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ABSTRACT

Few researchers have examined the impact on pre-service teacher efficacy as related to a field experience in a literacy content area. In this study, the pre-service teachers were enrolled in a phonemic awareness and phonics course with an associated field experience. The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale and a researcher created content specific survey provided pre and post field experience data. The researcher created content survey provided insight regarding the changes in attitudes of the candidates with the overall responses in the survey indicated that the candidates were more confident in phonemic awareness and phonic lesson design after the field experience. The study was conducted at a small private college with early childhood education majors. The small sample size limited overall conclusions. Indeed, the results indicated no significant differences. The impact of the field experience on individual efficacy was not evident; further research is required.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Teacher preparation programs influence future classroom practices. The role of preparation programs, specifically in the area of field experiences, may impact a candidate’s sense of efficacy. Bandura’s (1977) concept of performance accomplishment implies that the field experience required of candidates throughout an undergraduate program would impact their sense of efficacy. Undergraduate teacher credentialed programs follow national standards and adhere to requirements form CAEP (2016), including key assessments to demonstrate candidate performance. The national accreditation body for degree programs has emerged as the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) in 2016. The two previously established accreditation bodies: the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), are no longer used for accreditation as of 2016 in favor of CAEP. NCATE was established in 1954 as a non-profit accreditation body, and TEAC was established in 1997 with the purpose of improving degree programs. A great deal of the course format and design for field experiences is at the discretion of the teacher education program, with national accreditation standards acting as guidelines. Subsequently, field experiences vary from state to state and institution to institution.

The Ohio Department of Education (2016) requires a minimum of 100 hours of supervised field experience prior to student teaching. Supervised field experiences ensure that candidates are placed in licensure-appropriate classrooms with qualified teachers. Student teaching requires a minimum of 12 weeks and similar supervised guidelines. The partnerships established for field experiences are vital for the preparation of candidates. The CAEP Standards require that the provider or college program ensures that the candidates can connect theory and
practice. The connection is a clear link between content knowledge and field application. By establishing a program where content knowledge and field application are simultaneous, the schools benefit and the teacher education program is strengthened. The connection between content proficiency and field application is evident in National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) standards, as noted in Appendix H. The methods course and related field experience also meet the Ohio Department of Education (2016) reading core requirements, as noted in Appendix I. Standards 1 and 11 address phonemic awareness, phonics, and field experiences. The design of the course meets both standards, in addition to the dyslexia standards embedded in Standard 1 of the reading core. The Ohio Department of Education’s (2016) dyslexia requirements are required for state accredited institutions (see Appendix J).

The repeated connection of content knowledge and field experience is evident in the required standards for accreditation and recommendation. Key assessments throughout a program monitor the candidate’s achievement, with specific attention to performance in content classes and field experiences. The impact on a candidate’s sense of efficacy may be implied, but not required or reported, as a key assessment for accreditation purposes. The primary goal of the current study was to determine the impact on candidates’ sense of efficacy in a field experience associated with pedagogical content knowledge related to teaching phonics.

**Rationale & Significance of the Study**

NAEYC (2010), the International Literacy Association (2010), and Ohio Higher Education (2016) standards suggest that teacher education candidates practice designing, implementing, and evaluating developmentally appropriate lessons for children. The current researcher developed a field experience that gave candidates an opportunity to practice content knowledge of how to use multisensory approaches to teaching phonemic awareness and phonics.
The researcher determined to test whether or not practice in the field teaching phonics would have a positive impact on the candidates’ senses of efficacy. The significance of the study for teacher education programs beyond the researcher’s institution is the impact of the university course design and field placement on candidate efficacy in general and as it specifically relates to teaching phonics. The findings of the study may also impact institutions and programs with similar formats.

**Purpose of Study**

In this study, the researcher focused on the impact on candidate efficacy related to preparatory training and implementation of a field experience associated with a phonics methods course in a small private college in Ohio. The course content included phonemic awareness and phonics, multisensory instruction strategies, and background information and methods for addressing dyslexia. The method of multisensory instruction was based on Orton-Gillingham (Gillingham & Stillman, 1997) methods. Prior to the study, there was no field experience related to phonics methods at the institution. The purpose of the study was to determine whether the delivery of pedagogical content knowledge by the instructor and guided implementation during field experience would have an impact on candidate efficacy, both in general and specific to phonics. A word study program that focuses on a multisensory approach to phonics was suggested in the Ohio Higher Education (2016) dyslexia standards. The researcher selected Orton-Gillingham as a state recommended approach and took Orton-Gillingham training to prepare for the course instruction.

**Theoretical Framework**

Bandura’s (1977) efficacy framework was used to examine the impact of field experiences on efficacy. The four principles of Bandura’s theory include vicarious experience,
performance accomplishments, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal. The current researcher applied this framework to the specific area of teacher preparation programs and phonics content. First, vicarious experience for the candidates may be experienced through instructor modeling and classroom observations. The candidates may have observed phonics related lessons in previous classroom experience, or may have the opportunity to observe the classroom teacher participating in the partnership school.

Performance accomplishments, the second principle of Bandura’s framework, were found in the implementation of lessons in the field. The candidates’ implementation of lessons provides a natural performance accomplishment that leads to verbal persuasion. Verbal persuasion, the third principle, can happen both in the field from the classroom teacher and from the instructor during class. Emotional arousal, Bandura’s fourth principle, may occur in both the field and course work. The level of arousal may impact the teacher’s efficacy if the level is too elevated. The candidates are learning and emotional arousal will be critical; thus, feedback and debriefing with the instructor is absolutely necessary. Elevated emotional arousal may negatively impact the candidates by providing a false sense of success or creating a sense of failure.

