

Teacher Evaluation Feedback and Instructional Practice Self-Efficacy in Secondary School Teachers

Educational Administration Quarterly
1–31

© The Author(s) 2019

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/0013161X19888568

journals.sagepub.com/home/eaq



Eric C. Smith¹ , Gerene K. Starratt¹ ,
Carmen L. McCrink¹, and Heidi Whitford¹

Abstract

Purpose: This study, which investigated the relationship between veteran secondary school teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback and self-efficacy of instructional practice, was driven by the research question: What is the relationship among evaluation processes, teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback, and veteran secondary education teacher self-efficacy toward personal instructional practice? **Method:** Participants were recruited from two school districts in west central Florida. The study tested two hypotheses. Hypothesis 1: Veteran secondary teachers self-efficacy of instructional practice will be related to both evaluation system type (standard vs. nonstandard) and specificity of feedback (high vs. low specificity). Hypothesis 2: Veteran secondary school teacher perceptions of the characteristics of evaluation feedback will predict teacher self-efficacy toward personal instructional practice. The study instrument included the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) and additional feedback-related questions. Teachers were recruited through gatekeepers at the two districts and invited to take the online survey. **Results:** In a test of Hypothesis 1, analysis of variance revealed that

¹Barry University, Miami Shores, FL, USA

Corresponding Author:

Eric C. Smith, Adrian Dominican School of Education, Barry University, 11300 NE, 2nd Avenue, Miami Shores, FL 33161, USA.

Email: erismith@barry.edu

teachers who reported receiving specific evaluation feedback also reported higher teacher self-efficacy compared with teachers who reported receiving nonspecific evaluation feedback, although there were no differences related to standard versus nonstandard evaluation systems. To test Hypothesis 2, multiple regression analysis showed the perceived value of feedback to be the strongest predictor of teacher self-efficacy. **Conclusions:** These findings, which link teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback to teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice, have the potential to inform the creation of improved professional development practices.

Keywords

evaluation, feedback, teacher self-efficacy, teacher instruction

Purpose and Aims of the Research

Teacher evaluation systems have been a controversial topic in recent years and, as a progressive wave of educational changes meets school districts across the nation, questions of their legitimacy and impact arise (Arnold, 2013; Pogodzinski, Umpstead, & Witt, 2015). This scrutiny may provide a basis for improving teacher evaluation systems and creating effective change. The procedures and organization of evaluation processes varies from district to district and can encompass a variety of components, such as value added scores, observations, scripted evidence, and various forms of feedback through final evaluations (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012; Guinn & Vincent, 2006; Murphy, Hallinger, & Heck, 2013). How evaluation feedback is received during the evaluation process can affect teachers' perception of their instructional practice (MacLeod & Napoles, 2012; Tuytens & Devos, 2014).

Although teachers' responses to evaluation feedback are an important aspect of professional development, little research has addressed the ways in which teachers' responses to feedback are related to self-perception of instructional practice (Tuytens & Devos, 2014; van Roermund et al., 2013). Evaluation feedback has the potential to improve teacher practice and is intended to motivate teacher reflection on practice (Tuytens & Devos, 2014; van Roermund et al., 2013). The process of reflecting on evaluation feedback can increase teachers' sense of confidence and competence in delivering classroom instruction (Atkinson, 2012). Evaluation feedback has the potential to guide instructional improvements when a teacher implements new or revised instructional practices in response to feedback (Tuytens & Devos,

2014; van Roermund et al., 2013). Consequently, research that elucidates our understanding of how teachers use evaluation feedback in practice can be crucial to supporting instructional improvements (Tuytens & Devos, 2014; van Roermund et al., 2013).

Moreover, the dearth of empirical findings regarding the relationship between teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback and teacher perceptions of instructional practice has the potential to limit the improvement efforts of evaluation programs (Ford, Van Sickle, Clark, Fazio-Brunson, & Schween, 2017). Without viable improvements being consistently applied to evaluation programs, districts may repeat and cycle through ineffective practices that lead to misguided or stagnant professional development, as well as, a decreased sense of teacher self-efficacy toward instructional practice (Ford et al., 2017). Additionally, in preparing preservice teachers and future administrators for experiences with evaluation, understanding deficiencies within evaluation systems may lead to fostering productive professional development, effectively disseminating feedback, and promoting a culture that values reflection on one's instructional practice (Atkinson, 2012; Ford et al., 2017; Haplin & Kieffer, 2015).

This study was designed to investigate teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback across different evaluation systems and to explore teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice as it may be related to perceived characteristics of feedback. The goal of the study was to contribute data that facilitate an understanding of teacher perceptions of actual evaluation feedback as it relates to their perceived instructional practice effectiveness. Specifically, the overarching research question for this study was as follows: *What is the relationship among evaluation processes, teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback, and veteran secondary education teacher self-efficacy toward personal instructional practice?* Quantitative data were collected through surveys of teachers from two school districts in west central Florida to address the following two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: Veteran secondary teachers self-efficacy of instructional practice will be related to both evaluation system type (standard vs. non-standard) and specificity of feedback (high specificity vs. low specificity).

Hypothesis 2: Veteran secondary education teacher perceptions of the characteristics of evaluation feedback will predict teacher self-efficacy toward personal instructional practice.

Literature Review

Teacher evaluation systems have been a focus of reform efforts due to inconsistencies in the implementation of strategies for identifying effective and

ineffective teachers (Pogodzinski, Umpstead, & Witt, 2015; The New Teacher Project, 2010). Evaluation systems vary from state to state and from district to district, often involving only administrator or principal judgments as to the level of teacher effectiveness. Reform efforts have concentrated on adding elements to evaluation systems, such as value-added measurement, although little research has addressed how teacher evaluations and feedback received through evaluation processes are linked to professional development planning and teachers' confidence in delivery of instruction (Pogodzinski et al., 2015; The New Teacher Project, 2010).

Studies have shown enhanced self-efficacy of instructional practice can lead teachers to reflection-driven decisions about professional development activities that are strategically aligned to instructional practice deficiencies (Atkinson, 2012; Richardson, Kalvaitis, & Delparte, 2014). Through increased self-efficacy of instructional practice, teachers may choose to seek professional development in an effort to improve their classroom implementation of instructional strategies. Teacher enhancements to instructional practice and the strategic implementation of professional development have the potential to ultimately lead to positive student learning gains (Atkinson, 2012; Richardson et al., 2014).

Accordingly, the evaluation process can lead teachers through learning series in which recurring cycles of new instructional experiences, reflection, and discussions move teacher practice forward (Derrington & Kirk, 2017). If proactive improvement can be sustained by teachers through heightened self-efficacy and effective evaluation practices, then it might be expected that teachers may be more likely to enhance their classroom instruction and focus professional development efforts in specific areas, as guided by evaluation feedback (Arnodah, 2013; Atkinson, 2012; Ford et al., 2017; Richardson et al., 2014). Consequently, it is imperative to understand the potential impacts of evaluation feedback perception on teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice to further enhance evaluation systems in supporting teacher development. Ultimately, the end goal for any type of educational improvement is to benefit students with enhanced learning experiences in the classroom (Arnodah, 2013; Atkinson, 2012; Ford et al., 2017; Richardson et al., 2014).

Theoretical Framework

The evaluation setting consists of teachers and observers (evaluators) engaged in a social interaction. Characteristics of feedback (e.g., value and specificity) that constitute this unique social interaction, may affect how teachers perceive evaluation feedback, perceive their own instructional practice

(teacher self-efficacy), reflect on their experience with the evaluation process, and how they direct—or are motivated in—their efforts to improve. To set the foundation for understanding how various aspects of feedback are related to learning outcomes for teachers, we adopted social learning theory (SLT) as the theoretical framework for this study (Bandura, 1977b).

