knowing the “basics” such as reading and arithmetic, his purpose seemed to be for the students in his school to perform well on the state exams, rather than for the students’ own understanding. He stated that when he took over as principal he gave his teachers “…it has paid off…because we really perform well, we score well, and uh…it looks like we are going to keep on doing that way.”

While discussing the faults he found in the primary grade school and with the principal before him, he mentioned that “there were gaps” in the students’ learning, particularly in reading. He felt that the previous principal and teachers “were trying to get science and social studies in.” He thought it would be better to “take the rest of it, scratch the rest of it. I mean, put math and writing in there, and put in a few more things in there, but…” He seemed to believe that to focus on the subject areas that were tested was the best way to teach primary aged students. He also believed that “it starts to pay off” to focus on just the tested subjects as evidenced by his current schools’ top test scores.

Leadership Style

The authoritative versus authoritarian styles was researched with regards to parent and child relationships. However, in this study these terms were applied to teachers and principals. The authoritative parent sets high standards, but also has high emotional affiliation with the child (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, Dornbusch, 1991; Woolfolk, 2007). Whereas, the authoritarian parent sets high standards, yet has low emotional affiliation with the child. The following section describes how principals and teachers demonstrative either an authoritative or an authoritarian leadership style with teachers or students from the school.

Authoritative. The teachers that mentioned, and were observed performing, mastery style values, were also observed demonstrating authoritative (i.e., student-centered) classroom practices. During observations, these teachers walked around the room, engaging all of the
students in learning, facilitating the students’ learning rather than at the board lecturing or at the
front of their room, or at their desk. Students were actively participating, discussing with the
teacher, raising their hands and eager to speak, and working together on activities. These were
also the teachers who were high- to moderate-implementers of GE, which promotes active
student engagement and teacher movement throughout the room.

With respect to the principals, leadership style looks slightly different from the teachers
as the principals have different responsibilities due to their position. However, like the teachers
match between mastery focused and student centered values, there was also a consistency
between the high school principal who was more mastery focused and also believed in including
his staff in decisions, not being forceful and leading by example. He was very aware of the
importance of leading in this manner and would give his staff a voice in decisions so they would
not seem “forced.” Even when there were difficult decisions that had to be made (which is
common in any business or educational setting) this principal would “invite them” to join in by
providing what they thought was best for the school and the students. He openly discussed his
beliefs on leadership by asking:

…have you ever…this is going to sound weird…have you ever heard of the Horse
Whisperer? There is a process where…it is called the “joining up process”. Where it is
typical of any animal where you invite them to join you. It’s a soft sell, low key
approach. Where if you walk in and say ‘by golly we are going to do this, this, and this’
then you are going to alienate them. But if you walk in and say ‘let’s have a little meeting
and talk about this.’ And pick out a few key players that you think will be open minded to
it and then…like teacher advisors. [He initiated a teacher advisor program to have
teachers assist students in planning for college] We started dividing those kids up and a
lot of the teachers started saying ‘well I am not a counselor, I don’t know how to do this
stuff’. [His response to those teachers with apprehension was] ‘Well we are going to
teach you how.’ This is all about customer service, and we are going to get these kids to
understand how to take their transcript and make sense out of it. And now the teachers
are saying ‘let’s be sure to do teachers as advisors next year.’ All of it is just timing. But
you have to get them to buy-in and you have to get them to join up.

The high school principal also demonstrated his authoritative leadership by having high
standards for his teachers (and students) but also had high emotional affiliation (support) for his
teachers (and students), stating that when it comes to seeking training and making changes to
practices, “my bunch is pretty good. You know as long as they see value in it. If they see it as a
waste of time, then I see it as a waste of time. And I hate to waste time.” He mentioned that he
would encourage his teachers to seek professional development training to stay on top of things in their field. He mentioned that even though he preferred teachers to seek their own trainings, sometimes he would be pro-active in trying to convince his teachers to attend training to make sure they were not behind in their particular field. He mentioned that it

…really hit home to me at the school I was at before here. I had a chemistry teacher—he was two or three years away from retirement. I have always been real big on in-services, and have always thought it was important for us to get out and learn. But this guy…I kept saying ‘you need to go to these AP workshops, or I am going to make you go’. “Oh no, I don’t have time to go…I don’t want [to]…” And I said ‘you are going, that’s it, don’t argue with me.’ He came back and had kind of a sheepish look on his face, and said ‘you know what? I didn’t realize how far behind I was on stuff.’ He said ‘they are doing stuff in chemistry labs and chemistry stuff that I didn’t have a clue.’ He said ‘you were right for making me go.’ He said, ‘I was five years behind.’

The former elementary principal also demonstrated a match in mastery focused value and democratic leadership style consistency. She mentioned that, as she taught other principals about GE and their practices, it was difficult for some of them especially when it came to

…teacher involvement, it is not top-down, anymore. And that has really been tough for a lot of administrators. And teachers, all teachers have many more things to do than they have time to do. So they were programmed for someone to tell them what to do. And GE does not work that way. Everyone signs on the dotted line and we are in this together. And, um, so much peer coaching and observing in each other’s rooms, and we did so much vertical and horizontal alignment, before we even knew to call it that!

She even commented on the new elementary school principal’s leadership style, who demonstrated more performance focused values and leader focused style saying: “Mr.[name of principal], the [school] principal has been trained and went to the principal’s academy as well, but he is not as passionate about it. He thinks it is a good tool, but his leadership style is a little bit different” (not aligned with the values of GE).

Authoritarian. The teachers that mentioned and were observed performing more performance style values were observed demonstrating more authoritarian (i.e., teacher centered) classroom practices. During observations, these teachers were often sitting at their desk at the front of the room, or at the front board lecturing. There was less student engagement than that seen in authoritarian style classrooms, and students were often seen not participating, laying their
heads of their desks, or constantly asking to leave the room. These were also the teachers who were low-implementers of GE, as GE promotes active student engagement and teacher movement throughout the room.

Similar to the consistency between performance focused and teacher centered value there was also a consistency between the principal who was more performance focused and leader focused in his values. Although he often said about GE that “I don’t discourage it… just do whatever you want to around here… on programs” His leadership style concerning professional development programs (specifically GE) could be, at best described as benign neglect (Moynihan, 1965). Benign neglect is a concept of ignoring something and not encouraging that activity (or program) however, because he is in a leadership position, many of the teachers viewed his lack of encouragement and lack of action as discouraging the implementation of GE. Because this principal does not promote GE, many of the teachers may not be willing to implement a program that seems misaligned with their principal’s values. There were several teachers who implemented GE in this school although the principal seemed to be indifferent about it. However, these teachers had been in the school while the former elementary principal was there, encouraging and supporting their implementation during the early phases of GE implementation. These teachers did believe that the current principal’s attitude was negative and unsupportive.

The elementary principal was focused on other professional development trainings and programs that he viewed as better and more effective, although he did state that he agrees with his teachers’ pleas to “just let us teach”. The principal mentioned his concern that the previous principal had “just too much play time. Too much fluff…”

He discussed his own leadership style often and that it reflected the style of his “good friends” that “are hunting buddies of mine, been for years and stuff like that” who are the superintendent and assistant superintendent of the district and do not promote GE. His values were aligned with the values of the superintendent and assistant superintendent who are his superiors (i.e., a higher position) and his friends, which aligned his values with theirs due to their role hierarchy.
Valuing Relationships

The importance of relationships have already been mentioned as a key element in SDT to support an individual’s intrinsic motivation for change (Deci & Ryan, 1985). As teachers implement new classroom practices, they may or may not also be demonstrating how they value and support relationships in their classrooms. The valuing of relationships has also been shown to be influential in more productive leaders (i.e., transformational leaders) as demonstrated by Burns (1978) and Kuhnert & Lewis (1987).