The tool that the current researcher utilized to measuring the efficacy of the candidates was the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Morgan & Hoy, 2001). The tool was designed to measure the level of efficacy of pre-service teachers. The measure was based on the research of social and cognitive learning efficacy theories. Tschannen-Morgan and Hoy determined that their scale should include an assessment of both personal competence and task analysis in terms of resources and constraints. The analysis of previous measures indicated a need for a scale to assess both, since previous scales contained a singular focus.
Research Question

The research question that guided this study was, “Will the self-efficacy of pre-service teachers be impacted by the practicum experience associated with the phonics course?”

Definition of Terms

All P-12 students. This population is defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools, including students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin (CAEP, 2016).

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Candidate. In this report, the term “candidate” refers to individuals preparing for professional education positions (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2016).

Direct instruction. This is a Student-Teacher interaction required for learning concepts through defining and saying what students are going to learn and why (Birsh, 2015).

Dyslexia. The International Dyslexia Association (2016) defined dyslexia is a language-based learning disability.

Field experiences. These refer to early and ongoing practice opportunities to apply content and pedagogical knowledge in P-12 settings to progressively develop and demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions (CAEP, 2016). Student teaching is defined by CAEP separately.

Flexible grouping. The RTI Action Network (Feldman, 2016) defined flexible grouping the ability of students to move among groups based on performance and instructional need.

Multisensory. Multisensory learning pathways include visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile (Birsh, 2015).
**Orton Gillingham.** This is an approach for teaching language-related skills with carefully sequenced teaching structure (Birsh, 2015).

**Partner.** In the context of this study, this term refers to organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or educator preparation providers specifically involved in designing, implementing, and assessing the clinical experience (CAEP, 2016).

**Partnership.** This describes a mutually beneficial agreement among various partners, in which all participating members engage in and contribute to goals for the preparation of education professionals. This may include examples such as pipeline initiatives, Professional Development Schools, and partner networks (CAEP, 2016).

**Pedagogical content knowledge.** The combination of content and teaching knowledge (Lee Shulman, 1986).

**Phonemic awareness.** This is the knowledge that spoken words can be broken apart into smaller segments of sound known as phonemes (National Reading Panel, 1997).

**Phonics.** This is the knowledge that letters of the alphabet represent phonemes, and that these sounds are blended together to form written words (National Reading Panel, 1997).

**Self-efficacy or efficacy.** This term refers to an individual’s judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcome (Bandura, 1977).

**Small group instruction.** This is a designed experience to provide intense instruction to guide student’s rate of academic progress (Birsh, 2015).

**Systematic and cumulative.** Concepts are taught and systematically reviewed to strengthen and build on prior knowledge (Birsh, 2015).
VAKT. This acronym stands for visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile modalities (Birsh, 2015).

**Limitations**

The design of the study utilized small groups for a limited portion of the school day. The practices of the classroom teacher, in terms of incorporating additional lessons in phonics in whole or small groups, were outside of the control the researcher. The sample size was also small, so having experimental and control groups was impossible. Therefore, the researcher did not look at the effects of the small group instruction on student learning and chose instead to focus on the efficacy of the candidates in general and in relation to teaching phonics.

Another limitation was that the candidate’s implementation of the lesson may have deviated from the approved lesson plan. The researcher was unable to determine the frequency or degree of deviation. The classroom teacher’s expectations for the pre-service teacher may have impacted the execution of the plans. The classroom teacher’s educational background, experience, and beliefs about teaching phonics may also have limited the study. The interaction with the classroom teacher may have impacted the sense of efficacy of the candidate, especially if the classroom teacher used verbal persuasion to change the pre-service teacher’s knowledge and beliefs about teaching phonics as learned in the college phonics class. The researcher designed a phonics teaching survey to examine that aspect of the field experience.

The study was limited not only by the small sample size of candidates, but also by the fact that the study was conducted in a single district. The classroom teachers in the district conducted the universal screening and progress monitoring. The level of involvement in the process and the dialogue regarding individual students was at the discretion of that teacher. The candidates may or may not have been aware of individual student’s screening results or progress,
depending on whether data was shared. Whether or not the classroom teacher shared his/her academic grouping could have also impacted the design of candidate’s lessons.

Another limitation was the amount and content of classroom teacher instruction outside of the time the candidates were directly working with the public school students. The researcher was not present for all classroom lessons presented by the classroom teachers, so there was the possibility that students received additional whole group and/or small group instruction. Another limitation for the study involved pre-service teachers’ sense of efficacy in the area of reading instruction. While the candidates participating in the study have junior status, the background of the individual candidates could potentially have impacted their levels of sense of efficacy.

In Chapter I, the researcher presented the proposed study, along with its rationale, significance, research questions, and limitations. The researcher raised the question of the impact on teacher candidates when enrolled in a pedagogical content knowledge course and associated field experience. In Chapter II, the researcher reviews published literature related to sense of efficacy and the content specific studies to consider when designing the study as outlined in Chapter III. The researcher presents the results of the study in Chapter IV, and presents the analysis, conclusions, and recommendations in Chapter V. A list of references follows Chapter V, and the Appendices follow the references.
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

When examining the impact on candidate sense of efficacy as related to a pedagogical content knowledge course and related field experience, multiple factors apply. The theories and studies related to efficacy and the connection to field experience offer the base for this study. Since the current researcher examined phonics-specific content, studies related to phonics instruction, including methodology, lesson design, and small group instruction, qualify. The examination of practices and strategies must also include Orton-Gillingham practices, since it is incorporated in course content and field experience.