In SLT, Bandura (1977b) proposed that learning takes place through social interactions and personal observations. Behaviors and the social environment are interrelated, broadening a person's ability to learn through social interactions. While hands-on experience may play a role in learning, it is often what the learner observes and how they interact in a social setting that drives future action. This learning theory aligns with the manner in which teachers receive feedback and how feedback is internalized during the evaluation process (Kang & Fredin, 2012). Learners (or in the case of this study, teachers) adjust their course of action as dictated by their social environment through interactions that materialize during the evaluation process (Bandura, 1977b; Kang & Fredin, 2012; Murphy et al., 2013). Interactions with evaluators providing feedback occur within the teacher's social environment and are expected to have an impact on the teacher's professional development (Bandura, 1977b; Peterson & Peterson, 2006). From the perspective of professional development, it is believed that the teacher's future course of action may be affected or altered based on the interactions with evaluators and their feedback (Thomas, Chie, Abraham, Raj, & Beh, 2013). The learner's purpose and goals direct their behavior based on personal observations and interactions from their social environment (Bandura, 1977b). In the case of teacher evaluation, that social environment and interaction takes place between the teacher (learner) and evaluator (Bandura, 1977b).

Learning and performance are distinguishable within the SLT model (Bandura, 1986). That is, learners (or teachers) are able to obtain new knowledge, skills, or other cognitive constructs without an immediate response that displays what the teacher has ascertained from the evaluation process. It is not until the teacher is motivated to demonstrate this new knowledge that learned material is evident. A behavior, reaction, or display of performance in response to new knowledge is not a requirement under SLT. Although a teacher may not provide a discernable action that displays growth following reception of evaluation feedback, the teacher may have still learned from social interactions through what was observed or experienced during the evaluation process (Bandura, 1977b).

Evaluation feedback is present in a teacher's social environment and is communicated by evaluators, often an administrator (Bandura, 1977b). Administrators or evaluators initiate feedback thus creating a social interaction with the teacher receiving that feedback. From the moment the social

interaction begins, SLT constructs are relevant to the learner's retention of knowledge through that process. The teacher's retention of new knowledge, as a result of receiving evaluation feedback, occurs from the interaction between the administrator or evaluator and what was observed throughout the evaluation process by the teacher. Actions or displays of performance on the part of the teacher may not take place until sometime following feedback reception. Social interactions, observations, and experiences through teacher evaluation settings have the potential to dictate how the teacher responds to future instructional events, such as professional development. Moreover, the consideration of evaluation in the larger social context could have ramifications for the evaluator's learning and improvement efforts, not only the teacher's (Bandura, 1977b).

Standard and Nonstandard Evaluation Systems

In the United States, teacher evaluation systems vary across states and districts with regard to structure, process, and implementation. Teacher evaluation systems that include subjective and objective measures are more apt to accurately assess teacher instructional quality, compared with the use of student test scores as a lone form of measurement (Peterson & Peterson, 2006; Rockoff & Speroni, 2010). Accuracy of the individual teacher evaluation, as it relates to instructional effectiveness, is reportedly increased when a comprehensive system is implemented (Kane, Wooten, Taylor, & Tyler, 2011). Multifaceted teacher evaluation systems further support teacher quality by having a greater ability to address specific areas of instruction (Kane et al., 2011; Rockoff & Speroni, 2010). Adding subjective components to teacher evaluation systems, such as classroom observations or peer evaluation, can better inform professional development decisions and focus teacher instructional practice improvement in specific areas (Arnodah, 2013; Rockoff & Speroni, 2010; Speer, 2010). The rigor of a teacher evaluation system can be increased by adding a variety of criteria, including increased number of classroom observations, student test data, student satisfaction data, and offsite-based administrators providing qualitative, subjective data (Arnodah, 2013; Lacireno-Paquet, Bocala, & Bailey, 2016; Speer, 2010). Additionally, employing more than two categories of instructional effectiveness can assist in furthering differentiation of effective teaching practice (Danielson et al., 2009; Lacireno-Paquet et al., 2016). Disseminating multiple levels of instructional proficiency for certain teaching components can result in more accurate ratings of teacher effectiveness in specific areas of instructional practice (Danielson et al., 2009; Lacireno-Paquet et al., 2016). When utilized collectively, these criteria provide a more accurate representation of teacher

effectiveness (Arnadah, 2013; Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Lacireno-Paquet et al., 2016; Speer, 2010).

Currently, school districts across Florida utilize objective and subjective data approaches to teacher evaluation systems, although implementation and operation of these systems vary (Hull, 2013; Personnel Evaluation Procedures and Criteria, 2016). Due to the variability in evaluation systems and processes, operational definitions must be established to fully examine the research question and Hypothesis 1. For the purpose of this study, the following operational definitions and explanations have been adopted to differentiate between the teacher evaluation systems that are in place across the districts included in the study. First, teacher evaluation systems, which adhere to the Florida standard guidelines (without additional layers of assessment), will be defined as having a standard evaluation system (Hull, 2013; Personnel Evaluation Procedures and Criteria, 2016). Second, teacher evaluation systems that add additional layers of assessment, above and beyond what is required by the Florida state guidelines, will be defined as having a nonstandard evaluation system (Lacireno-Paquet et al., 2016; Personnel Evaluation Procedures and Criteria, 2016).

Standard teacher evaluation systems in school districts throughout Florida follow similar paths in using objective-based data through value-added scores and student exam scores to evaluate teachers (Hull, 2013; Lacireno-Paquet et al., 2016). Subjective data are also utilized in these systems by collecting instructional practice evidence during live classroom observations by site-based administration and measuring that evidence against a state approved rubric. Both forms of data are linked to teacher evaluations by most districts throughout Florida (Hull, 2013; Personnel Evaluation Procedures and Criteria, 2016). While most Florida school districts use a common base of objective and subjective data, some districts add additional measures to their teacher evaluation systems, which is permitted by the state (Personnel Evaluation Procedures and Criteria, 2016). These school districts choose to employ additional measures above and beyond the state mandated methods, as a means to improve teaching effectiveness, and ultimately student performance (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Ford et al., 2017; Lacireno-Paquet et al., 2016). That is, nonstandard evaluation systems utilize the same criteria as standard evaluation systems but have implemented additional measures that are intended to increase the rigor of the system, such as offsite-based administration conducting observations and offering feedback or an increased number of classroom observations (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Ford et al., 2017; Lacireno-Paquet et al., 2016).

For purposes of this study, standard and nonstandard evaluation systems were operationally defined as follows:

- A standard evaluation system was defined as a system utilizing state-determined criteria involving (a) objective student test score data, (b) subjective observational data conducted solely by site-based administration, (c) flexibility in time and scheduling of observations, and (d) either an internal form or no appraisal certification for interrater reliability (Danielson et al., 2009; Kane et al., 2011; Lacireno-Paquet et al., 2016; Porter, 2010; Rockoff & Speroni, 2010).
- A nonstandard evaluation system was defined as a system involving multiple forms of teacher quality measurement that includes (a) objective student test score data, (b) subjective observational data conducted by multiple observers that are site-based and offsite-based, (c) differentiated proficiency levels through a variety of instructional components used in measuring instructional effectiveness, (d) a required number of observations, and (e) an external form of appraisal certification for interrater reliability (Danielson et al., 2009; Kane et al., 2011; Lacireno-Paquet et al., 2016; Porter, 2010; Rockoff & Speroni, 2010).