Relationships may occur between students, between teachers, teacher to principal, etc., in an educational setting. However, individuals who value relationships may also promote relationships in those around them. For example, a teacher who values relationships may promote her students’ relationships with her and with each other. On the contrary, a teacher (or principal or district staff member) who does not value relationships, may not seek to build positive relationship affiliations with those around him/her and may not support the building of relationships among those around him/her. For example, a principal who does not value relationships may not work at building positive relationship affiliations with those around him and may not promote relationships among the teachers in his school.

In this study, teachers who implemented GE to a high or medium-high degree also tended to value relationships, not only among other teachers, but also promoted relationship building among his/her students. One high school teacher discussed the differences she saw in her students now that she implements GE. She said before attending and implementing GE she

…never picked on students who had low self image or low self esteem. But I was guilty my first two years of teaching, of picking on students that I thought could tolerate it and needed it, in my opinion. Like, there was for instance one student last year in my Pre-AP Geometry class, very good student, very bright. And some days she would just say something that was really dumb. And I would say ‘you dyed your hair last night’. And she had! ’some of it’s soaked in, effecting your brain’. And I don’t make those comments anymore. So, trying to build that safe environment, and trying to cut down on my negative comments, that were few and far between but still, trying to eliminate those…

She says that now that she implements GE, she has “learned to be loving with my students, firm, but loving with my students and not lose control of the class.” Not only does she value relationships between her students and herself, but also encourages the students to do “some
bonding” with each other through class activities and extra time to prepare for critical high school events (e.g., AP test).

Another high school teacher mentioned the importance of “just getting to know your students rather than just…getting them through”. She says that she likes “Just knowing what is going on with them and knowing why they do certain things and the things that they do. And their learning styles and things like that. Basically just getting to know the students better, rather than just trying to teach them and get through with them.”

Both principals seemed to be very cordial with the teachers and staff members of their school, however, interviews with teachers revealed that some of the teachers felt negatively towards the elementary principal, while other teachers felt positive affiliation toward the high school principal.

The elementary school principal had attended GE in the past and mentioned that he did implement some of the practices, however, his commitment to his relationship with the superintendent seemed to be his top relationship priority as one teacher mentioned her particular disgust with the way he did not promote teachers attending GE as had been done in the past. Also, he had particular professional development trainings that he viewed as important and would mandate certain teachers to attend them, unconcerned with their autonomy in the matter. This further demonstrates his unconcerned attitude toward the building of relationships.

The high school principal, on the other hand, understood the value of relationship building, particularly with himself and his teachers, but also among the teachers, and the teachers to their students. He mentioned numerous times how he believed in approaching leadership with a “soft sell” approach, and understood the importance of leading “by example not by force”. He mentioned that when it comes to “collegiality”, he “encourage[s] it”. All of the high school teachers interviewed in this study praised him for the way he led the school and how much he supported them in their teaching.

The district staff member interviewed for this study is also a former principal of the primary grades elementary school in town. She had much to say about valuing relationships and the importance of building relationships with other principals, teachers, and students. She mentioned that when she is leading a professional development training for teachers and/or principals, she believes the “number one is modeling. And just being very positive about it and building on their strengths.” She went on to say that often times, teachers and principals in her
trainings say: “‘Mrs. Phillips you are always so positive. Why don’t you just tell us what we did wrong?’ And I said ‘because I think, I do better when people brag on me and look at my strengths’.”

Alignment: Matches and Mismatches

In this study, many of the teachers’ values matched those of their context (i.e., principal). When there was a match in values, the teachers spoke highly of their principal and were more likely to agree with decisions and initiatives from that principal.

**Matches.** One teacher mentioned how much she agreed with her principal’s decisions and new initiatives for the school. Although this particular teacher did not value GE in her classroom, her principal also expressed concerns about the value of GE in schools, so their values were more aligned and she expressed respect for her principal’s decisions. When asked about making changes to her classroom teaching based on a professional development that she had attended due to the principals’ suggestion she stated: “oh very much encourages [attendance of professional development he promotes].”

**Mismatches.** One teacher from this study respected her principal enough to appreciate his qualities, but disagreed with the way he did not promote GE, which was a high value for the teacher. The teacher went on to explain that

…if your principal doesn’t push it [a particular professional development training], even a little, then people aren’t going to feel a need to go. I mean, you can encourage without pushing. And, I encourage, so… And it is not encouraged because…[principal] is an excellent principal, but he is a…‘you get in there and teach…’. And that is wonderful, but I wish some of our new ones were encouraged to go [to GE training]…And even though I wish he was more encouraging [of attending GE], I respect him that he that he feels his teachers are performing what they should be and if they are not, he is going to work with those individual teachers.

Another teacher expressed a match between her values and those of her principal, but a mismatch with the district leader (i.e., superintendent). When asked about how she was supported as a teacher she said,
[by the] principal yes. Administration, [district staff person] who is in the administration building, definitely. But, the superintendent, iffy. Iffy, I don’t know him, I haven’t gotten a good read on him, I think he is a short timer. And there are some things he has said and done that I can’t understand, I can’t appreciate. …I think I would give him a B. If he was a student, I would give him a B.”

The teacher went on to express her mismatch between her values and those of her superintendent due to a decision he had made concerning offering higher level math courses. The teacher explained that

…our superintendent has said ‘no we aren’t going to offer that class.’..even if I have 20-25, there are 20-25 that should be in a math class of some sort [and won’t be due to not offering the class she would prefer]. So, that is one of the things that I don’t see eye to eye with our Superintendent…

The district staff member who was interviewed during this study mentioned misalignment between her values (and those of GE) and the values of the new elementary principal. She explained that “[the elementary school principal] has been trained and went to the principal’s academy as well, but he is not as passionate about it. He thinks it is a good tool, but his leadership style is a little bit different [than her own].

She went on to explain that she still sees the teachers at the elementary school using “those tenets and 17 practices in their methodology, but as far as attending and being encouraged to attend, it is presented, but they are that ‘let’s get back to the basics, let’s teach reading and math and be in the classroom every minute that you can be in it.’ However, she felt that there were mismatches in values of the new elementary principal and some of the teachers because “that was a top down decision. And they did not have the buy in. So, I think the principal is the determining factor…”

The new principal in the primary elementary school (the school she was formerly principal and model GE school) demonstrated a mismatch in values between the majority of the teachers and his own values (unsupportive of GE practices). The district staff member said that the new principal told his teachers ‘that is just not for me’ [GE], and that this was hard on many of the teachers who believed in GE and were aligned with its values. Although the school seems to be adjusting, she mentioned that for her “that really backs up the research in the premise of the leader being such a determining factor.”

She also spoke openly of the match in values between the superintendent and assistant superintendent and the new elementary principal. Although the elementary principal had
attended and implemented some of the GE practices since the district leaders are “not a big proponent of GE” she believes that “has carried on and [the superintendent] is very good friends with the new elementary principal over there, so I think that is a big incentive as well.” Being that the superintendent is in a leadership role (i.e., higher position) than the elementary school principal, position may also play a part in the alignment of values and relationship due to this leadership rank.

Perceptions of Control of Individual

Control. Once the role-hierarchy is established, the model goes on by describing the perceptions of control of the individual. An individual’s perception of control as explained by Control-Value Theory (Pekrun, et al, 2002; Pekrun, 2006) encompasses perception of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977), attributions (Weiner, 1985) and expectations (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). Self-efficacy is a person’s belief about the efficacy of ability to carry out an action, which includes the autonomy (i.e., choice) as well as the ability (i.e., competence). In this study, participants’ control over attending GE, as well as, their competence in implementing changes varied by participant, but provides evidence of this theory.