Efficacy

A basic assumption to this study was that focused instruction and associated field experience would impact a candidate’s level of sense of efficacy. Understanding sense of efficacy was therefore central to the study. Bandura’s (1977) framework regarding efficacy provided the initial framework, since the study examined the impact on efficacy as related to a field experience. The framework includes four principle sources that impact efficacy. The first principle, vicarious experiences, can be derived by seeing others perform activities and tasks since individuals do not rely on mastery of a task as the sole source of efficacy. Live and symbolic modeling can impact efficacy. The second principle of the framework is performance accomplishments. The concept of success and mastery influencing efficacy is central to the principle of performance accomplishments, i.e. successes and failures can impact task mastery. Additional sources for performance accomplishment include performance exposure and participant modeling. The third principle in Bandura’s (1977) framework is verbal persuasion. Individuals are led to believe that they are capable through verbal suggestion. Verbal persuasion
is readily available and widely used due to its ease and access. Sources of verbal persuasion include suggestion, praise and self-instruction.

Emotional arousal is the final principle. Individuals judge their level of anxiety and stress based on their circumstances. The level of anxiety and stress can impact the level of efficacy, with higher levels of anxiety and stress decreasing efficacy. Sources of emotional arousal include biofeedback. An example of emotional arousal could be the response of the students to a lesson presented by a candidate. Bandura’s four principles can be applied to pre-service and practicing teachers.

Hoy and Spero (2005) explored efficacy and the general impact on pre-service and practicing teachers. These researchers examined the sense of efficacy during student teaching and the subsequent first year of teaching. They performed a longitudinal study to assess efficacy by using three different instruments with four separate efficacy measures to determine the changes in efficacy as the group was tracked from student teaching through the first year of employment. The researchers examined the connection between the scales and previous research with candidates. The researchers concluded that efficacy increased during student teaching, but decreased during the first year of teaching. While the study focused on scale comparison using a longitudinal model, the researchers posed possible influences to impact the decline, including level of support provided during student teaching compared to first year of employment.

De la Torre Cruz and Arias (2007) examined the efficacy of pre-service and practicing teachers. The study differed from Hoy and Spero (2005) since the researchers surveyed two different groups. The researchers surveyed pre-service and practicing teachers simultaneously using the same measures. The practicing teachers had an average of 15 years of experience. The researchers concluded that experience does positively impact efficacy. Once again, the
researchers were unable to determine the factors that influenced the change. De la Torre Cruz and Arias focused on general efficacy involving pre-service and practicing teachers.

The sense of efficacy in pre-service teachers and primary teachers provided the focus of a study conducted by İpek and Camadan (2012). The researchers collected scores from 418 pre-service and primary teachers. The researchers administered the Ohio Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Morgan and Hoy, 2001) and the Scale of Attitudes towards the Teaching Profession (Ozgur, 1994) to these teachers, which included 180 pre-service first grade teachers, 107 fourth grade pre-service teachers, and 131 primary teachers. Both scales were Likert and provided scores for $t$-test and ANOVA analysis. The researchers compared efficacy with first grade, fourth grade, and primary teachers using ANOVA. The researchers used $t$-tests to measure the efficacy and attitudes based on gender. The researchers analyzed preference in teaching using ANOVA. The results indicated that attitude scores are significantly higher in first grade when compared to fourth grade pre-service teachers. However, the efficacy scores were opposite as the change in attitude scores with the fourth grade pre-service teacher scores related to efficacy higher than the first grade teachers. When comparing gender, female pre-service and primary teachers scored significantly higher in attitude scores than male counterparts while efficacy is not impacted by gender.

O'Leary, Cockburn, Powell, and Diamond (2010) conducted a study examining the views of Head Start teachers regarding phonological awareness. Teachers representing 83 of 115 Head Start classrooms in a Midwest state were included in the study. Each teacher participated in a voluntary group interview which lasted approximately 90 minutes. During the interview, the teachers verified their responses twice. They were provided a summary after the interview for further verification. The researchers transcribed and analyzed the interview data using Hatch's
recommendation for analysis. In this process, the researchers first transcribed the interviews and then analyzed individual responses. The two researchers met with a third researcher to discuss emerging themes. They established reliability in this way, and repeated the process for the remaining transcripts. The researchers established a master outline to record patterns and divided teacher responses into phonological awareness and vocabulary. The results indicated that teachers usually expressed positive efficacy related to explicit instruction with phonological awareness, but expressed lack of confidence in the sequence of teaching letter recognition and associated sounds. The teachers debated whether vocabulary instruction should be planned or spontaneous, and support was given for both approaches (O’Leary et al., 2010).