Criteria that contributed to the dual categorization included number of evaluators, number of required observations, method of conducting observations, and appraisal certification procedure. The two districts chosen for the study were large and diverse in regard to teacher populations, coed learning environments, academic performance levels, and socioeconomic levels. District 1 utilized a nonstandard system that included multiple evaluators providing feedback, two total final evaluations, required formal and informal observations, and an appraisal certification system involving an outside organization for calibrating all evaluators. In contrast, District 2 employed a standard evaluation system that included one evaluation conducted by a site-based administrator, specifically, the teachers' principal. Additionally, the standard evaluation system in District 2 included a recommended number of observations (as opposed to a required number), feedback offered by site-based administrators, and a district-employed calibration team designed to ensure that reliable ratings are employed by this district. These evaluation criteria represented one of the independent variables in this study. These criteria were measured against the dependent variable of teacher self-efficacy towards instructional practice.

Feedback

An essential component to any evaluation system is to provide teachers with feedback on their instructional practice (Kang & Fredin, 2012; Kyriakides, Creemers, Teddlie, & Muijs, 2010; McCollum, Hemmeter, & Hsieh, 2013).

Teachers receive evaluation feedback related to a number of teaching activities associated with instructional effectiveness (Kyriakides et al., 2010). These include instructional skills, assessing students, daily lesson planning, long-term planning, promotion of active learning, differentiation, positive classroom climate, teacher content knowledge, and classroom management (Kyriakides et al., 2010). The purpose of evaluation feedback is to assist the individual teacher with improving effectiveness in the decision-making process and completion of the instructional task performed (Kang & Fredin, 2012). It has been demonstrated that following the reception of task feedback, a teacher's individual cognitive process is affected and the feedback is assimilated by the individual through a decision making process (Kang & Fredin, 2012). This study explored the process from receiving feedback, through the teacher's cognitive assimilation, and the process by which feedback is related to the teacher's perceived instructional effectiveness.

Generally within the teacher evaluation process, possible improvement strategies are communicated and related to deficiencies observed in the teacher's practice (McCullum et al., 2013). Teachers can then apply those improvement strategies to future instruction or use feedback to inform their professional development plan (Murtagh, 2014; Tuytens & Devos, 2014). That is, strategic use of evaluation feedback supports teachers' professional growth in a variety of ways (Looney, 2011). Speer (2010) reported that targeted and specific feedback has the potential to further facilitate teacher effectiveness. In some instances, when the feedback process is not targeted or specific, potential improvement of teacher effectiveness can be limited (Derrington & Kirk, 2017). Feedback can become arbitrary or lack follow-through, which has the potential to negatively affect teacher professional development (Derrington & Kirk, 2017). Because purposeful, relevant, and targeted instructional feedback has been demonstrated to be an essential component of the evaluation process, it is necessary to operationally define how these constructs are related to the construct of specificity of feedback. Below are the operational definitions for specific and nonspecific feedback as defined for the purposes of the present study.

Specific and nonspecific feedback. Evaluator feedback specificity is an important part of the evaluation process and has been positively associated with job satisfaction, motivation, and teacher efficacy (Ford, Urick, & Wilson, 2018). These areas are significant aspects of professional development and evaluation feedback can be a driving force in the direction and success of teacher practice improvement (Ford et al., 2017). Evaluation feedback specificity can vary in its content, ranging from a focus on pedagogical approaches to subject specific support. (Ford et al., 2018). For purposes of this study, specific and nonspecific feedback were operationally defined as follows:

- “Specific feedback” was defined as relevant and detailed information regarding instructional delivery provided to the teacher by an administrator, which (a) elaborates on the teacher’s performance, (b) includes exact instances of instructional practice from classroom observations, (c) provides evidence compiled during classroom observations, and/or (d) includes improvement strategies directly related to certain areas of observed instructional deficiencies (Cornelius & Nagro, 2014; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; McCollum et al., 2013; Murtagh, 2014; Ovando, 1994).
- “Nonspecific feedback” was defined as general and vague information regarding observed instructional practice. Nonspecific feedback can include (a) casual references to instructional practice, (b) limited or no classroom observation evidence, (c) a lack of improvement strategies offered, and/or (d) improvement strategies unrelated to specific areas of observed instructional practice (Cornelius & Nagro, 2014; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; McCollum et al., 2013; Murtagh, 2014; Ovando, 1994).

Efficacy Constructs

Because evaluation is composed of social interactions between teachers and evaluators, SLT describes the underlying link between teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback and teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice (Bandura, 1977b). Specifically, SLT proposes that an individual responds to social interactions via their perceptions through vicarious experiences, mastery experiences, and verbal persuasion (including feedback). Through these interactions, personal perception of capability (i.e., self-efficacy) dictates one’s internal ability to monitor and exhibit effort in a given task. As conceptualized by Bandura (1977b) within SLT, self-efficacy is the confidence one internalizes about a task, which is inherently affected by these social interactions (Bandura, 1977a; Pajares, 1992). This is particularly true of interactions involving feedback from others within a social setting and through observations of others modeling similar tasks (Bandura, 1977b; Pajares, 1992).

Bandura (1977a) also demonstrated through a series of experiments that an individual’s approach to performing various tasks is predicated on their level of perceived self-efficacy. In addition, individuals process feedback from a given task based on the outcome of that task. Consequently, an individual’s behavior is influenced as a result of this process, which can alter their personal feelings (Bandura, 1977a). These perceived feelings guide future endeavors involving specific tasks and dictate levels of interest, effort, fear, and motivation (Bandura, 1977a; Pajares, 1996). Overall, higher levels

of self-efficacy are associated with higher levels of motivation and effort when engaged in a task (Bandura, 1977a; Pajares, 1996).

While the literature is consistent in coverage of these global efficacy concepts, coverage of the construct of self-efficacy, and particularly the distinction between efficacy and self-efficacy has been less clear. Thorough analysis of the efficacy/self-efficacy literature has been covered elsewhere (Smith, Starratt, McCrink, & Whitford, 2017). For the purpose of the present study, the constructs of efficacy and self-efficacy are operationally defined as follows (Bandura, 1994; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Pajares, 1996; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009):

- Efficacy is defined as one's level of competence for a task or success in general.
- Self-efficacy is defined as an individual's *self-perception of confidence and competence* in one's personal abilities/skills to perform a specific task in a specific context.

Self-efficacy and professional development. Teacher self-efficacy is related to both instructional effectiveness and professional development (Bray-Clark & Bates, 2003; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Professional development that targets instructional effectiveness should address aspects of teacher self-efficacy to create more robust improvement strategies (Bray-Clark & Bates, 2003). When teacher self-efficacy is included as a component of the evaluation process, a higher emphasis is placed on the teacher by recognizing personal perceptions toward instructional practice that can lead to greater confidence in perceived teaching practices when provided with evaluation feedback and a more favorable attitude about the evaluation process as a whole (Ford et al., 2018; Mireles-Rios & Becchio, 2018). This can increase the likelihood for teacher engagement in the professional development process and follow-through with strategies, activities, and trainings designed to enhance instructional practice (Bray-Clark & Bates, 2003; Mireles-Rios & Becchio, 2018).

Additionally, teacher self-efficacy has been reported as having influence over motivation for professional development (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Teachers who report high levels of self-efficacy of instructional practice display a more positive approach toward professional development efforts, which increases the likelihood that an individual teacher would actively pursue their own professional development (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Increased motivation towards professional development has shown to be fundamental in creating instructional practice commitment

(Ford et al., 2017). In contrast, teachers who self-report low self-efficacy of instructional practice reportedly display a less positive approach toward professional development and even an unwillingness to participate in instructional practice improvements (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). To enhance professional growth, teacher motivation toward self-improvement must be increased (Ford et al., 2017).