Autonomy. Autonomy refers to a person’s feeling of choice over a decision or action (Deci & Ryan, 2000). When a person has a perception of autonomy, intrinsic motivation is increased as the element of choice has been demonstrated to be highly connected to intrinsic motivation (Deci, 1975).

In this study, many participants expressed feelings of autonomy (i.e., choice) in a variety of ways and to various degrees, but most participants did express feelings of autonomy with attending and implementing GE training and practices.

Competency. Feelings of competency may increase motivation as a teacher feels that they have the ability to make changes in the classroom. Several of the teachers in this study mentioned how GE supported their feelings of competency throughout the training which enabled them to make changes once they returned to their school. One teacher mentioned how GE “models what you are supposed to do in the classroom. So its practical what it preaches. And
it gives you a good comradery and provides an opportunity to meet with people who are uplifting and we had, you know...if you listen to the news everything is just so depressing, and it is so heavy to have to deal with reality. So sometimes when you can go into a place where people are uplifting yourself, your attitude is changed and you can...you can go again now.”

**Autonomy supported.** The high school principal demonstrated autonomy support for his teachers attending professional development trainings (e.g., GE) in order to help them gain the knowledge they needed to stay ahead in their field and also to help them fill their individual needs in the classroom. When asked about letting his teachers attend new trainings, he responded

…how do you know if you don’t try? …I’d rather try and fail then not try at all. In the last four years I have been here...we have put teacher advisors in, and a couple of the things haven’t worked and a couple of things we have...gone back and they worked the second time but it was all a matter of timing...But it was just like you were talking about, we were talking about this morning, all of this stuff you have to have buy-in from teachers...

He went on to say that although he has not attended GE training himself, when his teachers approached him and requested to attend he responded by saying ‘go ahead and try it.’ He mentioned his belief in “[I] always say to try anything once and see. It is kind of like Schools Attuned [a professional development training some of the teachers have attended]. Well, we have some people who have really done a lot with it, and we have others who it is just not their cup of tea. So, sometimes you have to send groups different directions to see what they need.”

The principal demonstrated autonomy support for his high school teachers saying “With a high school, you are not ever going to get everybody that likes going to workshops. Some people love em, some people just detest them…” However, he did feel it important for the teachers to stay current in their subject area and see what new opportunities and resources were available in their field.

The district staff member (former principal of GE model school) also demonstrated autonomy support for the teachers in her (former) school. She mentioned that “there were four” teachers in her school who were resistant to attend GE training. However, instead of forcing them to attend, she let them decide on their own that it was something they wanted to attend. She said “when they came back. Day one, they said ‘why did you not make us go before!’ She said to them ‘if I had made you, would you be saying this to me now?’ By not forcing them to attend the
training and allowing the teachers to make the decision on their own, when the teachers finally attended their motivation was increased because they felt ownership of their decision, and not mandated by someone in a leadership position.

_Autonomy unsupported._ Perceptions of unsupported autonomy can lead an individual into believing that they have no ownership or say in their decisions or behaviors. It is especially important for educational leaders to demonstrate support of the perceptions of autonomy for the teachers in their schools. However, not all principals or district leaders demonstrate autonomy supports for their teachers.

One principal kept saying that he did not “encourage…nor discourage” his teachers from attending GE. However, by requiring that the teachers attend other professional development trainings, the principal demonstrated unsupportive autonomy for the teachers. As already mentioned, one teacher felt a mismatch in values by the principals’ lack of encouraging other teachers to attend GE as she valued GE practices and goals.

_Competence supported._ To support competency a principal must be careful not to mandate training, although sometimes that may be necessary if teachers are resistant to attend any training at all. However, the high school principal recognized the important for his high school teachers to stay current in their particular field. He mentioned that he “encourage[s] it. That’s the word you use ‘collegiality’ when you get out…” and even understood the importance of teachers supporting each other through “collegiality” during trainings and implementation of changes to classroom practices. He said that he asked one of his veteran teachers to attend an AP (advanced placement) workshop in his field of chemistry and although the teacher was resistant at first, when the teacher returned from the training, he mentioned that, [he] “didn’t realize how far behind I was on stuff.’ He said ‘they are doing stuff in chemistry labs and chemistry stuff that I didn’t have a clue.’ He said ‘you were right for making me go.’ He said, ‘I was five years behind.’” So although the principal had requested that the teacher attend the training, in the end the teachers’ competency was supported by the principal encouraging him to seek new resources in his field.

The principal also mentioned that he thought of professional development trainings as “an opportunity …if we can work it out for the teacher we say ‘you bet, you got to go, you got to
stay up on what’s current.’ …You know latest practices on either their field or just of education in general.” His competency supports helped promote his teachers feelings of competency in their field by being current on the latest practices and knowledge in the field, which research has demonstrated also encourages self-efficacy by teachers (Woolfolk, 2007).

The district staff member spoke about herself as a model to her teachers to encourage their feelings of competency. She believes that “you have to walk your talk” by modeling to teachers and principal that “they [district faculty and staff] have to know that you are never going to lose sight of why we are all here: students. And really listen to their needs. And what they have…and meeting those needs.”

**Competence unsupported.** In this study, no direct data could be found that demonstrated competency being unsupported. However, in this case, the elementary school principal, although claiming that he did not “discourage the attending or implementing of GE” he also did not encourage it. This laissez-faire type of behavior is known as benign neglect. By not encouraging something, a leader is demonstrating discouragement of it. Followers will not put effort into something that the leader is not promoting, unless they have already seen the value in it. By not encouraging the teachers to attend or implement GE, the elementary principal was, in fact, unsupportive of teachers’ competencies to continue implementing GE. As mentioned previously, the teachers who already implement GE to a high degree felt a mismatch in values due to his lack of support and encouragement of GE.

**Relationship Affiliation**

A relationship affiliation is built on relationship history which continues to develop throughout the cycle. A relationship may experience a match of values, and support, but may then experience a negative cycle of a mismatch of values and lack of support. Depending on how much history the relationship has, one positive cycle may not be enough to improve a negative relationship, or one negative cycle may not be enough to negate a positive relationship.

All relationships are based on historical background. Relationships are built on encounters and situations. In this study, all of the relationships were already started and I had to make some assumptions about the historical background, although some were mentioned
directly. The historical background of some of the relationships of this study presented evidence to explain the behavior and motivations of individual within certain contexts.

**Relationship History**

Historical backgrounds of relationships may also be based on power or authority of one individual over another. For example, if a principal is concerned about his job, he may go out of his way to form a positive relationship with the superintendent (his boss) to ensure job security. Other relationships concerning power and authority may have to do with feelings of owing someone a favor from some thing that occurred in the past.

One principal in this study, received his current position based on having a long, positive relationship with the current superintendent. He may have felt obligated to with hold the values and positions of the superintendent based on that history stating: “… I decided to come back into town, I knew some guys, and thought I could get a principals job pretty quick. Worked my way in…”

The following section includes the discussion, conclusions, limitations, and avenues for future research as a result of this study.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This study began as an investigation into why some teachers are motivated to make changes in their classrooms, while others seem to resist change. Professional development for teachers is timely and costly. Schools and districts want to get the most for their money to promote and maintain high quality classroom teachers. Teachers may attend professional development for a variety of reasons, including: a desire to improve practices, wanting to learn new ways to be an effective teacher, a desire to stay current on the latest knowledge in the field, or more extrinsic reasons such as wanting to impress or please the principal. Having been mandated to personally attend and implement numerous teacher trainings in the past, I know how often trainings seem to be a waste of time in the eyes of the teacher. When professional development information is not tied to the needs of the teacher, nor does the teacher have choice in attending or how to implement the training elements, resentment may ensue. Resentment and power struggles between teachers and principals do not make for a positive atmosphere or relationship. Negative relationships can cause further conflicts and often lead to dissatisfaction and can affect performance in the classroom which may be harmful to the learning experience for the students in that classroom. These issues led me to investigate the teachers’ autonomy and motivation for change concerning professional development trainings. Several pilot studies led to the use of SDT as a theoretical framework for the research.