Self-efficacy and teaching science content was explored by Saka, Bayram, and Kabapinar (2016) using mixed methods. The initial scale was the Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument (Riggs and Enochs, 1990) with 23 items. Based on the results of the scale, four students were selected to participate in the study. The students demonstrated varying levels of efficacy. The qualitative portion of the study included observations and interviews. The results presented two elements: lesson preparation and teaching application. All four students demonstrated the importance of student centered learning. The researchers suggested, based on observations and interviews, the candidates with high-levels of self-efficacy transferred lack of student success on the students thus attributing the lack of success on the students. Whereas the candidates with low self-efficacy analysed their role in the learning activities and assumed responsibility for lack of student success. The researchers concluded pre-service teachers with low level self-efficacy might perform more with more self-reflection than pre-service teachers with high levels of self-efficacy.
Efficacy and field experiences. Atiles, Jones, and Kim (2012) researched the efficacy of early childhood majors using the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Morgan and Hoy, 2001). These researchers focused on classrooms with students with developmental delays and disabilities. The study involved 165 pre-service teachers enrolled at a Midwestern university. Since the study focused on the efficacy of candidates working in inclusive classrooms, the researchers modified the questions on the scale. The scale’s application and use in classrooms is limited when connecting phonics and phonemic awareness and candidates. The conclusion of the study indicated that a positive impact on efficacy is not related to hours spent in the field, but the ratio of identified students in the inclusive classroom.

Rushton (2003) explored the sense of efficacy by conducting a qualitative study with two pre-service teachers who taught in an inner city setting. The two pre-service teachers experienced cognitive dissonance during the experience. Through a series of four interviews, 12 written reflections, and seven transcribed group discussions, the researcher identified the impact of field experience on the two pre-service teachers. The teachers experienced challenges and the challenges changed their personal knowledge. Common challenges included classroom management and establishing boundaries with students. While the study only included two pre-service teachers, it demonstrated the possible impact of a field experience on pre-service teachers.

Bayraktar (2011) investigated the efficacy of pre-service primary teachers toward science instruction. The study included 282 candidates, with 147 classified as freshman and 135 classified as seniors. The researcher administered one scale to the participants, the Science Teaching Efficacy Beliefs Instrument (Enochs and Riggs, 1990) after which the researcher performed t-test analysis. The conclusion indicated that efficacy beliefs and attitudes evolve
during the 4 years of education. Moderately positive attitudes and beliefs were demonstrated by
the freshman, and the seniors were significantly more positive. The results indicated no difference
in gender. The researchers could not determine the role of content and method courses in the
evolution of attitudes and beliefs, since the scales were administered during the freshmen and
senior years.

In another study, Garvis, Twigg, and Pedergast (2011) examined pre-service teacher
efficacy used the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Morgan and Hoy, 2001) at the
beginning of the year and repeated at the end of the year. The study respondents included 175
candidates from Australia. The scale was given twice during the year, with results indicating a
lower mean efficacy score on the second survey. The researchers discussed the possibility of
over-estimating by the candidates when completing the initial survey. The candidates had
completed limited field experience when completing the initial assessment, which could have
impacted their sense of efficacy. In the final semester of the program, the respondents
demonstrated the lowest mean scores on the scale. One possible conclusion is that the candidates
gained a greater understanding of the challenges of the profession, accounting for the decrease in
mean scores between pre and post field experience.

Bates, Latham, and Kim (2011) executed a study that concentrated on the link between
mathematics self-efficacy, teaching efficacy, and mathematical performance. The study included
89 early childhood candidates from a Midwest institution. The researchers administered the
Mathematics Self-Efficacy Scale (Betz and Hackett, 1993), which consisted of 34 questions using
a 10-point Likert scale. The scale provided efficacy measures related to the ability to solve
mathematic problems and performance on mathematics-related tasks. The Mathematics Teaching
Efficacy Beliefs Instrument (Enochs et al., 2000) provided personal math teaching efficacy and
outcome teaching efficacy. The third scale was a basic skills test. The findings indicated that candidates with high self-efficacy were more likely to feel confident in their ability to teach, but were not sure if they impact student learning. One of the limitations could be the experience of the candidates in classroom instruction design and implementation in field situations.

Jong, Mainhard, Tartwijk, Veldman, Verloop, and Wubbels (2014) examined the sense of efficacy of 120 pre-service teachers enrolled in three graduate schools in the Netherlands. The researchers used the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Morgan and Hoy, 2001), a personality questionnaire, and data gathered from a questionnaire regarding discipline strategies to determine if a relationship existed between sense of efficacy and personality in regard to discipline strategies. The conclusion of the study indicated that there is not a connection between self-efficacy and teacher-student relationships. The researchers explained the lack of connection due to the fact that the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale measures perception and not actual competence. The researchers also chose to use the short version of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, when the recommendation for pre-service teachers is the extended form.

When examining the impact of attitudes and beliefs about teaching reading, Barnyak and Paquette (2010) administered a survey to pre-service teachers at two universities. The survey used a Likert scale to measure reading beliefs. The pre-service teachers completed the survey in the spring of 2006 and repeated in the fall of 2006 after completing methods coursework. The survey examined reading with individual questions focusing on elements of reading. One element was phonics experiences. The post-survey results proved only significant in the question regarding whether children should be taught skills to comprehend reading materials. The remaining questions, including the phonics experience, were not significant in pre- and post-survey results.
Putney and Cass (1998) examined the attitudes of pre-service teachers enrolled in senior level math methods courses. The researchers utilized the Mathematics Attitude Scale (Aiken, 1974) to measure the candidates’ attitudes over three academic quarters. Manipulatives in the teaching of mathematics were incorporated in the methodology section of the coursework so the researchers focused on change in attitudes related to use of manipulatives. The researchers concluded that the pre-service teachers were more positive in reference to math after exposure to the manipulative materials.