Because professional development is recommended in response to instructional deficiencies, it too often is viewed as a criticism of practice (Ford et al., 2017; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tuytens & Devos, 2014). In these cases, feedback can lead to lower levels teacher self-efficacy. In addition, when teachers experience negative perceptions of their practice, motivation to engage in professional development efforts is diminished. Conversely, higher levels of teacher self-efficacy are associated with greater willingness to engage in professional development. Consequently, both motivation for professional development and teacher self-efficacy can be increased through positive and purposeful administrator feedback during the evaluation process (Ford et al., 2017; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tuytens & Devos, 2014). Limited feedback on professional development efforts involving new strategies or skills reduces teachers' level of self-efficacy toward instructional practice (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Coaching and purposeful feedback are desired components to facilitate not only successful outcomes in mastering new instructional skills but also increasing teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Purposeful feedback and targeted professional development have the potential to create lasting change and indefinitely improve both instructional practice and personal perceptions of practice (Atkinson, 2012; Ford et al., 2017; Kyriakides, Demetriou, & Charalambous, 2006; Richardson et al., 2014; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Weiss, 1997).

Methodology

This quantitative study used a cross-sectional/ex post facto research design (Kirk, 2013) to investigate the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback. Teachers who participated in the study had previously been evaluated through their respective district's evaluation system and received feedback through their evaluation process. For the purposes of this study, teachers self-reported their level of teacher self-efficacy, as well as their opinions about the quality and characteristics of the feedback received during their most recent evaluation.

The first hypothesis of this study (investigating the relationship between a type of evaluation system and specificity of feedback) was tested utilizing a

2 × 2 factorial design with two levels of the first independent variable (evaluation system: standard vs. nonstandard, as indicated by district policy) and two levels of the second independent variable (type of feedback: nonspecific vs. specific, self-reported by the participant). It is relevant to note the evaluation system variable is a policy variable since these systems were already set in place by their respective districts, which aligned with the ex post facto design (Kirk, 2013). Conversely, the feedback type variable is an individual differences variable due to feedback being provided differently by each administrator and captured as self-report perceptions by the participant. The feedback type variable was categorized as specific or nonspecific by calculating a median split based on participants' self-report of the study instrument item, "How much of the feedback you received was linked by the evaluator specifically to your classroom activities?" The dependent variable was teacher self-efficacy, as measured by the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

To test the study's second hypothesis, a stepwise multiple regression model was utilized to investigate the degree to which various aspects of teacher perceptions of feedback relate to their self-efficacy of instructional practice (Norman & Streiner, 2008). The predictor variables included self-reported scores assessing the degree to which teachers reported feedback to be specific, positive, valuable, and perceived to be supportive of instructional practice.

These particular predictor variables were selected on the basis of having been identified the most relevant characteristics of evaluation feedback as reported in recent research. First, specific and positive characteristics are repeatedly identified throughout evaluation literature as important components of the evaluation process and the feedback construct itself (Ford et al., 2017; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Murtagh, 2014; Richardson et al., 2014). Second, feedback must be perceived as valuable in effort to drive change and can be viewed in a negative light when teachers do not perceive feedback as having any value, ultimately hindering further growth (Derrington & Kirk, 2017; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Kyriakides et al., 2006). Finally, teacher evaluation feedback should be associated with instructional practice, whether it be pedagogical or subject specific, to assist with improving effectiveness of instruction (Kang & Fredin, 2012; McCollum et al., 2013). These predictors represent continuous variables using participants' responses to the relevant survey item. The criterion variable, teacher self-efficacy, was also measured by self-report scores on the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

It is relevant to note here that two of the planned predictors, valuable feedback and feedback supportive of instructional practice, were highly correlated. This finding suggests that teachers perceive the "value" of feedback to

be related to the degree to which it is supportive of instructional practice. For this theoretical reason and to avoid issues of multicollinearity, of these two variables, only value was retained. Consequently, the statistical model for this stepwise multiple regression analysis included the following components: Y_i = teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice, b_1 = specific feedback, b_2 = positive feedback, b_3 = valued feedback, and ε = error term. The statistical equation for the model is represented by the following:

$$Y_i = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + \varepsilon.$$

Participants

The participants for this study were veteran secondary school teachers who received evaluations through their respective administrative processes during the 2015-2016 school year. For purposes of this study, a veteran teacher was defined as any teacher who had 3 or more years of experience with classroom instruction at the time of the study (Ben-Peretz & McCulloch, 2009; Day & Gu, 2009; Maximum Class Size, 2016).

Responses were received from a total of 98 teachers. Of the 98 respondents, 69 met the criteria for experience teaching and provided sufficient data. Missing data were imputed for participants who provided insufficient responses for one or two items. For each participant, missing data were imputed with the mean of all items to which the participant responded (Norman & Streiner, 2008). A total of nine items were omitted by 7 of the 69 participants and mean responses were substituted in their place (Norman & Streiner, 2008). This imputation procedure did not affect the overall mean TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) score for any participants.

Participants included 50 respondents from District 1 (nonstandard evaluation system) and 17 respondents from District 2 (standard evaluation system). Two participants who did not report a district were omitted from the analysis related to district evaluation system. Full demographics are presented in Table 1.

Data Collection

A nonrandom, convenience sampling procedure was used in this study. Gatekeepers (e.g., administrators, principals or assistant principals) at the two participating districts forwarded the recruitment e-mail, including a survey link, to potential participants at their respective school sites. Privacy settings were selected so no names or e-mail address were collected in the data set, which ensured anonymous data, although, the SurveyMonkey site

Table 1. Demographic Data of Participants ($N = 69$): Gender, Age, Years of Teaching Experience, and Ethnicity.

Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Female	50	73
Male	17	25
Age, years		
30-39	16	23
40-49	21	30
50-59	22	32
60 and older	8	12
Years of teaching experience		
3-9	12	17
10-19	29	42
20-29	15	22
30 and over	11	16
Ethnicity		
White	53	77
Black	4	6
American Indian	1	1
Other	3	4
Did not respond	8	9

monitored IP addresses to block participants from responding to the survey more than once.

Instrumentation

The study instrument was composed of the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) and additional feedback-related questions. The TSES was used to capture veteran secondary school teachers' reported self-efficacy using a 9-point Likert-type scale format. The response options for the TSES are labeled as follows: 1 (*none at all*), 3 (*very little*), 5 (*some degree*), 7 (*quite a bit*), and 9 (*a great deal*). The overall reliability rating for the TSES has been estimated to be .94. The overall mean was utilized as the scoring method for the present study (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

In addition to the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) items, each participant was asked to respond to a series of questions related to evaluation feedback components. These additional questions were created by the researcher to capture teachers' perceptions of evaluation feedback as it related

to their self-efficacy of instructional practice. These evaluation feedback component questions followed the same Likert format of the TSES (e.g., “How much of the feedback you received was positive in nature?”).

Demographic questions captured age, gender, ethnic background, whether the teacher was in a charter school, and teacher service status information. Teacher service status was captured as the total number of years the participant has been teaching. Three years of service classified participants as veteran teachers for the present study. First- and second-year teachers, as well as charter school teachers, who completed the survey were omitted from the study. The study instrument was created and administered in SurveyMonkey and included the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) survey, additional feedback-related items, and demographic information, respectively. To protect participant privacy, no identifying information was collected.

Analysis Process and Procedures

To address the first hypothesis, a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to measure teacher self-efficacy toward instructional practice as it relates to the perceived type of evaluation feedback received and type of evaluation system (Norman & Streiner, 2008). More specifically, the two-way ANOVA investigated differences in teacher self-efficacy toward their instructional practice across specific and nonspecific feedback conditions in standard and nonstandard evaluation systems.