What began as a qualitative study to discover how elements of SDT promote greater implementation of a professional development program for teachers has led to a model of theoretical understanding called “The importance of values-alignment within a role-hierarchy for increasing teachers’ motivation for implementing professional development”. This model emerged with a central theme of “relationships matter” as the focus.

Mastery to Intrinsic: Performance to Extrinsic

Deci and Ryan’s (1991) SDT states that extrinsic rewards offered to learners (e.g., prizes and candy) from teachers may undermine intrinsic motivation in students. While the reward may encourage the student to perform the desired behavior in the short term, in the absence of the
reward, the student may or may not demonstrate intrinsic motivation to continue the desired behavior, although the desired behavior may continue (Deci & Ryan, 1991). In this study, I viewed “teachers as students” as they attended professional development trainings. The teachers were hoped to exhibit intrinsic motivation to implement changes so that greater implementation and sustained changes would continue. When teachers are intrinsically motivated to change (much like students’ intrinsic motivation to learn) then change may be more likely to be sustained over time. Someone of power, who values performance focused goals, often provides extrinsic rewards to promote their values (Pintrich, 2000). For example, a principal who is performance focused may more likely encourage high test scores from students (and therefore pressure teachers) in the school and may therefore, reward teachers (and students) based on high performance on the tests. Teachers who have performance focused goals are more likely to see the high test scores and the rewards that come with them as positive and may therefore, pass those values on to their students. Research has shown that students in performance-focused teachers’ classrooms are more likely to adopt performance focused goals as well (Ames, 1992; Pintrich, 2000). The concern with a performance focused classroom based on rewards is: What happens when there is no reward? What happens when the test score, or grade, or act of learning does not come with an extrinsic reward? Research suggests that the behavior may terminate along with the external rewards which only fostered extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1987; 1991). The current study contributes to this research and offers a look at how a match between teacher and principal in performance focused goals and includes a positive relationship affiliation fosters extrinsic motivation and a focus on performance; whereas a match between teacher and principal in mastery focused goals and a positive relationship supports intrinsic motivation and a focus on mastery.

Future research can investigate relationships among the type of goals (mastery vs. performance) a teacher had before attending a professional development, as it relates to extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation to change, as well as, investigating the relationship between the teacher and principal before the training. Did the training promote his/her feelings of autonomy, competence and relatedness? Did the principal support feelings of autonomy, competency, and relatedness when he/she returned and implemented (or failed to implement) the training? How did this further his/her relationship with the principal? Other relationships within the school,
district, or other settings could also investigate answers to these questions, as these might contribute to the understanding of how relationships contribute to motivation for change.

Leadership Styles

**Authoritative vs. Authoritarian Parenting Styles**

The authoritative versus authoritarian styles was researched with regards to parent and child relationships. However, in this study these terms were applied to teachers and principals. The authoritative parent sets high standards, but also has high emotional affiliation with the child (Lamborn, et al., 1991; Woolfolk, 2007). Whereas, the authoritarian parent sets high standards, yet has low emotional affiliation with the child. Similar research on different types of leadership styles include those of transactional vs. transformational leaders, more commonly researched in business (and education) settings and is described below.

**Transactional vs. Transformational Leaders**

There are different types of leaders who can be successful in various situations, depending on the context and the followers. MacGregor Burns (1978) identified two types of leadership, transactional and transformational. Both leaders differ in their style and manner of leading a group. However, depending on the followers and goals of the organization, both types can be successful.

A transactional leader is one who makes exchanges with followers, “leaders approach followers with an eye toward exchanging” (Burns, 1978, p. 4). These types of leaders believe in reciprocity as a core value so both parties get what they want (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). In the case of a school setting (i.e., principal and teacher), perhaps a transactional principal would ask for teachers to ensure that students get high test scores and in exchange may get bonuses. Both the leader and the followers are participating in an exchange so both get what they want. Depending on the personalities and values of the followers, a transactional leader may be successful in some organizations; however research demonstrates that this type of leader focuses
on marginally improving performance and maintains a particular quality from followers (Burns, 1978, Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987).

A transformational leader demonstrates actions based on the shifting of beliefs and values of the followers to instill awareness about the consequences of the organization (Burns, 1978). These types of leaders lead with their own values and beliefs and express these standards to their followers. This type of leadership often results in greater achievement and levels of performance (Burns, 1978). In a school setting, a transformational principal may express values of teaching students in order for them to gain mastery focused goals, this value may be seen as important to the teachers who in turn teach with mastery goals.

Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) investigated the importance of a transformational leader to thoroughly articulate his/her values to followers so those values may be accepted. Effective communication and demonstration of these values to the followers is vital to the success of a transformational leader. This body of research focuses on the importance of leaders’ own belief and value system as it influences the followers in an organization.

Chatman (1991) researched the importance of value alignment between leader and followers and found that in order to ensure happy and more motivated employees, values alignment is vital. Perhaps when a principal and the teachers in that school have value alignment, motivation to implement professional development (as a value of the principal) will also be increased.

The results of this study provide further support that followers (teachers) are motivated (in this case to implement professional development) when there is values alignment between the values of the principal and those of the teachers. This values alignment promotes a positive relationship affiliation which fosters motivation to implement professional development. Although a transactional principal may still be able to produce high test scores or high performing students, a misalignment of values between the principal and teachers often leads to negative relationship affiliations and low motivation to implement. A transformational principal leader in this study was able to communicate his values and beliefs about the importance of preparing students for their future, not just about getting high test scores. Future research could include further investigation into different types of principals or school leaders including transactional and transformational leaders. Perhaps with different settings and different values both types of leaders could be successful.
The Model

The emerged model from this study begins with the role hierarchy that exists between any interpersonal relationship in a work setting. Although the model follows a progression, examples from this study demonstrate that the model may not necessarily be linear in nature (i.e., from before attending professional development, during professional development, and after attending professional development). For example, a teacher may be mandated or encouraged to attend a particular professional development by her principal. The teacher may not feel autonomy to attend the training. However, if the training is of high quality and the values of the training are aligned with the teachers’ own values, the teachers’ perception of autonomy supported, competency is encouraged, then a positive relationship will be created and the teacher will more likely be motivated to implement changes. These external supports (from the principal) will likely encourage teachers’ intrinsic motivation to implement the training to a high degree. This study demonstrated that when the teacher returns to her school the immediate support of autonomy, competency, and relatedness is key to her continued implementation of the training elements. Once teachers’ implementation is high, those supports may be discontinued, but teachers’ implementation may still remain. However, if a teacher returns to her school and her perceptions of autonomy, competency, and relatedness are not supported, low implementation may occur.

This study bridges the gap between motivational theories such as SDT and Control – Value Theory and research concerning professional development for teachers. Relationships are a big part of a teacher’s career and daily activities. These relationships can help create a positive learning environment for students (Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Woolfolk, 2007), or a negative learning environment classroom for learners. Teachers who feel intrinsically motivated to seek trainings that may provide insights into better teaching practices are more likely to have more productive classrooms (Fullan, 1993). These teachers may also demonstrate more positive attitudes about teaching in general and this attitude may be reflected in their teaching (Guskey, 1986).