**Phonics**

**Teacher practices and attitudes.** When examining approaches to phonics instruction, the meta-analysis presented by Ehri et al. (2001) summarized the role of systematic phonics instruction. These researchers sorted articles based on subset information for further analysis. Based on the analysis of the studies, the researchers concluded systematic phonics instruction benefits students in the early primary grades more than older students. The analysis also posed the idea that other factors not measured in the studies might impact the effective nature of phonics instruction at higher-grade levels.

Xue and Meisels (2004) researched the issue of top-down or bottom-up approaches to literacy instruction. These authors attempted to answer questions regarding varied learning, instructional practices and influences related to background. The sample was large and utilized a survey of teachers to answer the posed questions. The sample included 13,609 kindergarten children in 2,690 classrooms, with data collected while they were enrolled in kindergarten, first, third, and fifth grades. The longitudinal study also included data from parents, kindergarten teachers, and a school administrator. The researchers explored various subcategories such as the role of social-economic status, national region, race, and impact of urban living. The authors
concluded that students benefit when both top-down and bottom-up approaches are used in a classroom, with balance emphasized.

A qualitative study by Kotaman, Tekin, and Tekin (2007) provided insight regarding the knowledge of the classroom teacher. The study included examining teacher practices in phonics instruction in Turkey. Through interviews of three public school first grade teachers in one district, the researchers were able to make general observations, but failed to make recommendations. According to the researchers, phonics instruction is new in Turkey. Generalization from the interviews regarding phonics instruction included the concept that letters are taught first but not in alphabetical order. One teacher indicated a focus on teaching letter and sound with visuals to reinforce the sounds. The results of this study demonstrate that diverse definitions of phonics instruction and classroom applications exist.

In a study conducted by Shapiro and Solity (2008), the researchers addressed whole group phonics delivery as a strategy. The delivery of the lesson was to a classroom of students instead of a small group intervention model. Twelve schools participated in the 2-year study which included teachers and children. The study examined whole group daily instruction that included 12-minute lessons that occurred three times daily. Each lesson focused on individual aspects of phonics instruction. The study focused on the effects of less intense instruction with whole group instruction delivery. Whole group instruction, while designed to address the needs of all, is not the same as intervention groups where numbers are limited and instruction focused. They used a quasi-experimental design to implement the study, which lasted for 2 years. The scale of the study provided a control and intervention schools. The results indicated significant differences with the intervention schools scoring higher and having fewer students identified with reading difficulties. The conclusion supports the recommendations of the National Reading
Panel that phonics instruction needs to be part of daily language instruction. If focused, whole-group instruction can yield results. The question of whether combined whole group and focused small group instruction would be effective for children at risk of reading failure would be of interest.

In regard to phonics instruction and practice by classroom teachers, Clark (2013) conducted a survey of literacy coordinators and classroom teachers in England simultaneous to the implementation of a required phonics check. The baseline survey pool included case study interviews at 14 schools. The initial study data collection involved 844 literacy coordinators and 940 teachers. Findings from the interviews revealed the teachers’ belief that phonics should be taught with multiple methods and a positive attitude toward phonics instruction. Teachers indicated that they used limited classroom adjustments in methodology. Clark (2014) repeated the survey in year 2 of the study. Responses indicated phonics was part of instruction and valued. The emergence of pseudo-word instruction in the second study indicated a shift in instruction in order to address the required phonics check. Teachers recognized the importance of phonics instruction, but practices were not altered until the scores on the phonics check indicated areas of concern. The interviews indicated that teachers alter practice and adjust instruction based on student test scores. Davis (2012) contended that the debate of synthetic versus analytical methodology exists, but the idea of whether one methodology works for every student continues to be unanswered. The research regarding the systematic approach to phonics instruction appears to indicate that teachers do value phonics instruction. The reviewed research does not provide a clear standard for length of instruction or methodology.

**Instructional strategies.** One quantitative study facilitated by Olinghouse, Lambert, and Compton (2006) looked at phonics instruction and included children with disabilities.
Participants included 40 identified students in a metropolitan school located in southwestern United States who were part of a larger intervention. The intervention encompassed 70 hours of intense intervention in reading using systematic and sequential instruction. The conclusions supported the recommendations of the National Reading Panel. These researchers examined the use of the Intervention Aligned Word List designed for the study to monitor student progress. One limitation of the study was that the assessment was specific to the intervention. When the two are interdependent, the question arises whether the assessment could be applied to other interventions.

When exploring the role of phonics in first grade students, Schmidgall and Joseph (2007) evaluated the role of instructional effectiveness through the use of word boxes. The study involved six first grade students in a suburban school district in Central Ohio. The researchers selected students demonstrating delays in word-reading skills. The level of impact by an instructional approach varies from student to student. Initial assessment for the study was the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), which is a common assessment tool in public schools. The test includes segmentation and identifies weakness and strengths of individual students. After analysis of the results, students were provided individual intervention for 20 consecutive school days. The students were introduced to six unknown words and the researchers employed use of word boxes to establish connection between letters and phonetic analysis. The researchers accounted for all dependent variables and measured for cumulative impact of the instruction by recording the accuracy of word recognition. The researchers analyzed the results based on three conditions including word acquisition, maintenance of learned words, and rate of mastery. The study indicated all students benefited from the
intervention, but the limitation noted was the use of one type of phonetic analysis. The level of impact by an instructional approach varies from student to student.

