The Reading Professor

Volume 44 | Issue 1 Article 8

Exploring Literacy Coaches' Self-Efficacy to Identify Their Professional Development Needs

Adam Brieske-Ulenski

Michelle J. Kelley

Exploring Literacy Coaches' Self-Efficacy to Identify Their Professional Development Needs

Adam Brieske-Ulenski
Bridgewater State University, Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Michelle J. Kelley
University of Central Florida-Orlando

Authors' Notes

Adam Brieske-Ulenski, Ed.D. is an Assistant Professor and Graduate Program Chair of Reading Education at Bridgewater State University in Bridgewater, Massachusetts. He can be reached at: abrieskeulenski@bridgew.edu

Michelle J. Kelley, Ed.D. is a Professor and Coordinator of Reading Education at the University of Central Florida in Orlando, Florida. She can be reached at michelle.kelley@ucf.edu

Abstract

The International Literacy Association highlighted three coaching models that a literacy coach might employ: coaching to conform, into practice, and for transformation. While numerous researchers have explored the roles and tasks of literacy coaching, there is little research on these coaching models. Studies have described the disconnect between what a coach should be doing and what they are actually doing, and the perceptions of administrators related to coaching roles and tasks. While these studies have illuminated issues in literacy coaching, few have looked at the self-efficacy of literacy coaches to enact roles and tasks, and we believe none have explored the self-efficacy of coaches to employ coaching models. This article describes the development and initial testing of the *Elementary Literacy Coaching Self-Efficacy (ELCSE)* survey which established the validity and reliability of the survey. Potential uses of the ELCSE survey are described which include assisting teacher preparation programs, districts, and schools to identify the professional development needs of future and current literacy coaches, no matter what coaching model they employ.

Keywords: literacy coaching, self-efficacy, literacy leadership, higher education and teaching, adult and continuing education and teaching, professional development

Introduction

The International Literacy Association (ILA, 2018) has suggested that with the abundance of reading/literacy coaches in today's schools, there is a need to clarify the coaching models a coach may employ based on their context. Beyond defining coaching models, the ILA goes a step further suggesting that the model chosen to employ matters and should be dependent on the goals and objectives being sought. While we agree with the ILA, our personal experiences as a reading coaches and specialists led us to believe that a coach's efficacy to utilize a model and take on coaching roles and tasks are as important, and perhaps more important.

Literature Review

Three Coaching Models

The ILA (2018) identified three coaching models: coaching to conform, coaching into practice, and coaching for transformation. According to the ILA, coaching to conform became more prevalent as the result of No Child Left Behind policies and positions the coach in a more authoritative role. Typically employed to support the implementation of an innovation or a program under adoption, this model necessitates the coach to be direct and focused. The goal is for the teacher to achieve a higher level of implementation. Sometimes referred to as "coaching toward a standard," in this model the coach may observe and give feedback to teachers on what they liked and what could be improved based on the coach's knowledge as an expert (ILA, 2018).

In contrast, the coaching into practice model is more student centered. The goal of this model is to have the teacher self-reflect on his/her practice based on student responses, data, and/or artifacts. The coach uses student work and outcomes for the teacher to determine if the instructional choices made were appropriate or if they need to be adjusted. Sometimes also

referred to as "coaching for reflection," this model requires the coach-teacher relationship to be less authoritative and necessitates mutual respect and trust (ILA, 2018). In this model, the coach might listen and ask questions to assist the teacher in developing an action plan to grow teacher practices. The coach may also co-teach with a teacher, provide opportunities for a teacher to observe other teachers, and suggest professional resources and readings to support a teacher's professional growth.