However, the relationship affiliations between principals and teachers are not the only important relationships in a teachers’ life, Relationships between a teacher and her students are also important, and may reflect similar, underlying processes that exist between principal and
teachers. Teachers must trust and have positive relationship affiliations with their principal and district staff in ways that teachers feel supported as professionals to make a difference in their students’ achievement. Similarly, students need positive relationship affiliations with their teachers in ways that students feel supported to learn. These positive relationship affiliations may promote greater intrinsic motivation for a teacher to implement effective instructional strategies and may promote students’ intrinsic motivation for learning. Additionally, positive relationship affiliations may promote teachers’ intrinsic motivation to continue seeking professional development that will help enhance classroom practices, while positive relationship affiliations may promote students’ life-long learning.

Future research could investigate how this model applies to the student to teacher relationship. Evidence exists that a teacher with mastery focused goals would promote mastery focused goals for students and is more likely to support students feelings of autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Pintrich, 2000).

Value-Control

Atkinson first introduced the concept of Expectancy-Value theory (1957; 1970) by describing the importance of what an individual believes about his own capabilities and what he values to be motivated for changing a behavior or complete an action. Expectancy-Value theory was further developed by Wigfield and Eccles (2000) and Pintrich (2000). Expectancy-Value theory focuses on the expectations an individual has concerning 1) Outcome-expectancies, e.g., success/failure and 2) beliefs about skills to bring about the outcome. For example, if a teacher attends a professional development training expecting to learn new ideas to bring back to her classroom, she is more likely to feel motivated to make changes that may improve her instruction and effectiveness for students. My results indicated that in addition to expectancies, an individual’s values (i.e., teacher) and the values within the context of a role-hierarchy (i.e., principal) need to be aligned in order for a positive relationship affiliation to form which fosters intrinsic motivation. My results also indicate that if that same teacher values the practices and classroom changes that the training suggests, plus the benefits outweigh the costs of implementing changes, motivation for change (i.e., outcomes) will more likely be increased.

This study supports the elements of Pekrun’s Control-Value theory (2002; 2006). Control-Value theory states that perceptions of control as well as an individual’s values dictate
an individual’s motivation for a goal or outcome. Unlike Expectancy-Value theory, Control-Value theory also considers past (historical) perceptions of control, as well as present feelings of perceptions of control that may dictate an individual’s motivation toward an outcome. Control-Value theory also considers an individual’s emotions to play a key role in feelings of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation. Since SDT also focuses on intrinsic motivation, it seems that the missing element in SDT was that of the importance of values to promote intrinsic motivation. The model that emerged from analysis of data from this study demonstrates the importance of the alignment of values, along with the SDT elements of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. The element of control in Control-Value Theory includes aspects of SDT via perceptions of autonomy and competence that are related to perceptions of control to foster intrinsic motivation to implement changes.

As the results of this study were analyzed and a grounded theory approach was used to analyze data, a model emerged with the relationships between individuals and others in the context (or environment) as its central focus, values also were seen as more important or coming before perceptions of control in the cycle of motivation and implementation. The values an individual has shape his/her thoughts and behaviors (Pekrun, 2006). For example, if I value friendships, my thoughts and therefore my behaviors will demonstrate my concern for those friendships and keeping those friendships. My behaviors will also demonstrate my concern for my friends and I will be motivated to keep those friendships. My thoughts and behaviors are being guided by my values. If I worked in a highly competitive field where friendships were not valued over success, perhaps I would not be “successful” in that field because my value system would be different than that of my work context. My interpersonal relationships with others in my field may be negative due to our differing values.

Future research could investigate if the alignment of values is more important than the support of control or if both are equally key to foster intrinsic motivation to implement changes to classroom practices. Quantitative as well as additional qualitative studies could be helpful in this area.
Perceptions of Control

Perceptions of control (i.e., autonomy and competence) have been shown to promote intrinsic motivation in an individual to perform a task or goal (Pekrun, 2006; Weiner, 1985; 1976). Control-Value theory encompasses two aspects of SDT through the element of perceptions of control. Control-Value theory (Pekrun, 2006) states that an individual’s motivation is contingent upon their perceptions of control to bring about desired outcomes and their values for obtaining the desired outcome. For example, a teacher may set a goal for improving her students’ test scores. To accomplish this goal she knows she must implement certain instructional strategies. If she feels she has control over improving her students’ test scores and has the ability (i.e., competence) to improve her students’ test scores, her motivation to achieve her goal will be facilitated by these perceptions. However, according to Control-Value theory, the teacher must also value this goal. If a teacher does not value the goal of improving her students’ test scores despite her perceptions of control (i.e., autonomy and competence) her motivation to enact an instructional strategy aimed at improving her students’ test scores will be hindered. With respect to this study, if teachers do not have perceptions of control (i.e., autonomy and competence), and don’t also value the training and its elements, their intrinsic motivation to implement will be low.

The Importance of Relationships

The model which emerged from analysis of data from this study reflects the primary importance of interpersonal relationships in an educational setting. This includes interpersonal relationships between: teacher and student, teacher and parent, teacher and teacher, (teacher and principal, teacher and district member, principal and district member, etc.) The analysis and results of this study showed that all of these interpersonal relationships affect the climate of the school and district and may contribute to the motivation of employees and students as agents of change and development.

This study focused on professional development for teachers as being a catalyst for change. Research has demonstrated a need for making teacher training more effective for teachers in order to develop high quality teachers that modify and reflect on needs for changes in their classrooms (Guskey, 2003; Fullan, 1993). As teachers attend professional development
trainings, either by choice or by mandates from their district or school, teachers who have a more positive relationship affiliation with their principal and district staff may be more likely to be open to attending trainings. According to my results, teachers who have negative relationship affiliations with their principal or district staff may be less likely to attend trainings or to implement changes to their classroom practices.

However, as demonstrated by the data in this study, teachers who have autonomy-supports and competency-supports during and immediately after the training may implement changes despite a negative relationship affiliation with a principal in the future. For example, two of the teachers interviewed in this study were encouraged to attend GE by another principal in their district. They may have felt somewhat pressured to attend, and therefore may not have felt much autonomy. Still, they attended the training. Because GE is high quality training, the training supported their autonomy and facilitated their perceptions of competency. Once the teachers returned to their schools, their principal at the time continued to support their autonomy and competency and that built a positive relationship affiliation as implementation began. This demonstrates that the relationship between the teacher and the principal at the beginning of implementation (or immediately after training) may be especially important to promote greater implementation. When I interviewed the teachers for this study, a new principal did not support these teachers’ feelings of autonomy or competency for implementing GE. By that time, the implementation of GE was such an integral part of their teaching that the teachers didn’t necessarily need a principal’s continued support to continue their high implementation of GE practices. However, the relationship between the teachers and the new principal was negative in affiliation because of his lack of support and mismatch of values for the teachers’ practices.

Conversely, another teacher interviewed during this study had attended GE because her university offered attending GE as a reward for graduation from the university’s education program. The teacher attended GE and enjoyed the program, but her principal did not support her feelings of autonomy or competency to implement GE once she obtained employment at a school in the district in which this study was conducted. So although her feelings of autonomy and competency were supported during the training, her lack of support from a principal lowered her motivation to implement, therefore she implemented GE to a low degree. Her relationship with the current principal is positive because their values match (they do not highly value GE practices). However, both the teacher and principal have more performance-focused goals (test
Another aspect of the relationship between principal and teacher that developed during this study was the issue of turnover of principals (and teachers) within a school (and district). In one school, a principal had started working about five years prior, so the teachers who were there before him and had a strong relationship with the previous principal seemed less willing to develop a strong, positive relationship with the new principal. The teachers who had been hired after his start, seemed to be much more positive and willing to listen and understand his ideas. Also, the district member who was interviewed had been a principal at a primary-grades school very nearby the elementary school I visited. She had been principal for many years and many of the teachers, even those at the other elementary school, had developed a strong and positive relationship with her. She highly valued and encouraged the attending of GE training, so many teachers decided to attend GE based on her recommendation. However, now that she is a district person, the teachers see less of her and the relationship may not be as strong as it once was, which has negatively effected many teachers’ excitement and willingness to attend GE training.