To address the second hypothesis, a multiple regression analysis determined the degree to which teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback and teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice were related. Specific feedback, positive feedback, and valuable feedback were utilized as predictors in a stepwise multiple regression analysis (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002).

Findings

To test the first hypothesis (that there would be a relationship between teacher self-efficacy, type of evaluation system, and specificity of feedback, a two by two ANOVA was conducted to compare means of the dependent variable, teacher self-efficacy, across the levels of the two independent variables, type of evaluation system and specificity of feedback (Norman & Streiner, 2008). In order to investigate perceptions of the specificity of feedback, a median split was calculated based on participants’ responses to one item on the study instrument: “How much of the feedback you received was linked by the evaluator specifically to your classroom activities?” The median split on the point scale yielded participants with a score of six or below being categorized as

Table 2. TSES Means and Standard Deviations Across Type of Evaluation System and Type of Feedback.

Evaluation System	<i>n</i>	Teacher's Sense of Self-Efficacy (TSES)					
		High-Specific Feedback, <i>n</i> = 37		Low-Specific Feedback, <i>n</i> = 30		Total, <i>N</i> = 67	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Standard	50	7.33	1.01	6.41	0.71	6.79	0.94
Nonstandard	17	7.14	0.70	6.56	0.57	6.91	0.70
Total	67	7.17	0.75	6.51	0.61	6.88	0.76

Note. *N* = 67. TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) was the instrument used to score the dependent variable, teacher self-efficacy.

having received evaluation feedback that they judged to be of low specificity, while participants who scored a seven or above (on a scale of one to nine) on this item being categorized as having received evaluation feedback that they judged to be of high specificity.

ANOVA findings provided partial support for Hypothesis 1. Specifically, there was no difference in teacher self-efficacy across the two types of evaluation systems, $F(3, 63) = 0.01, p = .92$, or for the interaction between the type of evaluation system and feedback level, $F(3, 63) = 0.74, p = .39$. However, scores for teacher self-efficacy differed across feedback type (high vs. low specificity), $F(3, 63) = 14.22, p < .001$, with teachers who perceived the feedback they received to be highly specific reporting higher self-efficacy, compared with teachers who perceived the feedback they received to be low in specificity. The means and standard deviations for the ANOVA are displayed in Table 2 and the ANOVA summary of effects are displayed in Table 3.

To test the second hypothesis, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted to identify the degree to which aspects of feedback (i.e., specificity, positivity, and value) predicted teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice, as measured by the TSES (Shadish et al., 2002; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the feedback variables are displayed in Table 4.

As noted earlier, perceptions of feedback that supported instructional practice was an additional planned predictor, so it is included in Table 4 to show the relationship among all variables and support the decision to remove this variable from the multiple regression analysis. Participants' perceptions of the value of evaluation feedback (i.e., "valuable") was a significant predictor in

Table 3. 2 × 2 ANOVA Summary of the Effects of Teacher Self-Efficacy Across Evaluation System and Feedback Type.

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Evaluation system	1	0.01	0.01	0.01	.92	.00
Type of feedback	1	6.95	6.95	14.22	.00	.18
Evaluation system × Feedback level	1	0.36	0.36	0.74	.39	.01
Within cells	63	30.78	0.49			
Total	67	3205.59				

Note. *N* = 67. ANOVA = analysis of variance; *df* = degrees of freedom; *SS* = sum of squares; *MS* = mean squares.

Table 4. Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Teacher Self-Efficacy and Feedback Predictor Variables.

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
Teacher's sense of self-efficacy (TSES)	6.85	0.74	.38	.39	.51	.45
Predictor variable						
Specific feedback	6.31	2.00	—	.52	.46	.44
Positive feedback	6.80	1.60		—	.41	.51
Valuable feedback	4.84	2.23			—	.85
Association with instructional practice	4.44	1.95				—

Note. *N* = 68. TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) was the instrument used to score the criterion variable, teacher self-efficacy. All correlations significant at $p \leq .001$.

two correlational analyses. First, as shown in Table 4, of the four predictor variables, participants' perception of the value of feedback was the predictor that was most strongly correlated with the criterion variable, teacher self-efficacy ($r = .51$). Similarly, participant perceptions of the value of feedback was also the predictor most strongly correlated with participant perceptions of the degree to which feedback was associated with instructional practice ($r = .85$). Based on these results, it was evident that teachers' perceive evaluation feedback that is linked directly to their instructional practice to be most valuable.

The multiple regression analysis summary is displayed in Table 5. Results of the multiple regression analysis including the three predictor variables indicate that only valuable feedback was a significant predictor of teacher self-efficacy, $R^2 = .260$, $F(1, 66) = 23.23$, $p < .00$, as it is measured by the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The remaining variables (i.e., specificity and positivity) were not significant predictors and were eliminated from the regression model.

Table 5. Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Feedback Variables Predicting Teacher Self-Efficacy.

Variable	B	95% CI	β	t	p	Collinearity Statistics
						VIF
(Constant)	6.01	[5.64, 6.39]		32.074	.00	
Specific feedback			.18	1.56	.13	1.275
Positive feedback			.22	1.94	.06	1.205
Valuable feedback	0.17	[0.10, 0.24]	.51	4.82	.00	

Note. CI = confidence interval; VIF = variance inflation factor. $R^2 = .260$ ($N = 68$).

Implications of Findings

The findings of this study suggest that higher levels of teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice are positively associated with both the perceived *value* of feedback and the degree to which feedback is specific to instructional practice. While specific feedback and the value of feedback have been reported in literature as having impacts on teacher evaluations (Awkard, 2017; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Norris et al., 2017; The New Teacher Project, 2010; Yoo, 2016), this study is the first to link these constructs to teacher self-efficacy.

Specificity

Throughout the literature, evaluation feedback has been labeled with identifiers, such as detailed, clear, elaborate, useful, immediate, and evidential (Cornelius & Nagro, 2014; Ford et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2013; Murtagh, 2014; Reddy, Dudek, Kettler, Kurz, & Peters, 2016). Additionally, evaluation feedback has been referenced under different contexts, such as instructional practice evidence or goals for improvement (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Looney, 2011; Tuytens & Devos, 2014). In the field of education, specific feedback related to strengths and weaknesses can be related to either pedagogy or content. As such, specific feedback may include a variety of statements or explicit dialogue in relation to certain instructional strategies (pedagogy) employed during observed lessons, content related issues, or suggestions for improvement related to either (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Looney, 2011; Tuytens & Devos, 2014). Specific feedback (as opposed to general feedback) has been defined in this study as feedback related to observations provided by an administrator to a teacher that addresses certain

instructional related events or incidents that were observed (Cornelius & Nagro, 2014; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; McCollum et al., 2013; Murtagh, 2014; Ovando, 1994). Findings from the present study support the suggestion that receiving specific feedback allows the teacher to focus on particular aspects of their practice that have been identified as being notable either for their strength or weakness (McCollum et al., 2013). These findings are aligned with current research that associate benefits from specific, administrator feedback with high levels of confidence (Mireles-Rios & Becchio, 2018).

The present findings are also consistent with previous research addressing the importance of specificity when providing feedback to improve classroom instruction. For example, studies have reported that teachers prefer immediate and specific feedback from evaluators during observation periods to provide clarity in evaluations and to target professional growth (Awkard, 2017; Norris et al., 2017; Reddy et al., 2016). Similarly, data have shown that teachers perceive evaluators who give less specific feedback as being less adequate or skilled in conducting evaluations, compared with evaluators who offer more specific feedback (Norris et al., 2017; Reddy et al., 2016). Specifically, teachers can perceive evaluators as being incompetent in their respective subject areas, displaying inability to accurately evaluate content understanding and pedagogy (Norris et al., 2017; Reddy et al., 2016). Consequently, these previous findings suggest evaluators offering improvement feedback that is not specific to individual practice or related to the content, may have an adverse effect on teacher perceptions, which could lead to devaluing, negating, or rejecting feedback (Kyriakides et al., 2006; Norris et al., 2017; Reddy et al., 2016).