Coaching for transformation is similar to coaching into practice, as this model also seeks to grow teacher practices through reflection; therefore, many of the same coaching techniques are utilized in this model. What differentiates the two models is that in coaching for transformation, the coach and teacher may be challenging the status quo in a school (ILA, 2018). Schools are institutions, and institutions have histories. Sometimes the structures that exist in a school need to be questioned. This model focuses on having the teacher, with the support of the coach, engage in challenging these assumptions if these traditions are impeding student and professional growth. In this model, the coach should be especially cognizant of change theory, school reform, and andragogy. While administrative support is ideal for each coaching model, it is imperative when coaching for transformation.

Looking Beyond Coaching Roles

Although the three coaching models offer guidance, such as when to use a particular model in a certain context, they do not address how to best prepare coaches to employ these models or how to prepare coaches for the multitude of roles and tasks within each model. Hunt and Handsfield (2013) reported that many researchers have explored the roles literacy coaches perform, how others perceive the coaches' roles, and how literacy coaches spend their time. They noted that these studies have helped to illuminate the challenges coaches face, yet these

studies do not address “the complexities of literacy coaching” (p. 48), nor do they necessarily lead to targeted professional development for a literacy coach. In their year-long study of first-year literacy coaches, Hunt and Handsfield (2013) examined how coaches negotiated issues of identity, power, and positioning during professional development designed to prepare them for coaching in schools. Their “findings suggest that instructing literacy coaches in how to simply enact various roles in appropriate ways is not sufficient” (p. 48). Using Hargreaves’s (2000) “emotional geographies,” Hunt and Handsfield (2103) suggested that coaches need to be prepared “to build strong, trusting relationships with teachers, with the goal of leveraging pedagogical change and positively affecting student learning” (p. 48). So how can we accomplish this daunting task? Does a one-size-fits-all approach to literacy coaching work or make sense? Do literacy coaches or potential coaches all have the same needs in terms of developing their coaching skills and strategies? This article describes the development and initial testing of the *Elementary Literacy Coaching Self-Efficacy (ELCSE)* survey and how this tool can be used by teacher preparation programs, schools, and districts to more effectively prepare coaches for the variety of tasks and models they may employ and perhaps more importantly, to more effectively differentiate literacy coaching professional development to the needs of each coach.

Educator Efficacy Beliefs

Numerous studies have found that teacher efficacy is related to student achievement (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006; Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, & Morrison, 2012; Klassen et al., 2011). Specifically, Guo et al. (2012) noted that the greater the sense of efficacy a teacher has, the better their students perform on reading assessments. Examining teacher efficacy as it relates to literacy coaching is necessary since

literacy coaches are teachers, and they impact the self-efficacy of classroom teachers that provide literacy instruction to students.

Cantrell et al. (2015) concluded that there is a need to understand the forces that influence a literacy coach's work. One such force that has affected literacy coaches' work is their self-efficacy beliefs in being able to perform literacy coaching tasks. Self-efficacy is useful in explaining and predicting a person's behavior choices, performance, effort level, and motivation (Cantrell et al., 2015; Kitching, Cassidy, Eachus, & Hogg, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). It is imperative to understand the four sources of information: mastery experience, vicarious experience, social persuasion, and somatic and emotional states, all of which influence a literacy coach's self-efficacy and the relations between a literacy coach's efficacy and job performance (Cantrell et al., 2015).

Mastery experience. Mastery experience is the most influential source of information related to a person's self-efficacy (Cantrell et al., 2015). Mastery experience is defined as achieving success; this raises a person's sense of efficacy (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Fives and Buehl (2017) explained that mastery experience occurs through practice sessions. These practice sessions are set up to reinforce success and to develop a sense of personal efficacy (Bandura, 1977). During these practice sessions, a more experienced person helps another person achieve a mastery experience when the more experienced person models, guides the person throughout practice, gradually increases the complexity during practice, and provides aid to the person to help reduce the fear of failure (Bandura, 1977; Pajares, 2002). Mastery experience is most powerful when the person sustains her/his effort to overcome obstacles or tasks that are challenging (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Through support and guidance, a mastery experience increases a person's sense of efficacy (Usher & Pajares, 2008).