Future research could investigate how new a relationship (e.g., a new teacher just hired) versus that of an existing relationship is influenced by a principal who supports or does not support teachers’ feelings of autonomy, competency, and relatedness to implement changes to classroom practice. Also, how does the alignment of values and perceptions of control between the teacher and principal influence a relationship from the start versus one with much historical background?

Contributions

This study is a contribution to the literature on Self-Determination Theory, Control-Value Theory and motivation and implementation of professional development programs for teachers. The new model which emerged as a result of analysis of the data from this study demonstrates a cycle of motivation and implementation for change involving interpersonal relationships, alignment of values, and perceptions of control. Much of past research on Control-Value and Expectancy-Value seemed to focus on the control and expectancies, not on the values. Indeed, a special edition of Educational Psychologist included a call for more research focusing on the
value component of Expectancy-Value theories (Brophy, 1999). The introduction by Brophy (1999) suggested that expectancies as opposed to values have been much more researched in the past, but values may be found to be just as, if not more, important to understanding motivation in addition to the knowledge understood about expectancies in this area. Brophy further suggests that researchers need to better understand an individual’s values that may foster or hinder their motivation to make changes. This study continues the research with a focus on the importance of values, not only an individual’s values, but the alignment of those values with the values of another in a relationship.

Additionally, researchers such as Anderman and Leake (2005) have sought ways to facilitate the understanding of multiple motivation theories in educational psychology, particularly for pre-service teachers. For example, their research model combined numerous motivational theories into a SDT framework to help provide a clearer way to present motivational theories to pre-service teachers. Similar to Anderman and Leake’s study, the current dissertation study also uses SDT, but combines those elements with those of Control-Value Theory into a single model. This may help provide a clearer presentation of motivational theories in education. Future research could focus on continuing to combine compatible theories that may more clearly explain the phenomenon in a setting, particularly complex educational settings.

*Alternative Applicable Contexts*

Although this model was developed utilizing data collected within a school context (i.e., relationships between teachers and principals), this model is expected to stand in other environmental contexts as well. This model could be applied to business settings which include role-hierarchy relationships, for example: worker/boss, worker/co-worker, worker/client, etc. to investigate how and if this model still holds true. Research on transactional and transformational leaders includes that conducted in business settings. This model may also hold true in business and government environment such as other related research was demonstrated.
Additional Avenues for Future Research

As previously mentioned, future research could explore how this model is reflected in other types of settings, (i.e., higher educational and business) to investigate how other role-hierarchy relationships may be influenced by the alignment of values and enhancing perceptions of control. To further support this model as an extension of this study, I would like to continue to investigate the relationships of this study to determine how the relationships experience changes as more history has occurred since this data was collected. Another avenue for research would be to investigate how a historically positive relationship is influenced by a mismatch of a particular value although the majority of values were matched between those in the relationship.

Limitations

Because this study focused on one professional development training, these results represent a single case study in which an emergent model was found. Limitations include a small sample size from one specific environment (GE training). Results may be different if collected in another professional development environment.

Also, this study is completely qualitative, with only some quantitative data from observation rubrics. Qualitative studies have limitations that differ from quantitative studies due to the nature of collecting and conducting a qualitative study. Some differences, and therefore limitations, of qualitative versus quantitative studies are the: 1) focus of research 2) goal of investigation 3) sample and 4) mode of analysis (Merriam, 1998). The focus of research in qualitative studies is a focus on quality (nature) as opposed to quantity (how much). Qualitative studies have investigation goals of understanding, and desire rich descriptions (Guba & Lincoln, 1989), discovery, and meaning. The sample sizes of qualitative studies are small, nonrandom, and purposeful. Additionally, the mode of analysis of qualitative studies is inductive in nature as opposed to deductive with quantitative studies.

Future research could include qualitative studies in other professional development, other training, or other work settings (e.g., business settings) to investigate the details (applicability) of the model and how intrinsic motivation is affected by the alignment of values and perceptions of control as they influence the relationship affiliations among role-hierarchy relationships.
Other limitations of this study are that the many of the participants were asked to provide information about historical events, which must then be based on what the participants can remember. Although many of the participants implemented GE to a high degree and had positive comments about the training, other historical events may have slightly changed their perceptions of reality. Also, when asked to describe relationships between former principals and with GE instructors and other attending teachers, the current relationship with their principal or teachers may have tainted their responses to questions.

Conclusions

Teachers must constantly react to changes, including changes to policy and changes of administration. Even change of their students is common place within an educational environment. How do teachers handle all of these changes if they are unwilling to make changes to their own teaching practices? Professional development is often the way administrators and teachers seek answers to questions and educational changes. However, research has demonstrated that often times professional development is seen as an inconvenience to teachers and administrators and that it takes away from what teachers most want to do: teach. As students, parents, and policies change around them, teachers must be able to reflect on their own classroom practices and be willing to accept the possibility that there may be more effective ways to reach their students. Administrators must also set the example of how valuable professional development can be when implemented within the current teaching environment.

In order to be willing to implement changes, teachers must be motivated not only to make changes to teaching practices, but to seek professional development opportunities that appeal to their own needs in the classroom. Research has shown the importance of training meeting the needs of teachers to increase teachers’ motivation to implement changes to practice. The results of this study also demonstrate the importance of SDT supports as well as the alignment of values and perceptions of control to foster teachers’ motivation to implement changes. Although professional development is mandated through state and district initiatives as re-certification requirements, some teachers do understand the value in continually revising and updating their own knowledge and skills in the classroom. Numerous studies reveal that teachers with expert
knowledge in their subject area are “high quality teachers” (Driscoll, 2003; Woolfolk, 2007) and are more likely to demonstrate confidence and self-efficacy in their own teaching abilities.

The results of this study have demonstrated important elements that could be in place to foster teachers’ motivation to implement changes to their practices. Not only must teachers perceive that professional development will meet their competency needs to facilitate their implementation, but results suggest that principals must also perceive that the professional development is important for teachers’ to implement (i.e., teachers’ and principals’ values must be aligned). The model further suggests that, when principals’ and teachers’ values are aligned, teachers’ perceptions of control are enhanced. Consequently, these two elements (alignment of values leading to perceptions of control) are vital to promote positive relationship affiliations that support teachers’ intrinsic motivation to implement changes. Understanding the historical background of a relationship may predict the extent to which the role hierarchies have a match or mismatch of values, as well as, the extent to which teachers’ perceptions of control are supported or unsupported within the hierarchy. Reversing any negative relationship affiliations could take time, and may need to occur, in order for a teacher to feel motivated to implement changes. However, results also suggest that teachers’ perceptions of control may be facilitated through ongoing support provided by the processional development. To bolster teachers’ implementation, both professional development trainings and administrators can support teachers’ motivation to learn and implement new instructional strategies. Focusing on supporting teachers’ autonomy, competence, and relatedness may be necessary to foster a teachers’ intrinsic motivation, but also the importance of alignment of values may be key to developing a positive relationship affiliation between individuals in role-hierarchy relationships that could initiative or intensify teachers’ intrinsic motivation to implement changes. Professional development is costly and timely, and, although complex, understanding ways to support teachers’ intrinsic motivation can help facilitate effective implementation of high quality teaching practices that will promote students’ academic achievement and well-being.