Similarly, principal perspectives on specific feedback are comparable to teacher perspectives, in that a lack of ability of an evaluator to offer specific feedback can foster feelings of inadequacy in the recipients of feedback (Kraft & Gilmour, 2017). Principal evaluators reported focusing mostly on evaluation scores and having to repeatedly positively motivate teachers during postobservation conference, which detracts from their ability to provide more specific feedback. The inability to offer consistent specific instructional practice feedback, including pedagogical strategies or knowledge of content, can affect progression of teacher professional growth (Kraft & Gilmour, 2017).

Evaluators who employ a strategy to provide specific feedback consistently in their evaluation practice are able to offer guidance related to more appropriate and beneficial avenues of professional development, whether it be related to pedagogy, content, or both (Norris et al., 2017; Yoo, 2016). Targeted professional development that is linked to specific feedback during the evaluation

process is more likely to improve the observed instructional deficiency (Norris et al., 2017; Yoo, 2016). Evaluators' use of specific feedback also enhances individual teacher perceptions of evaluators' competency to conduct fair, objective, meaningful, and valuable evaluations (Norris et al., 2017).

Value

Evaluators who provide consistent, specific, and immediate feedback are more likely to build trust between faculty and administration (Awkard, 2017). Increased trust in administrator feedback can foster teachers' willingness to utilize evaluation feedback for self-improvement (Awkard, 2017). Once trust has been established between the teacher and the administrator providing the feedback, the teacher is more likely to perceive evaluation feedback as valuable during the observation process (Awkard, 2017; Yoo, 2016). Specifically, the teacher is more inclined to be receptive and responsive to feedback during the evaluation process which can lead to establishing a learning cycle beginning with active performance reflection, acceptance of evaluation feedback, pursuit of targeted professional development, and ultimately, implementation of new skills learned (Awkard, 2017; Yoo, 2016).

Linking Specificity and Value

Evaluators who engage in evaluation practices that provide immediate and specific feedback are perceived by teachers as competent with instructional practice and committed to improving teacher performance (Awkard, 2017). Similarly, evaluators who consistently use specific feedback in evaluation practices are more likely to enhance the value of feedback from the teacher perspective, which can lead to targeted professional development and increased teacher growth (Awkard, 2017; Kraft & Gilmour, 2017; Norris et al., 2017; Yoo, 2016). The inability to conduct evaluation conferences with specific feedback and targeted action for teacher instructional improvement can result in a lack of direction for professional development and hinder teacher performance growth. The lack of targeted guidance related to professional development can negatively affect how teachers perceive feedback from principals (Kraft & Gilmour, 2017; Norris et al., 2017; Yoo, 2016). To maintain progress with professional development efforts, evaluators must consistently engage teachers in regular dialogue that includes specific feedback (The New Teacher Project, 2010). According to the results of this study, dialog between evaluators and teachers that includes specificity in evaluation feedback will enhance the perceived value teachers have toward the feedback they receive, and ultimately, their self-efficacy of instructional practice.

The results of this study suggest specific feedback and teacher perceptions of the value of feedback are important aspects of the evaluation process. Feedback specificity can improve teacher perceptions of the value of evaluation feedback, enrich their reflection on practice, and enhance targeted professional growth opportunities. Consistently incorporating specific feedback in evaluation practices can lead to higher levels of teacher self-efficacy and increase the value teachers place on the evaluation process. Improving teaching self-efficacy can yield not only greater confidence in teaching practices but also the enhanced ability to self-improve.

Teachers may have an increased sense of empowerment when utilizing evaluation feedback to precisely target their professional growth. The high value teachers place on useful and impactful feedback can propel their instructional practice improvement efforts to greater achievements with classroom instruction. A teacher who has a high level of instructional practice self-efficacy has the potential to positively affect the students they teach. Consequently, these findings suggest a successful evaluation process should include a focus on the specificity of feedback and the processes through which teachers come to value evaluation feedback. Although this study did not establish a causal link, it is reasonable to assume that providing specific evaluation feedback is likely to enhance teacher perceptions of the value of evaluation feedback, which might be expected to yield higher levels of teacher self-efficacy.

Professional Development

The literature suggests teachers who perceive evaluation feedback as benefiting their classroom instruction are more likely to follow through with professional development plans and reflect on practice (Atkinson, 2012; Richardson et al., 2014). The findings from this study are consistent with the literature, suggesting that it is reasonable to assume that the incorporation of specific feedback, which might be expected to increase teachers' perceptions of the value of the feedback, could lead to improved teacher reflection on practice. Furthermore, it might also be expected that the additional reflection on practice would lead to more strategic decisions related to professional development. If teachers feel confident in their practice in relation to feedback they were provided during the evaluation process, then they may be more prepared to engage in self-improvement that targets instructional deficiencies detected during the evaluation. Similarly, instructionally accomplished teachers might also be more able to utilize specific feedback to strategically seek professional development in supporting continued efforts toward excellence.

Additionally, findings from this study contribute not only to our understanding of teacher perceptions of feedback but also to our understanding of evaluator practices. Principals, administrators, and other school personnel who conduct observations and provide feedback can benefit from the findings of this study, improving crucial components of their practice. Training and professional development for evaluators can emphasize areas of specificity and perceived value of feedback in how to best implement and execute within evaluator practice. Evaluator professional development can foster opportunities for reflection and assist in assessing specificity and feedback value to hone evaluator best practices.

Reflection

The findings from this study contribute to our understanding of teacher reflection and self-efficacy with regard to motivation for professional development. Some authors have proposed that the reflection process is the driving force motivating teacher improvement (Atkinson, 2012; Richardson et al., 2014). Specific feedback may improve teachers' reflection processes through their personal perceptions of the value of evaluation feedback. This enhanced reflection then might be expected to directly facilitate professional growth through the selection of training specifically targeting desired areas for instructional practice development.

Reflection is a complicated and elusive concept for many teachers and it has been suggested that some teachers may not fully utilize their internal reflective capacity during or following instructional practice (Laverick, 2017). Some teachers may choose not to reflect on their practice or fully involve themselves in a structured, reflective process. This could lead to inaccuracies in identifying challenges or problems with instruction and limit the pursuit, preparation, and implementation of plausible improvement measures. To enhance reflection practices, collaboration among colleagues and administration can be a valuable experience. Collaborative dialogue including specific feedback related to observed instructional practices, can initiate the reflection process for teachers and enrich the depth and breadth of individual teacher reflection. Reflective thought leads to the understanding of a problem and the exchanging of ideas surrounding a particular problem can have a profound effect on the teacher's ability to further reflect on that problem and create improvement measures (Dewey, 1910; Laverick, 2017). Evaluation feedback that is specific to a problem with instructional practice can facilitate focused reflection efforts on that particular problem to begin the improvement process. This may lead the teacher to identify and select targeted professional development that can foster understanding of the problem that is negatively affecting their instructional practice.

Higher Education

Additionally, these findings have the potential to inform programming in higher education school administration programs. Specifically, the findings from this study may inform future discussion regarding administrator practices related to feedback delivery methods to include and emphasize the importance of specificity and value. In academic programs that offer strategies and curricula on effective feedback and evaluation practices, highlighting the impacts of specific feedback and value placed on evaluation feedback as it relates to teacher self-efficacy can have the potential to improve administrator practice in assessing, motivating, and supporting the instructional practice of the teachers they serve.