The visual aspect of the previous study suggests comparison to a study by Cihon, Gardner, Morrison, and Paul (2008). Based on the recommendation of the classroom teacher, the participants for the study included five low-performing children ranging in age from five to six. The study focused on use of hand signs to teach phonics skills. The intervention groups received consistent lessons with the difference in delivery. The intervention occurred in the spring of the academic school year. One group learned through hand signs, and the other learned both hand signs and written code. The quantitative results indicated little difference in the two groups, but indicated growth through the DIBELS assessment. Once again, the use of intervention for at risk students proved to increase student achievement. These results indicated increases in student achievement after intervention, but failed to determine a singular method.

While the previous study focused on visual elements, Rose and Magnotta (2012) studied the impact of an arts-based reading program on reading achievement. The study added to the volume of research regarding a specific arts-based curriculum. Key elements of the curriculum included phonemic awareness, systematic phonics and small groups. The participants included 57 treatment and 48 control children in one of four schools in Chicago. The students varied in grade assignment K-3. The treatment group received an extra 40-60 minutes of daily instruction using the curriculum. The treatment and control groups were similar in reading assessment scores at the beginning of the study. The end results indicated a significant difference in assessment results with the treatment group scoring higher than the control.

Vadsay and Sanders (2010) illustrated the effects of phonics intervention for 84 low skilled, limited English minority students in the first grade. Participants in the study attended
full-day kindergarten classes in urban public schools. Twelve schools participated in the study. This study also included the element of time. The intervention included 70 scripted lessons, which included 20 minutes on phonics activities and 10 minutes on scaffolding. The intervention occurred four to five times per week for 18 weeks. The quantitative results indicated a gain in achievement for all students but presented a limitation. The gains in phonemic awareness were limited in the limited English students, causing the researcher to question the role vocabulary development plays in phonemic awareness.

Early childhood literacy instruction begins with the recognition of letters and the connection of letters to sounds, as noted by the National Reading Panel (2000) report. Cardoso-Martins, Mesquita, and Ehri (2011) investigated the role of phonological awareness and letter name recognition. While phonics is the connection of letters and sounds, the study focused on children who did not know any consonant letter names except the first letter in their name. Thirty-two Brazilian students were selected for the study, which involved eight sessions of 20 minutes each for two or three times a week. The researchers designed the instruction based on the name of the child, with the focus on the initial letter of the name and a medial letter. The training was individual in nature with the first step of the training establishing the control group. The intervention group was provided with letter names and tactile opportunity to work with the letters. The control group never heard the name of the letter. The next step was establishing the sound of the letter learned in the first task. The result from experiment one indicated the instruction based on initial letter recognition produced gain when comparing the two groups but failed in the medial letter recognition. The second experiment of the study focused on the students who did not know any letters. The training was more intense, with 28 training sessions and four to five trainings per week. The results were similar to the initial experiment, with the
conclusion being that students acquire initial letter recognition and sound correspondence more readily than medial sounds.

While the studies mentioned varied in methodology and structure of intervention, the commonality relates to student reading achievement and indicates a positive impact on it. The allocated time for intervention and the group size do not appear to clearly impact post-intervention scores. Systematic instruction and scheduled formal instruction are the common factors having a positive impact. The age group consistently studied included primary students and often those at risk of failure in reading. The conclusions made from these studies emphasized that intervention can yield increased student achievement in reading, but failed to identify one strategy or method as best or most effective.

**Small group instruction.** Multiple studies provide research regarding the implementation of small group intervention in phonics. Vadsay and Sanders (2010) researched the efficacy of reading intervention with low-skill kindergarteners. Olinghouse et al. (2006) used a phonics intervention program that was systematic and sequential. Cihon et al. (2008) used visual phonics as a form of intervention. Shaw and Davidson (2009) used a published program to provide phonics intervention. Noltemeyer, Joseph, and Kunesh (2013) designed their study with a control group and phonics intervention. The mentioned studies incorporated small group intervention utilizing a variety of methods and strategies. The age group consistently studied included primary students and often those at risk of academic failure. The conclusion of these studies emphasized that small group intervention can yield increased student achievement in reading, but failed to identify one particular strategy or method as best or most effective.

Shaw and Davidson (2009) noted a change from *whether* to teach phonics to *how* to teach phonics. This is important to the conversation, since some previous scholars have questioned the
instructional time given to phonics. The study focused on a particular program, which was administered by a trained instructor to small groups of four children. They received intervention instruction two or three times a week for 20 weeks. Each session lasted 40 minutes. While all students in the group demonstrated growth at the end of the intervention, the question remained regarding the influence of typical development and instruction outside of the intervention time. Since the sample was small, it would be appropriate to scale the model to include more participants or to include a control group that did not receive the small group intervention. The study also employed one method, so the effectiveness of this program compared to other methods of teaching phonics is unknown.

An intervention utilizing small group instruction conducted in an urban area in Southern California included 42 first-grade students (Menzies, Mahdavi, & Lewis, 2008). The researchers examined the ongoing assessments, small-group design and explicit instruction as related to reading intervention. The first-grade students in the study were identified as at risk. The post testing results indicated significant growth. The researchers were deliberate to involve multiple professionals in the instructional portion of the intervention to reduce the influence of the classroom teacher.

Koutsoftas, Harmon, and Gray (2009) identified the impact of an intervention designed to impact the achievement of phonemic awareness. The study focused on three public school and two Head Start classrooms in Arizona. The children identified for the study met the requirements for Tier 2 Intervention and also were classified as low-income. The intervention schedule included twice weekly instruction for 6 weeks. Each intervention time lasted 20-25 minutes. The intervention program used scripted lessons with the teachers meeting during the intervention for
debriefing. The results of the study indicated improved beginning sound awareness in the children participating in the study.