Valuing change and discovering more efficient ways to help students succeed should be a common goal of every teacher. When the environment (e.g., principal) is supportive of the teacher and the teacher values their own professional growth, motivation to implement positive changes that can increase students’ achievement can be facilitated. As we continue our path of research to discover new and better ways for teachers to teach in ways that help students learn,
we can also continue to investigate ways to help teachers incorporate and use this research-based knowledge, knowing that promoting greater student-success, by preparing them for productive lives, is what motivates us all.
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APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM

Facilitators and Barriers to Instructional Change: Spring 2007-Fall 2008

You are being asked to participate in an evaluation and research study about the process of implementing change in the classroom. This study is being conducted by Crissie Grove, Doctoral Candidate, and Jeannine E. Turner, Ph.D., at Florida State University. The evaluation processes has been authorized by the Great Expectations organization, but no one involved with Great Expectations (director, instructors, etc.) will see your individual information.

You may recall your participation involved completing surveys at the summer 2006 training. As a follow-up, you have agreed to an interview that will document the process of your implementation of the training you received at this past Summer’s Institute. In addition to an interview, an observation of your classroom would be greatly appreciated. Your information can help us improve (1) the Great Expectations training, (2) the processes of implementing Great Expectations’ training.

Your responses will be strictly confidential—no one at your school or Great Expectations will know your answers. At no time will anyone other than the researchers, or graduate research assistants, have access to your interview responses or observation data. Your responses will strictly be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. Confidentiality may, however, be breached in the case of child abuse or neglect, court ruling, or threat of harm to self or others. If you choose to participate in an interview, it is important that you keep in mind that digital audio recording may be used to record your interview until it can be transcribed. Survey responses and audio data will remain in a secured storage area, in my office, until it is destroyed no later than 9/31/2008.

Although Great Expectations (GE) is requesting that we document and evaluate implementation and change processes, we are requesting that you allow us to use your information for research purposes. You are not required to let us use your information for our research. You may refuse to participate in the research and/or withdraw your participation at any time. Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your relations with your school leadership or the GE organization. They will not know the school faculty members who have agreed to participate in the research. Your personal responses to interview questions or observation data will not be shared with your principal or district. You will be provided with a copy of this form for your records.

The information gained from you will be valuable in helping us understand the implementing processes in your teaching and your school. Additionally, your answers will help identify aspects of teachers’ environment that help, or hinder, whole-school reform efforts. Additionally, your information will help us understand aspects of teachers’ motivation that facilitate or hinder change efforts. Finally, the information you provide, over time, will help us to identify ways the training may inspire (or hinder) changes in your teaching practices. All of the information you provide will help us understand instructional change processes, but in particular, ways that training can successfully facilitate your teaching goals and your school’s student-achievement goals. Advantages to your participation in this study may include personal insight and greater understanding of your decision-making processes about training and instruction.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, or if you feel you have been placed at risk because of your participation, you can contact the chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the FSU Office of the Vice President for Research at (850) 644-8633 or by email: phaire@fsu.edu. If you have any questions about this study or any aspect of this research, you are welcome to contact me. My contact information is provided below. Best wishes on your new journey!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crissie M. Grove</th>
<th>Jeannine E. Turner, Ph.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Cognition and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Educational Psychology and Learning Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Learning Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 Stone Building</td>
<td>307 Stone Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email: <a href="mailto:crissiegrove@yahoo.com">crissiegrove@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Tallahassee, FL  32306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>850/645-2405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>email: <a href="mailto:turner@coe.edu.fsu">turner@coe.edu.fsu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please complete the following as consent for interview and/or observation.

For analysis of data and in order to match your interview responses to past survey responses, we need a 4-digit (minimum) ID number. You may choose any number you wish, but in order to remember the number easily, we recommend the last four numbers of your social security number.

I choose to:

1. Be interviewed by phone or in person concerning my GE training experience.

__________________________
Signature

__________________________
ID # (we suggest the last four numbers of your SS#)

OR

2. Be observed in my classroom by Florida State University researchers at which time a face to face interview will also take place.

__________________________
Signature

__________________________
ID # (we suggest the last four numbers of your SS#)

If you are willing to be interviewed and/or observed this spring concerning your implementation processes, please write your name, ID (we suggest the last four numbers of your social security number), and phone number below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>Phone number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: INTERVIEW WITH PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, DIRECTOR OF GE, AND GE STAFF

1. What is your position?
2. How long have you been in your position?
3. Background on teaching, mentoring, etc...

School Level

Interviews of Principals.

1. How did your school decide to attend GE?
2. To what extent were the teachers and staff members involved in the decision to attend GE?
3. Did you attend GE as well?
4. Why or why not?
5. Was the training mandated for your teachers and/or staff?
6. Why or why not?
7. If not mandated, how did you ensure that your teachers and/or staff understood the importance of attending GE?
8. How did the school decide what goals and expectations were needed to be addressed in the GE training?
9. In what ways do you encourage the use of GE?
10. In what ways do you implement GE in your school?
11. How do you ensure implementation of GE in your school by any and all teachers?
12. How will you continue to increase the implementation of GE in your school by any and all teachers?
13. How did you decide what teachers were to attend GE?
14. Were the teachers allowed to attend as a group? (if yes, include 16 and 17)
15. Why or why not?
16. How do you feel this group dynamic influenced teachers’ attendance of GE?
17. How do you feel this group dynamic influenced teachers’ implementation of GE practices?
18. After attending GE, what has been done to continue to promote the use of GE?
19. How do you encourage the teachers to discuss and share ideas and thoughts of GE?
20. Do you feel this discussion is important to the implementation of GE practices?
21. What elements of GE helped motivate your decision to attend or have your teachers attend GE?
22. In what ways did GE meet your expectations?
23. In what ways did GE feel the needs of your school?
24. What specific elements of GE helped to motivate you and your teachers to implement GE practices?
Interviews of Teachers. Participating teachers were interviewed based on their attendance and implementation of GE training elements. Interview questions based on the research questions are as follows:

1. Why did you attend GE this past summer?
2. To what extent did you have some choice in attending the training?
3. How did your school decide (or you) to attend GE?
4. If admin requested that you attend the training, how were you told about the training? How was the information presented?
5. How did you decide to attend GE?
6. How do you think this impacted your thoughts going into the training?
7. What did you want to learn (or gain) from attending GE?
8. How were these goals different from your overall schools’ goals?
9. Why?
10. How did GE meet your needs for attending the training?
11. How have your used that information in your classroom?
12. How did GE meet the needs of your school for attending the training?
13. How have your used that information in your classroom?
14. How have other teachers used that information in their classrooms?
15. What elements of GE have you implemented? (I don’t want to be too specific as I want to give them a chance to tell me what they have implemented or not. Give examples of 17 GE practices if needed.)
16. In what ways did you implement those practices? (List back to them if needed)
17. Are there certain practices you prefer over others?
18. Why do you think that is?
19. Will you attend an advanced GE?
20. Was the GE training what you expected?
21. What did you hope to learn (understand) as a result of GE?
22. Will you continue to implement GE in the coming years?
23. Did any of your peers (i.e. fellow teachers from school) attend GE as well?
24. Have you discussed your implementation of GE with those peers?
25. Why or why not?
26. How has your discussions or lack of with other teachers influenced your implementation or resistance of suggested teaching practices?
27. How has that impacted your implementation of GE?
28. How has your school supported your implementation or not of GE elements?
29. How did you feel while attending the GE training?
30. Were all of your expectations met?
31. Why or why not?
32. In what ways has that influenced your implementation of GE? (if at all)
33. In what ways did you connect or relate to the other attending teachers at GE?
34. In what ways did you connect or relate to the trainers of GE?
35. What motivated you to implement GE strategies? (or did you not feel motivated?)
Training Level

Interview of Director of GE.