Vicarious experience. Vicarious experience follows mastery experience in terms of its influence on a person's sense of efficacy (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Vicarious experiences occur when success is modeled and the observer believes they share common skills and capabilities with the person modeling (Bandura, 1994; Cantrell et al., 2015; Pajares, 2002). Through the observation, the observers persuade themselves that they also can perform the tasks because of perceived shared capabilities (Usher & Pajares, 2009). Several research studies have indicated that modeling is an effective form of vicarious experience since the observer is taught better ways to accomplish the same task (Bandura, 1997; Fives & Buehl, 2017; Pajares, 2003). As the task is modeled for the person watching, the context should be similar (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). The task that is being modeled needs to occur in a similar context as the one in which the observer will perform the task because the observation experience is more persuasive in increasing the observer's efficacy when the context is similar (Usher & Pajares, 2008).

Social persuasion. Social persuasion is another way to develop a person's sense of efficacy (Usher & Pajares, 2008). As the term states, it is through suggestions and feedback that one persuades another that she/he can perform the task well (Usher & Pajares, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). However, the believability as perceived by the person receiving feedback, is based on the credibility of the person providing suggestions or feedback (Usher & Pajares, 2009). The effects of these social judgments are enhanced through instruction and if the task is performed under the right conditions (Hattie & Timperley, 2007), which include a safe situation for the person to try the task with minimal support, and being able to attribute the success of performing the task as a result of personal capabilities (Usher and Pajares, 2008). Fives and Buehl (2017) noted that in workshops, social persuasion is used to bolster a person's

self-efficacy beliefs. Workshops are an example of Hattie and Timperley's (2007) notion of a "right condition." In the K-12 setting, workshops typically appear in the form of professional development. Our analysis of the ILA coaching models suggests that workshops can be the coaching activities that occur in the classroom with teacher-colleagues, too. This would include modeling, providing feedback, and conversations that appear across the three ILA coaching models.

Somatic and emotional states. Somatic and emotional states contribute to the development of self-efficacy in a person (Zeldin & Pajares, 2000). Feeling excited, stressed, nervous, or anxious provide insight into a person's self-efficacy beliefs. These feelings influence one's thoughts about her/his capabilities to perform a task (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Additionally, a person's mood affects their sense of efficacy (Cantrell et al., 2015; Klassen et al., 2011; Usher & Pajares, 2009).

As stated, these four sources of information impact a person's sense of efficacy and that self-efficacy is an accurate predictor of one's performance level for specific tasks (Usher & Pajares, 2009). A person's self-efficacy beliefs are a direct influence on a person's performance level, such as how long a person is willing to persevere despite obstacles to successfully complete a task (Usher & Pajares 2008; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Additionally, the choices that people make are influenced by their perceived self-efficacy (Klassen et al., 2011; Usher & Pajares, 2008). Exploring the self-efficacy beliefs of literacy coaches has the potential to provide insight into the choices coaches make in their roles, the tasks they select to perform within their roles, and the selection of the ILA coaching models they use when supporting teacher-colleagues.

The Elementary Literacy Coach Self-Efficacy Survey

Recent research has offered insights into exploring the self-efficacy beliefs of elementary literacy coaches with the development of the *Elementary Literacy Coach Self-Efficacy* survey (Appendix A: Ulenski, Gill, & Kelley, 2019). The ELCSE survey was developed using Bandura's (2006) guidelines for constructing a self-efficacy instrument, the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), and the International Literacy Association (2010) Standards for Reading Professionals. The TSES was selected as a model because it is an extensively used measure of teacher efficacy. The items on the ELCSE survey were written with specificity and alignment to the ILA 2010 Standards for Reading Professionals (ILA, 2010). This guaranteed that the items on the survey reflected the role of the literacy coach. The items on the ELCSE survey were reviewed by two content experts, one in the area of self-efficacy and one in the area of literacy coaching. The first expert in self-efficacy reviewed the items to ensure they were written in a way that accurately assesses one's self-efficacy. Feedback from this expert was utilized to bring clarity to several items. The second expert in literacy coaching reviewed the items to ensure that they reflected the tasks and roles of a literacy coach. Feedback from this expert was utilized to reword several items. Both experts reviewed the final items as a means of establishing content validity.