Limitations

Limitations in this study were detected in the areas of statistical power, demographics, and one aspect of study design. First, while a target number of 64 participants was reached for the ANOVA ($N = 67$), the target number of 82 participants was not obtained for the multiple regression analysis ($N = 68$), which resulted in reduced power for that analysis. Additional predictor variables (i.e., positive and specific) may have reached statistical significance if the target number of participants had been attained for this analysis.

Second, participants were not evenly distributed across the two districts in the study, with District 1 accounting for 73% of all participants (50 out of 67). Since the hypothesis related to the district variable was not supported, the discrepancy in sample size across districts is of little consequence, but relevant to note.

Third, a median split procedure was employed due to the methodological challenges of capturing data related to feedback specificity. This procedure has been criticized in the literature for various statistical limitations such as a loss of power, loss of effect size, loss of measurement reliability, and subjectivity with regard to cutoff points (Cohen, 1983; Gebhardt, Rose, & Mitte, 2014). Despite the statistical limitations of using the median split for the ANOVA in this study, the effect of specificity was strong enough to be identified.

Future Research

Further exploration of the relationship between evaluation feedback and teacher self-efficacy may support future improvement efforts with evaluation processes and teacher instructional practice. First, there would be value to

investigating additional variables that may factor into the relationship between teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback and teacher self-efficacy. Relevant variables may include timeliness of feedback, number of evaluators, participant age, and content area. In addition, future research may further investigate the construct of “value” in regard to perceptions of evaluation feedback. While the findings from this study suggest specificity of feedback contributes to the perception of value that relationship is not well understood. It would be relevant to further explore this relationship, as well as to explore other potential variables that would contribute to the “value” of feedback.

Second, investigation of changes in teacher self-efficacy related to feedback over time (e.g., through a presurvey and postsurvey design) may provide clarity as to how teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback directly affect teacher self-efficacy. This approach could provide valuable input for evaluation system improvements in fostering higher levels of teacher self-efficacy.

Third, future research that would capture data related to professional development follow-through would make a valuable contribution to both research and practice. The evaluation cycle leads to potential teacher change in practice following reflection or professional development efforts. Positive changes in teacher efficacy, as a result of targeted professional development, have been reported in the literature and could potentially explain the change process through further study (Yoo, 2016). Adding the change element paired with data from this study could provide insight as to how the teacher changed their practice as a result of evaluation feedback and, ultimately, its effects on their self-efficacy of instructional practice (Bandura, 1977a; Weiss, 1997). Additionally, differentiating between the type of specific feedback offered, such as content knowledge or pedagogical practice, may provide more insight as to how evaluation feedback affects teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice.

Finally, qualitative data on teacher perceptions about the evaluation process, characteristics of feedback, reflection, and how feedback influences decisions about professional development have the potential to inform both administrative decisions about practice and directions for future research. Better understanding these relationships can inform a theory of change that suggests experimental studies to further investigate the complex relationship between evaluation feedback, self-efficacy, and how it affects teachers' efforts to continually improve their instructional practice.

Conclusion

As progressive changes to teacher evaluation practices continue to reshape policies, processes, and procedures, it is imperative to have an understanding of

the impacts of those changes. In the controversial topic of teacher evaluation, any change, alteration, or implementation of an evaluation system can have immense impacts to teachers, schools and, ultimately, students. The findings of this study extend the current understanding of evaluation practices by identifying a relationship between teacher self-efficacy of instructional practice and teacher perceptions of evaluation feedback. Feedback specificity and the perceived value of evaluation feedback were discovered as key elements in this relationship. Further investigation could elucidate aspects of this relationship and how they fit into the grand scheme of evaluation practices as a whole.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iDs

Eric C. Smith  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2672-7027>

Gerene K. Starratt  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3412-9825>

References

- Arnodah, I. (2013). Teacher improvement through peer evaluation in Kenyan schools. *European Journal of Training and Development, 37*, 635-645. doi:10.1108/EJTD-10-2012-0047
- Atkinson, B. M. (2012). Rethinking reflection: Teachers' critiques. *The Teacher Educator, 47*, 175-194. doi:10.1080/08878730.2012.685796
- Awkard, T. (2017). The power of reflective action to build teacher efficacy. *Phi Delta Kappan, 98*(6), 53-57.
- Bandura, A. (1977a). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1977b). *Social learning theory*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York, NY: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], *Encyclopedia of mental health*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1998)
- Ben-Peretz, M., & McCulloch, G. (2009). International perspectives on veteran teachers: Introduction. *Teachers and Teaching, 15*, 403-408. doi:10.1080/13540600903057153

- Bray-Clark, N., & Bates, R. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs and teacher effectiveness: Implications for professional development. *The Professional Educator, 26*, 13-22.
- Cohen, J. (1983). The cost of dichotomization. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 7*, 249-253. doi:10.1177/014662168300700301
- Cornelius, K. E., & Nagro, S. A. (2014). Evaluating the evidence base of performance feedback in preservice special education teacher training. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 37*, 133-146. doi:10.1177/0888406414521837
- Danielson, C., Axtell, D., Bevan, P., Cleland, B., McKay, C., Phillips, E., & Wright, K. (2009). *Implementing the framework for teaching in enhancing professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 93*(6), 8-15.
- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2009). Veteran teachers: Commitment, resilience and quality retention. *Teachers and Teaching, 15*, 441-457. doi:10.1080/13540600903057211
- Derrington, M. L., & Kirk, J. (2017). Linking job-embedded professional development and mandated teacher evaluation: Teacher as learner. *Professional Development in Education, 43*, 630-644. doi:10.1080/19415257.2016.1231707
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Ford, T. G., Urick, A., & Wilson, A. S. P. (2018). Exploring the effect of supportive teacher evaluation experiences on U.S. teachers' job satisfaction. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 26*(59), 3559. doi:10.14507/epaa.26.3559
- Ford, T. G., Van Sickle, M., Clark, L. V., Fazio-Brunson, M., & Schween, D. C. (2017). Teacher self-efficacy, professional commitment, and high-stakes teacher evaluation policy in Louisiana. *Educational Policy, 31*, 202-248. doi:10.1177/0895904815586855
- Gebhardt, C., Rose, N., & Mitte, K. (2014). Fact or artifact: An item response theory analysis of median split based repressor classification. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 19*, 35-51. doi:10.1111/bjhp.12029
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 569-582.
- Guinn, B., & Vincent, V. (2006). The influence of grades on teaching effectiveness ratings at a Hispanic-serving institution. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 5*, 313-321. doi:10.1177/1538192706291138
- Haplin, P. F., & Kieffer, M. J. (2015). Describing profiles of instructional practice: A new approach to analyzing classroom observation data. *Educational Researcher, 44*, 263-277. doi:10.3102/0013189X15590804
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*, 81-112. doi:10.3102/003465430298487
- Hull, J. (2013). *Trends in teacher evaluation: How states are measuring teacher performance*. Alexandria, VA: Center for Public Education.
- Kane, T., Wooten, A., Taylor, E., & Tyler, J. (2011). Evaluating teacher effectiveness. *Education Next, 11*(3). Retrieved from <https://www.educationnext.org/evaluating-teacher-effectiveness/>