Another Tier 2 intervention study (Toste et al., 2014) questioned the impact of Tier 2 intervention with 125 first grade students attending urban and suburban districts in Nashville. The study involved 3 years and three cohorts. The researchers concluded that the classification of nonresponsive or responsive was not clearly defined when recommending students for Tier 3. Tier 3 intervention is the most intense intervention for students. The impact of Tier 2 intervention was evident for students.

**Dyslexia**

The conversation about the impact of dyslexia on student achievement and instruction began in 1887 by Berlin (Millichap & Millichap, 1986). While the terms and terminology related to dyslexia have evolved through the years, researchers have documented a neurological link to dyslexia (Birsh, 2015). As with many other learning disabilities, intelligence impacts identification, so the label of specific learning disability given by Dr. Samuel T. Orton (Gillingham & Stillman, 1997) appears to be an appropriate fit for dyslexic students. The identification of dyslexic students can be challenging for classroom teachers since intelligence is not the obvious contributing factor. Rather, the factors are neurological. Signs and characteristics for learners with dyslexia include difficulty following directions, letter recall, sequencing, time management, and attention (Birsh, 2015). Other characteristics as noted by the International Dyslexia Association (2016) include difficulty comprehending long passages, reading quickly, and learning letters and sounds. One challenge is that these characteristics are not exclusive to dyslexic students and potentially are indicators of other concerns. The IDA indicated that 15-20% of the population may suffer from dyslexia symptoms. Assessment for dyslexic students, as
noted in the IDA fact sheet, includes phonological awareness, phonological memory, rapid automatic naming, and receptive language.

Considering that a percentage of population may demonstrate dyslexia symptoms without identification, college student beliefs, attitudes, and individual symptoms should be considered. Dyslexia related knowledge as related to candidates was examined by Washburn, Matesha Joshi, and Binks Cantrell (2013). These authors distributed a dyslexia survey to 171 candidates from three different universities, with two in the United States and one in Northern England. The survey administration occurred prior to the beginning of a 13-week course on reading and language. The survey consisted of 19 statements with a Likert scale to indicate the respondent’s level of knowledge or beliefs. The results indicated that the level of knowledge was similar between institutions.

Guyer and Sabatino (2001) conducted a study with 30 college students who attended a summer school at Marshall University. The study examined the impact on reading achievement if students were exposed to an Orton-Gillingham approach. The researchers used three techniques, including multisensory, non-phonetic and a control with the Orton-Gillingham group demonstrating the greatest gain in reading achievement scores. The Orton-Gillingham group included the following:

1. Teach letters and sounds including blends, diphthongs, prefixes, suffixes, etc.;
2. Teach the mnemonic device CLOVER; Closed, Consonant LE, Open, Vowel Pair, Magic E, Bossy R
3. Teach blending skills;
4. Teach left/right orientation;
5. Teach decodable rules;
6. Teach reading, spelling, and handwriting at the same time;
7. Teach dictionary skills;
8. Use graphic organizers;
9. Encourage subvocalizing when writing;
10. Encourage self-discovery of best individual sensory channel.

While one specific practice may not emerge as the best method, a multisensory approach appears to offer the best balance for dyslexic learners (Birsh, 2015). A multisensory approach to reading acquisition involves visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile (VAKT) methods during direct instruction (Millichap & Millichap, 1986). When reviewing the initial definition of dyslexia, the incorporation of VAKT appears appropriate and a potentially effective practice for all students (Birsh, 2015).

A quantitative study conducted by Schiffel, Shaw, and Shaw (2008) explored the Orton-Gillingham approach with first grade students. The researchers conducted this study in three elementary schools in a suburban district located in Colorado. Since the study involved a control, 224 children participated in the treatment group and 476 in the control group. The study included the training of teachers over the summer in the Orton-Gillingham approach. The training included 30 hours of in-service and follow-up visits during the school year. The researchers used the DIBELS assessment to measure student achievement three times during the year. The treatment group received 30 additional minutes of daily reading instruction using the Orton-Gillingham supplemental program. The researchers compared the treatment school to a control school without the Orton-Gillingham approach. At the mid assessment, the students in both the treatment and control schools scored similarly. The growth in the treatment school was evident at the last assessment at the conclusion of the school year. Of note, the students in the treatment
school became more homogenous than the control group, indicating that early interventions using Orton-Gillingham methods can impact the literacy development of students at an early age.

Schiff, Katzir, and Shoshan (2013) facilitated a quantitative study to examine the connection between vowelized and unvowelized Hebrew words as related to dyslexic students. The study included 133 Israeli children in the fourth and second grades. The fourth grade students were placed in two groups based on previous dyslexia identification. Since the dyslexic students performed below grade level, the third group for the study was comprised of second grade students without dyslexia identification. After a series of tests, the researcher concluded that children with identified dyslexia demonstrated similar reading speed as compared to their peer group, but the focused group instruction related to vowelized and unvowelized words led to the conclusion that dyslexic students do not rely on vowelized skills when reading. This result suggests potential future research in the area of skills used to read by dyslexic students. In other words, if students with dyslexia fail to rely on the vowel structure of words, they must acquire other strategies as they learn to read.