The anonymous survey was distributed in two phases using Qualtrics, a web-based platform. In the first phase, it was distributed as part of a pilot study to ten elementary literacy coaches in a large school district in the southeastern United States. The pilot participants' range of years as literacy coaches were 1 to 9 ($x = 5.20$) and range of years in education were 11 to 31 ($x= 17.40$) (Ulenski, Gill, & Kelley, 2019). The pilot study scores, using SPSS software, revealed patterns that were expected: coaches' efficacy correlated with areas with which it was intended to correlate and not correlate with areas with which it was not intended to correlate. For

example, scores on the ELCSE and the modified Collective Teacher Efficacy scale (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000) were in the expected direction. Feedback from pilot participants indicated that the survey was ready to be distributed to a larger population.

In phase two of the survey distribution, the ELCSE was sent to 167 elementary literacy coaches in the southeastern United States. 102 participants completed the survey, resulting in a 61% response rate (Ulenski, Gill, & Kelley, 2019). A purposive sampling was chosen to target a subgroup of the teaching profession, elementary literacy coaches. In phase two of the survey distribution, participants' range of years as a literacy coach were 1 to 18 ($x = 5.60$) and range of years in education were 5 to 40 ($x = 16.90$) (Ulenski, Gill, & Kelley, 2019).

SPSS software was used for data analysis in phase two of the survey distribution to determine validity and reliability. Results indicated that the ELCSE survey has strong internal consistency with an alpha coefficient of 0.93 ($n = 102$) and a range of 0.86-.87 for three subscales: Peer Mentoring Self-Efficacy, Designing Professional Development Self-Efficacy, and Adaptive Coaching Self-Efficacy (Ulenski, Gill, & Kelley, 2019). An exploratory factory analysis (EFA) was conducted to examine the underlying factor structure. The Bartlett's test of sphericity was 0.000, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy value was 0.88, and the communalities of the items on the ELCSE were greater than 0.30 (Ulenski, Gill, & Kelley, 2019). Principal axis factoring and oblique rotation using Promax rotation was utilized for this EFA. This resulted in three factors with eigenvalues over 1.0 and contributed to 68% of the total variance (Ulenski, Gill, & Kelly, 2019). During the initial EFA, it was revealed that items 15 and 16 cross-loaded on factors 1 and 3. This resulted in the removal of those items in the final version of the ELCSE. A second EFA was conducted on the remaining 14 items of the ELCSE, which correlated with each other at 0.30 or higher and resulted in the decision to

continue using principal axis factoring with Promax rotation (Ulenski, Gill, & Kelley, 2019). The statical analysis on the remaining items yielded the following results: Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant at 0.000, KMO adequacy value of 0.86, and communalities of greater than 0.30 (Ulenski, Gill, & Kelley, 2019). The eigenvalues in the second EFA resulted in three factors that explained 69.57% of the variance (Ulenski, Gill, & Kelley, 2019). Factor 1 (Peer Mentoring Self-Efficacy) represents items 1-7 on the ELCSE, factor 2 (Designing Professional Development Self-Efficacy) represents items 8-11, and factor 3 (Adaptive Coaching Self-Efficacy) represents items 12-14 (Ulenski, Gll, & Kelley, 2019). The second EFA provided evidence of three interpretable factors.

Construct validity was determined by correlating the ELCSE survey with other previously published measures. As expected, the ELCSE survey correlated positively with a modified version of the Collective Teacher Efficacy (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000) because both instruments have similar underlying constructs. As expected, the ELCSE survey did not correlate with non-coaching tasks on the Time Coaches Spend on Activities During a Typical Two-Week Period survey (Marsh et al., 2008) because the non-coaching tasks on the Time Coaches Spend survey do not appear in the 2010 ILA standards.