1. How do schools go about contacting GE for training opportunities?
2. How do you encourage the training to be a choice rather than a mandate for teachers?
3. Why do you believe this choice is important for attendees of GE?
4. How do individual teachers go about contacting GE training opportunities?
5. How do you encourage whole school attendance of GE versus that of an individual teacher?
6. In what ways does the GE training encourage the competence of implementation of GE elements?
7. How does the GE corporation demonstrate the importance of competence in order to implement the GE practices?
8. GE encourages whole school reform, as opposed to single teachers’ implementing GE. Why do you feel this group implementation is important?
9. In what ways do you promote this group collaboration for the attendance and implementation of GE?
10. In what ways do you feel this group collaboration is important to greater implementation of GE?
11. How do you encourage relationships among the mentors/instructors of GE?
12. Why do you feel these relationships are important?
13. In what ways does the GE training foster implementation of the elements?
14. What specific elements of the GE training promote implementation of GE practices?

Interviews of GE Staff.

1. How do you think that the element of choice in attending GE influences teachers’ perceptions of the training?
2. In what ways do you encourage this positive perception of change during the training?
3. How do you encourage teachers’ feelings of competence in their ability to implement GE practices during the training?
4. How do you think the structure of the training itself influences teachers’ feelings of ability to implement GE?
5. In what ways do you think relationships among the attending teachers influences their thoughts about GE?
6. In what ways do you encourage these relationships during your GE training?
7. In what ways do you think relationships between you and the attending teachers influences teachers’ thoughts about GE?
8. In what ways do you encourage this relationship during your GE training?
9. How do you believe the relationships between the attending teachers influence their implementation of GE?
10. In what ways do you help sustain this connection for increased implementation?
11. In what ways do you sustain the connection with attending teachers to encourage greater implementation of GE?
12. In what ways does your follow up with the teachers ensure implementation?
13. In what ways do you encourage your teachers to discuss GE ideas together?
14. In what ways do you believe the GE training encourages implementation of practices?
15. What specific elements of the GE training do you believe helps to foster greater implementation of GE?
APPENDIX D: OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

2007 Grove Dissertation Observation Protocol
Spring 2007

Observer: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________ Time: ________ to __________

Teacher: ___________________________ School: ___________________________ Grade: ________ Students (#) ________

Subject(s): □ Reading □ Phonics □ Language □ Social Studies □ Science □ Mathematics □ Other

Lesson Objective:

Notes:

Physical Environment:
Describe the classroom environment. Draw a schematic to show the class arrangement. Include the location of desks, displays, resource materials, computers, tables, and other items of importance in your drawing.
### Classroom Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEO Practices</th>
<th>High Implementation</th>
<th>Medium-High Implementation</th>
<th>Medium-Low Implementation</th>
<th>Low Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice 1:</strong> The teacher models desired behaviors and attitudes such as those set forth in the Life Principals and the Eight Expectations for Living.</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher integrated life principles/quotes/poetry/creeds into lesson or procedures</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher referred to life principles, quotes, etc. more than once</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher gave some reference to life principles/quotes, etc. but seemed “forced” or did not reference but were on the wall</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice 2:</strong> Students and teachers speak in complete sentences and address one another by name, demonstrating mutual respect and common courtesy.</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always spoke in complete sentences, little teacher prompting</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often spoke in complete sentences with some prompting</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally spoke in complete sentences; need prompting, seemed unnatural and forced</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice 3:</strong> Students are taught as a whole group, thoroughly and to mastery, with intensive and specific modifications insuring success for all.</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent feedback, questioning, and processing of activities. Assists students in processing new information</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some feedback and questioning of students to help with their understanding of activities</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral feedback and questioning of students</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice 4:</strong> Lessons are integrated, related to the real world, reviewed consistently, and connected to subsequent curricula.</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher provides “hook” to connect content, and real-world appreciation for learning. Teacher provides opportunities</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some use of “hook” to engage students. Some opportunities for alternative assessments.</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little use of “hook” to engage students in material. Some use of paper/pencil tests.</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection of material to real world. No “hook” to engage students. All or many paper/pencil tests.</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for students to demonstrate their learning through performance assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice 5: Critical thinking skills are taught.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice 6: A non-threatening environment conducive to risk-taking, is evident. Mistakes are okay. Students are taught to learn from their mistakes and to correct them.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice 7: Memory work, recitations, and/or writing occur daily. These enhance character development and affective communication skills while extending curricula. Recitations are</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
exuberant and full of expression.  

| Practice 8: Enriched vocabulary is evident and is drawn directly from challenging writings and/or wisdom literature. Sources should include classic literature, myths, fables, poetry, proverbs, quotes, and other genres. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Uses excerpts from wisdom literature set the stage for topics, or integrates with other classroom content | Uses classic literature, quotes, and proverbs in connection with material, but not integrated | Displays quotes, but did not connect to material | No reference to quotes, and/or classic literature |

| Practice 9: The Magic Triad, a positive and caring environment, and discipline with dignity and logic are evident. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (High Positive Dialogue) Teacher used only indirect, reframing statements, used quotes, reminded students of pledges, responsibilities | Teacher used mostly indirect comments & occasional direct discipline confrontation statements | Teacher used direct confrontation only | Teacher was critical of mistakes for rule breaking, used direct confrontation only |

| Practice 10: Every students’ work is displayed in some form. Teachers provide commentary through oral and/or written feedback. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| All students’ work is displayed in multiple places (i.e., room, hallway) | All students’ work is displayed in one area | A few, but not all students’ work is displayed | None of students’ work, or only “good” students’ work is displayed |

| Practice 11: Word identification skills are |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Use of multiple work | Some use of phonics | Some use of one type of | No use of any language |

95
used as a foundation for expanding the use of the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>practice 12: Students assume responsibility for their own behavior. Their choices determine consequences.</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students frequently take initiative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students took initiative for some aspects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students did not take initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice 13: A school, class, or personal creed is recited or reflected upon daily to reaffirm commitment to excellence.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Most students memorize and recite creed, but is not referred to during the day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No creed is displayed or referred to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students memorize and recite creed, class creed is referred to</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Most students memorize and recite creed, but is not referred to during the day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No creed is displayed or referred to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice 14: All students experience success. The teacher guarantees it by comparing students to their own past performance, not the performance of others. Students are showcased, and past failures are disregarded.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher frequently compares students to self, not others. Teacher encourages and affirms students throughout learning process. Teacher encourages students to do their best.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no affirmation of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher frequently compares students to self, not others. Teacher encourages and affirms students throughout learning process. Teacher encourages students to do their best.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher sometimes compares students to self. Some affirmation of students.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no affirmation of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher compares students to each other. Teacher discourages students throughout learning process, questions students’ ability, and uses sarcasm</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Some participation is encouraged. Some walking around, monitoring students.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no affirmation of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher stands at board. Little participation of students is encouraged. Little mention of expectations, and teacher does not monitor students’ engagement.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Some participation is encouraged. Some walking around, monitoring students.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no affirmation of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher sits at desk and demonstrates low expectations for students. Students are not engaged and not monitored.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Some participation is encouraged. Some walking around, monitoring students.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no affirmation of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice 16: Each classroom has a student who greets visitors and makes them feel welcome and comfortable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student greeting is fluid, no hesitation, good eye contact, visitor directed into classroom, introduced to class, and/or directed to chair, etc.</td>
<td>Student greeter spoke with some hesitation &amp; awkwardness, most likely due to “stage fright”</td>
<td>Greeting was stilted, not well-rehearsed, seemed “forced”</td>
<td>No student greeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Practice 17: Teachers and students celebrate the success of others. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9  | 8  | 7  | 6  | 5  | 4  | 3  | 2  | 1  |
| Students celebrated the success of others more than once | Students celebrated the success of others once or themselves more than once | Students celebrated the success of themselves once | Students did not celebrate the success of themselves or others |
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