- Kang, G., & Fredin, A. (2012). The balanced scorecard: The effects of feedback on performance evaluation. *Management Research Review*, 35, 637-661. doi:10.1108/01409171211238848
- Kirk, R. E. (2013). *Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kraft, M. A., & Gilmour, A. F. (2017). Can principals promote teacher development as evaluators? A case study of principals' views and experiences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52, 711-753. doi:10.1177/0013161X16653445
- Kyriakides, L., Creemers, B. P. M., Teddlie, C., & Muijs, D. (2010). The international system for teacher observation and feedback: A theoretical framework for developing international instruments. *International Encyclopedia of Education* (3rd ed.), 2010, 726-734. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.01636-5
- Kyriakides, L., Demetriou, D., & Charalambous, C. (2006). Generating criteria for evaluating teachers through teacher effectiveness research. *Educational Research*, 48(1), 1-20. doi:10.1080/00131880500498297
- Lacireno-Paquet, N., Bocala, C., & Bailey, J. (2016). *Relationship between school professional climate and teachers' satisfaction with the evaluation process* (REL 2016-133). Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/projects/project.asp?projectID=4460>
- Laverick, V. T. (2017). Secondary teachers' understanding and use of reflection: An exploratory study. *American Secondary Education*, 45(2), 56-68.
- Looney, J. (2011). Developing high quality teachers: Teacher evaluation for improvement. *European Journal of Education*, 46, 440-455. doi:10.1111/j.1465-3435.2011.01492.x
- MacLeod, R. B., & Napoles, J. (2012). Preservice teachers' perceptions of teaching effectiveness during teaching episodes with positive and negative feedback. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 22(1), 91-102. doi:10.1177/1057083711429851
- Maximum Class Size. (2016). *The 2019 Florida Statutes: Title XLVIII-K-20 Education Code, Chapter 1003-Public K-12 Education, 1003.03 Florida*. Retrieved from http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?mode=View%20Statutes&SubMenu=1&App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=veteran+teachers&URL=1000-1099/1003/Sections/1003.03.html
- McCollum, J. A., Hemmeter, M. L., & Hsieh, W. (2013). Coaching teachers for emergent literacy instruction using performance-based feedback. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 33, 28-37. doi:10.1177/0271121411431003
- Mireles-Rios, R., & Becchio, J. A. (2018). The evaluation process, administrator feedback, and teacher self-efficacy. *Journal of School Leadership*, 28, 462-487. doi:10.1177/105268461802800402
- Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (2013). Leading via teacher evaluation: The case of the missing clothes? *Educational Researcher*, 42, 349-354. doi:10.3102/0013189X13499625
- Murtagh, L. (2014). The motivational paradox of feedback: Teacher and student perceptions. *Curriculum Journal*, 25, 516-541. doi:10.1080/09585176.2014.944197

- The New Teacher Project. (2010). Teacher evaluation 2.0. Retrieved from <http://nttp.org/publications/view/teacher-evaluation-2.0>
- Norman, G., & Streiner, D. (2008). *Biostatistics the bare essentials* (3rd ed.). Shelton, CT: People's Medical Publishing House.
- Norris, J., van der Mars, H., Kulinna, P., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Kwon, J., & Hodges, M. (2017). Physical education teacher perceptions of teacher evaluation. *The Physical Educator, 74*, 41-62. doi:10.18666/TPE-2017-V74-I1-6882
- Ovando, M. (1994). Constructive feedback: A key to successful teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Management, 8*(6), 19-22. doi:10.1108/09513549410069185
- Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and education research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 307-332. doi:10.2307/1170741
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research, 66*, 543-578. doi:10.2307/1170653
- Personnel Evaluation Procedures and Criteria. (2016). *The 2019 Florida Statutes: Title XLVII-K-20 Education Code, Chapter 1012-Personnel, 1012.34 Florida*. Retrieved from http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?mode=View%20Statutes&SubMenu=1&App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=teacher+evaluation&URL=1000-1099/1012/Sections/1012.34.html
- Peterson, K. D., & Peterson, C. A. (2006). *Effective teacher evaluation: A guide for principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Pogodzinski, B., Umpstead, R., & Witt, J. (2015). Teacher evaluation reform implementation and labor relations. *Journal of Educational Policy, 30*, 540-561. doi:10.1080/02680939.2014.999827
- Porter, J. (2010). *Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT): An evaluation of inter-rater reliability* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 757340264)
- Reddy, L. A., Dudek, C. M., Kettler, R. J., Kurz, A., & Peters, S. (2016). Measuring educators' attitudes and beliefs about evaluation: Construct validity and reliability of the teacher evaluation experience scale. *Educational Assessment, 21*, 120-134.
- Richardson, R. T., Kalvaitis, D., & Delparte, D. (2014). Teaching evaluations and reflective practice: Strategies for improving teacher skills in adventure education. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation, Education, and Leadership, 6*, 77-87. doi:10.7768/1948-5123.1169
- Rockoff, J., & Speroni, C. (2010). Subjective and objective evaluations of teacher effectiveness. *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings, 100*, 261-266.
- Shadish, W., Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological Reports, 114*, 68-77. doi:10.2466/14.02.PR0.114k14w0
- Smith, E. C., Starratt, G. K., McCrink, C. L., & Whitford, H. (2017). *Teacher evaluation feedback and instructional practice self-efficacy in secondary school teach-*

- ers (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database: <https://search.proquest.com/openview/d838b26b46dd7b1604e878cfa0382c52/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Speer, S. (2010). Peer evaluation and its blurred boundaries: Results from a meta-evaluation in initial vocational education and training. *Evaluation, 16*, 413-430. doi:10.1171/1356389010382265
- Thomas, S., Chie, Q., Abraham, M., Raj, S., & Beh, L. (2013). A qualitative review of literature on peer review of teaching in higher education: An application of the SWOT framework. *Review of Educational Research, 84*, 112-159. doi:10.3102/0034654313499617
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783-805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*, 202-248. doi:10.2307/1170754
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & McMaster, P. (2009). Sources of self-efficacy: Four professional development formats and their relationship to self-efficacy and implementation of a new teaching strategy. *Elementary School Journal, 110*, 228-245. doi:10.1086/605771
- Tuytens, M., & Devos, G. (2014). How to activate teacher through teacher evaluation? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 25*, 509-530. doi:10.1080/09243453.2013.842601
- van Roermund, T., Schreurs, M., Mekkink, H., Bottema, B., Scherpbier, A., & van Well, C. (2013). Qualitative study about the ways teachers react to feedback from resident evaluation. *BMC Medical Education, 98*(13), 1-9. Retrieved from <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6920/13/98>
- Weiss, C. (1997). Theory-based evaluation: Past, present, and future. *New Directions for Evaluation, 76*(Winter), 41-55.
- Yoo, J. H. (2016). The effect of professional development on teacher efficacy and teachers' self-analysis of their efficacy change. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability, 18*, 84-94.

Author Biographies

Eric C. Smith is an adjunct professor in the Higher Education Administration graduate program at Barry University and works in the Hillsborough County Public Schools district as an instructional mentor. His research interest include K-12 teacher evaluation practices, feedback, K-12 teacher instructional practice, teacher self-efficacy, impact of teacher support programs and evaluation, teacher preparation, and clinical education.

Gerene K. Starratt teaches research methods and statistics courses in ADSOE's undergraduate and graduate programs. Her research interests include community-based research, metacognition, leadership, program evaluation, and interventions to support ninth-grade student success.

Carmen L. McCrink serves as associate professor and department chair of the Higher Education Administration and Educational Leadership programs at Barry University. She has interest and expertise in areas such as community colleges; teaching and learning; curriculum development; internationalization of higher education; reading, writing, and literacy studies; Hispanic research issues; and critical thinking.

Heidi Whitford holds a PhD in Higher Education Administration from New York University, an MEd in International Education Policy from Harvard University, and a BA in International Studies from the University of Florida. Her research and professional interests include internationalization of higher education, higher education in developing countries, experiential education, service learning, student success and engagement, student activism, governance of higher education, student learning and development, and technology.