Using the ELCSE survey provides insight into the self-efficacy beliefs literacy coaches have for the various tasks they perform related to the ILA (2010) standards and the models of coaching (ILA, 2018) they will select to use in their settings. For example, coaches that have strong positive efficacy beliefs related to items one and two on the ELCSE survey will more than likely engage in modeling lessons that align with the coaching to conform model. Figure 1 demonstrates the alignment between the ILA coaching models, ELCSE survey items, and coaching tasks. Literacy coaches, like other educators, judge their own capabilities for the tasks

and activities they perform (Cantrell et al., 2015), and this set of self-efficacy beliefs influences the tasks a person is or is not willing to perform (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Literacy coaches who believe they are not strong at certain coaching tasks or applying certain coaching models will avoid performing these tasks and using such models; the opposite is true as well. Understanding literacy coaches' self-efficacy beliefs allows for a greater insight into their behavior choices and provides an awareness of the ILA (2018) coaching models they feel comfortable using or not using in their school and/or district settings.

Figure 1. *The Alignment Chart.*

ILA Coaching Models	ELCSE Survey Item #	Coaching Tasks
Coaching to Conform	1. I can confidently go into any classroom in my school to provide an observation lesson because of the relationships I have with my colleagues.	Modeling
	2. I can provide an observation lesson using the gradual release of responsibility in a literacy lesson in front of students as a teacher-colleague observes.	Modeling
	3. I can clearly articulate my instructional moves to teacher-colleagues while providing an observation lesson.	Coaching Technique
	12. If a teacher in my school becomes disruptive or resistant, I can quickly apply a variety of coaching techniques to get that teacher to change his/her thinking.	Resistant or Struggling Teachers
Coaching into Practice	1. I can confidently go into any classroom in my school to provide an observation lesson because of the relationships I have with my colleagues.	Modeling
	4. I can engage teacher-colleagues in the instructional decision-making process by posing questions during an observation lesson.	Coaching Technique
	5. I can engage teacher-colleagues in the instructional decision-making process by receiving suggestions as to my next instructional steps during the observation lesson.	Coaching Technique
	6. As I observe a teacher-colleague teaching a literacy lesson, I can quickly decide what to whisper into the teacher's ear to provide a response as she/he is teaching the lesson.	Coaching Technique
	7. I can provide specific suggestions on research-proven instructional practices to teacher-colleagues as I observe a lesson.	Coaching Technique
	11. I can plan and design the observation lesson to the specific needs of a teacher-colleague.	Lesson Planning
	13. When a teacher is having adaptive challenges with a particular instructional design, I can regulate my coaching work.	Resistant or Struggling Teachers
	14. If a teacher-colleague cannot implement a particular instructional design, I can seek solutions collaboratively.	Resistant or Struggling Teachers
Coaching for Transformation	8. I can design professional learning opportunities that are specific to the needs of the school.	Providing Professional Development
	9. I can design professional learning opportunities that are specific to the needs of a certain grade level.	Providing Professional Development
	10. I can design professional learning opportunities that are specific to the needs of individualized teacher-colleagues.	Providing Professional Development
	11. I can plan and design the observation lesson to the specific needs of a teacher-colleague.	Lesson Planning
	13. When a teacher is having adaptive challenges with a particular instructional design, I can regulate my coaching work.	Resistant or Struggling Teachers
	14. If a teacher-colleague cannot implement a particular instructional design, I can seek solutions collaboratively.	Resistant or Struggling Teachers

ELCSE Survey and ILA Coaching Models

As described earlier, with the three coaching models, the ILA (2018) emphasized that the use of the model depends on the context: their teachers, climate, norms, and perceptions. We believe that as much as context matters, so does one's efficacy for the tasks that can be associated with these coaching models. Literacy coaches might determine that a model may be appropriate for the contexts they are coaching within, however if they have low efficacy for that model, they will be less likely to use that coaching model, as noted in previous research on self-efficacy. As such, we aligned the items on the ELCSE survey to coaching tasks and the ILA coaching models (see Figure 1). Upon aligning the items to the ILA coaching models we found that several items could be used in different coaching models depending on the context for how that item/task may be performed.

Literacy coaches who understand their efficacy beliefs for the tasks on the ELCSE survey would have a better understanding of the ILA coaching models (ILA, 2018) they feel comfortable using in their schools or district environments. Additionally, literacy coaches with lower self-efficacy for certain tasks and coaching models would want to seek professional development in those areas. Teacher preparation programs that develop literacy coaches could use the ELCSE survey similarly. The ELCSE survey is a tool that teacher preparation programs, literacy coaches, and school districts can use to better understand and meet the professional development needs of their literacy leaders.

Implications

The specificity of the ELCSE survey with regards to literacy coaching tasks and their alignment to the ILA coaching models (2018) provide for opportunities to identify and employ

targeted whole and small group professional development. Professional development that addresses the needs of literacy coaches based on the tasks and coaching models where they appear weaker is advantageous to the coach, teacher preparation programs, administrators, and school districts. Differentiated professional development would support the literacy coach's growth and conversely enhance his/her work with classroom teachers. In addition, the ELCSE survey could be used as a tool to deliver feedback to literacy coaches by their supervisor, whether that be in teacher preparation, at a school, or at a district level. For example, graduate reading program faculty can utilize the survey with their college students by administering the survey periodically throughout the program to track shifts in student self-efficacy beliefs related to coaching tasks and models. This would offer faculty the opportunity to provide specific and targeted learning opportunities to current and pre-service literacy coaches as they progress through the program. A suggested way to begin using the ELCSE with coaches is offered in Figure 2.

Figure 2. *Identifying the Professional Development Needs of Literacy Coaches*

Step 1: Make a copy of the *Elementary Literacy Coach Self-Efficacy* survey for your students.

Step 2: Have students respond to each item on the survey.

Step 3: Look at items your students scored as low.

Step 4: Use Figure 1 in this article to identify tasks and coaching models associated with those items from step 3.

Step 5: Find articles, videos, and professional development related to the tasks or coaching model to share with your students.

Step 6: Have students try out the tasks or coaching model with a willing colleague.

Step 7: Have students reflect on their experience.

Step 8: Re-administer the *Elementary Literacy Coach Self-Efficacy* survey with your students.

Additionally, the items on the ELCSE survey provide school districts the opportunity to develop professional development modules for the specific ILA coaching models (ILA, 2018). For example, if a literacy coach has a lower sense of efficacy for items 1-3 and 12 on the ELCSE survey, then a training module designed about how to use the coaching to conform model would be relevant. Understanding the items with this lens would provide focused learning opportunities for the specific models of literacy coaching that could help a literacy coach become and feel more successful in her/his position. Modules designed to address specific tasks and coaching models of weakness could help the coach use the coaching models as needed in a particular context. Figure 1 can be used by school districts to identify these training modules.

School districts and teacher preparation programs that use the ELCSE survey to help plan professional learning opportunities for current and future literacy coaches should be thoughtful

about the conditions in which the professional development is being delivered. A coaching session, a form of professional development, could increase the observing literacy coach's efficacy by utilizing the four sources of information for self-efficacy (Fives & Buehl, 2017). One example of an effective coaching session includes the experienced coach modeling and providing feedback in a context that is similar as the one in which the observing coach would perform the same task. This could include coaching the coach. The observing coach and the more experienced coach, in a type of pre-observation meeting, would plan out a session for the observation of coaching to occur. The more experienced coach models and demonstrates a specific coaching task or the use of a particular coaching model. During this modeling, the more experienced coach would demonstrate his/her ability to engage in the coaching task by communicating his/her thinking and reasoning while showing the observer what to do. The observing coach would believe he/she can perform the same task as the experienced coach because of perceived shared capabilities and having the demonstration occur in a similar setting where the observing coaching would perform that task (Pajares, 1997).

Whether it is a teacher preparation program, school district, or coach that uses the ELCSE survey to determine the needs of a coach and pursue professional development related to those needs, it should be noted that self-efficacy beliefs change. Previous research has noted that coaches tend to overinflate their efficacy beliefs prior to or at the beginning stages of professional development (Cantrell et al., 2015). Since the ILA's coaching models are relatively new, coaches may overinflate their efficacy for the items present on the ELCSE survey and the models and tasks that are associated with those items. This would require either the coach, districts, or teacher preparatory programs to monitor the coach's self-efficacy beliefs over time

using the ELCSE survey. Cantrell et al. (2015) noted a decrease in literacy coaches' self-efficacy during the first year of training as a result of becoming more aware of the expectations for each task. The same could be true for literacy coaches learning about specific coaching tasks or coaching models. Therefore, providing literacy coaches with an ample amount of time to learn and practice all of the coaching models prior to use with a classroom teacher is ideal. Furthermore, tracking their progress with multiple administrations of the ELCSE survey would allow for tailored professional development based on survey responses, allowing a literacy coach time to build efficacy for each of the coaching models and use the model appropriately when the situation arises.

Conclusion and Implications for Future Research

We believe the ELCSE survey is a tool that can be used by a teacher preparation program, a school district, or a coach to identify and evaluate professional development needs. Higher education institutions could use the ELCSE survey to identify items with low efficacy beliefs among their college students and then plan opportunities for practicing coaching tasks and models that align with those items as suggested in Figure 2. Current or future literacy coaches could analyze the ELCSE items, to better understand the tasks that are associated with each ILA coaching model (see Figure 1). Additionally, by studying the efficacy beliefs related to each ELCSE item, the current or future coach can partake in professional development that is best suited for the type of coaching tasks and the ILA coaching models associated with those items they feel less confident in performing.

The ELCSE survey (Ulenski, Gill, & Kelley, 2019) is a valid and reliable instrument and is currently the only self-efficacy survey that can provide insights to a literacy coach's beliefs

regarding the ILA coaching models and tasks. We believe using the ELCSE survey that is aligned to the ILA standards that are currently used by higher education institutions and school districts is integral to ensuring that curriculum and training that prepare students and education professionals for literacy coaching reflect the coaching role in today's schools.

APPENDIX A

ELEMENTARY LITERACY COACH SELF-EFFICACY SURVEY

Rate your degree of confidence by recording a number from 0 to 6 using the scale given below:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cannot do at all			Moderately can do			Highly certain can do

1. I can confidently go into any classroom in my school to provide an observation lesson because of the relationships I have with my colleagues.
2. I can provide an observation lesson using the gradual release of responsibility in a literacy lesson in front of students as a teacher-colleague observes.
3. I can clearly articulate my instructional moves to teacher-colleagues while providing an observation lesson.
4. I can engage teacher-colleagues in the instructional decision-making process by posing questions during an observation lesson.
5. I can engage teacher-colleagues in the instructional decision-making process by receiving suggestions as to my next instructional steps during the observation lesson.
6. As I observe a teacher-colleague teaching a literacy lesson, I can quickly decide what to whisper in the teacher's ear to provide a response as he/she is teaching the lesson.
7. I can provide specific suggestions on research-proven instructional practices to teacher-colleagues as I observe a lesson.
8. I can design professional learning opportunities that are specific to the needs of the school.

9. I can design professional learning opportunities that are specific to the needs of a certain grade level.
10. I can design professional learning opportunities that are specific to the needs of individualized teacher-colleagues.
11. I can plan and design the observation lesson to the specific needs of a teacher-colleague.
12. If a teacher in my school becomes disruptive or resistant, I can quickly apply a variety of coaching techniques to get that teacher to change her/his thinking.
13. When a teacher is having adaptive challenges with a particular instructional design, I can regulate my coaching work.
14. If a teacher-colleague cannot implement a particular instructional design, I can seek solutions collaboratively.

References

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191.

Bandura, A. (1994). *Self-efficacy.* In V. S. Ramachaudran (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press.

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

Bandura, A. (2006). *Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales.* In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Cantrell, S. C., & Hughes, H. K. (2008). Teacher efficacy and content literacy implementations: An exploration of the effects of extended professional development with coaching. *Journal of Literacy Research, 40*(1), 95-127.

Cantrell, S. C., Madden, A., Rintamaa, M., Almasi, J. F., & Carter, J. C. (2015). The development of literacy coaches' self-efficacy beliefs in a dual-role position. *Journal of School Leadership, 25*(4), 562.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and student's academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(6), 473-490.

Fives, H., & Buehl, M. M. (2017). The functions of teachers' beliefs: Personal epistemology on the pinning block. In G. Schraw, J. Lunn, L. Olafson, & M. VanderVeldt (Eds.),

Teachers' personal epistemologies: Evolving models for transforming practice. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Association, 37*(2), 479-507.

Guo, Y., Connor, C. M., Yang, Y., Roehrig, A. D., & Morrison, F. J. (2012). The effects of teacher qualification, teacher self-efficacy, and classroom practices on fifth graders' literacy outcomes. *The Elementary School Journal, 113*(1), 3-24.

Hargreaves, S. (2000). *Emotional geographies of teaching.* Teachers College Record, 103(6), 1056-1080.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*, 81-112.

Hunt, C. S., & Handsfield, L. J. (2013). The emotional landscapes of literacy coaching: Issues of identity, power, and positioning. *Journal of Literacy Research, 45*(1), 47–86.

International Literacy Association. (2010). *Standards 2010: Reading specialist/literacy coach*. Newark, DE: Author.

International Literacy Association. (2018). *Literacy coaching for change: Choices matter* [Literacy leadership brief]. Newark, DE: Author.

Kitching, J., Cassidy, S., Eachus, P., & Hogg, P. (2011). Creating and validating self-efficacy scales for students. *Radiologic Technology. 83*(1), 10-18.

Klassen, R . M., Tze, V. M. C., Betts, S. M., & Gordon, K. A. (2011). Teacher efficacy research 1998-2009: Signs of progress or unfulfilled promise? *Educational Psychology Review, 23*(1), 21-43.

Marsh, J. A., McCombs, J. S., Lockwood, J. R., Martorell, F., Gershwin, D., Naftel, S., . . . Corporation, R. (2008). *Supporting literacy across the sunshine state: A study of Florida middle school reading coaches.* RAND Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2008/RAND_MG762.pdf

Pajares, F. (1997). Current directions in self-efficacy research. In M. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement.* Volume 10, (pp.1-49). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Pajares, F. (2002). Overview of social and cognitive theory and of self-efficacy. Retrieved from: http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/eff.html

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19*(2), 139-158.

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. *The Elementary School Journal, 110*(2), 228-245.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783-805.

Ulenski, A., Gill, M. G., & Kelley, M. J. (2019). Developing and validating the elementary literacy coach self-efficacy survey. *The Teacher Educator, 54*(3), 225-243, doi: 10.1080/08878730.2019,1590487.

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the | literature and future directions. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(4), 751-796.

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2009). Sources of self-efficacy in mathematics: A validation study. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 34*, 89-101.

Zeldin, A. L. & Pajares, F. (2000). Against the odds: Self-efficacy beliefs of women in mathematical, scientific, and technological careers. *American Educational Research Journal, 27*, 215-246.