Berninger, Lee, Abbott, and Breznitz (2013) examined the connection between dyslexia and spelling difficulties. The quantitative study included 24 students with dyslexia identification in grades four to nine, with random treatment assignments provided in an afterschool setting at a university. The design of the research included providing similar treatment for all students as a baseline and then adding additional treatments to measure effectiveness. The students were involved in 30 lessons, which were 1 hour in length twice a week. The lessons included the baseline treatment with a focus on phonological and orthographic loop as utilized in the working memory model. Birsh (2015) defined working memory as the capacity of the brain to hold information for short periods of time. The working memory also allows individuals the
opportunity to manipulate information. Interest and motivation were also considered in lesson design. While the students demonstrated growth in phonological skills, the researchers found the addition of morphological awareness was key to improvement in reading skills. As with the previous study, the incorporation of other skills may have greater impact on student reading achievement than focused intervention in one skill. Dyslexic students appear to employ multiple strategies in literacy acquisition just as typical students.

Frequently teachers will suspect dyslexia in some children with reading difficulties, but are limited by the structure of identification in the school setting. Snowling, Duff, Petrou, Schiffeldrin, and Bailey (2011) hypothesized the connection between teacher suspected dyslexia and potential identification. After teacher identification of 73 at-risk 6-year-olds, the researchers individually administered a series of tests to determine the best tools for identification. The researchers received consent to test these children as a control. The children were tested individually and similar tests procedures for each student in the study were used. Results from multiple testing measures indicated a rapid automatic naming color test and sound isolation tests in combination provided the best verification of suspected dyslexia. Either test alone did not yield this result. One finding from the study was the ability of classroom teachers to correctly identify potential reading difficulties with at risk students. The other finding was that poor phonological awareness, verbal memory and verbal process speed were common difficulties of at-risk students suspected of being dyslexic. These findings support the important role of the teacher in identification, but fail to identify the best intervention practices for each student. While teachers are able to identify indicators for potential reading difficulty, formal identification of dyslexic students may not occur because of limitations on the identification process at the school level.
Hwee and Houghton (2011) determined the impact of Orton-Gillingham instruction when used with Singaporean primary-school-aged children. Seventy-seven students identified as dyslexic participated in the study. Three female teachers provided the instruction over the year study. The conclusion of the study indicated the Orton-Gillingham approach significantly impacted word recognition and word expression but not contextual decoding.

**Summary**

The literature review revealed diversity in studies and results as related to sense of efficacy. Central to the review is the work of Bandura (1977). The four sources of efficacy identified by Bandura can be applied to teacher practice. Performance accomplishments, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal are components of daily classroom interaction. The efficacy of teachers in designing and implementing lessons was explored by O’Leary et al. (2010) and Atiles et al. (2012). Impact on candidate sense of efficacy through phonics specific content course design and related field experience has not been because no studies on this specific topic have been identified in the literature.

The connection between teacher instructional practices and impact on student achievement in the area of phonics has been studied. Multiple researchers have explored the implementation of small group intervention in phonics with the focus on intervention based on environmental factors or methodologies. Vadsay and Sanders (2010), Olinghouse et al. (2006), Cihon et al. (2008), Shaw and Davidson (2009), and Noltemeyer et al. (2013) all conducted studies utilizing multiple methods for intervention. These studies focused on intervention rather than effective small group instruction for all students. The impact of dyslexia on student reading acquisition is related to methodologies. Gillingham and Stillman (1997) proposed a multisensory approach to teaching phonics related skills. The practices apply to dyslexic students. Schiffel et
al. (2008), Berninger et al. (2013), and Snowling et al. (2011) examined the impact of dyslexia on classroom instruction either through classroom practices or teacher identification. Since dyslexia diagnosis is neurobiological in nature, the identification of students may or may not happen by the classroom teacher. The practices of classroom teachers become central to the acquisition of literacy related skills since children with learning disabilities may not be identified. Scholars have examined the impact of small group instruction on primary aged students’ academic achievement. Also, multiple studies have examined the impact of Orton-Gillingham methods on primary aged students. The question remains whether the practices to benefit dyslexic learners could positively impact all learners, but since so many children are not identified, it behooves teachers to use the most effective methods they can.

There appears to be a gap in the literature related to sense of efficacy and candidates in the focus areas of phonemic awareness and phonics. The roles of background knowledge, methodology, dyslexia and pre-service teacher sense of efficacy have not been explored in a single study. The need exists to study the impact on candidates’ sense of efficacy when designing small group instruction using Orton-Gillingham related methods.
 CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

Considering Bandura’s (1977) efficacy framework, a structured course design connecting content courses and field experience might positively impact the sense of efficacy of candidates. The designed content course and field experience met the standards required for accreditation and state specific requirements for licensure. The impact of the experience on teacher candidates’ sense of efficacy was the focus of the current study.

Research Question

The research question of the study was, “Will the self-efficacy of pre-service teachers be impacted by the practicum experience associated with the phonics course?”

Research Design

The researcher designed this study to examine the effect on candidates’ sense of efficacy based on introducing a field experience during an undergraduate phonics content course. Focusing on the theoretical framework from Bandura (1977), the researcher incorporated vicarious experiences, performance accomplishments, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal in the phonics content course and field experience. The researcher used quantitative measures to assess sense of efficacy prior and post field experience. The researcher utilized the field experience associated with the phonics undergraduate course, as noted in Appendix C.

The researcher met with a local principal interested in the content and method experience and agreed to the candidate placements in kindergarten and pre-kindergarten classes. Once the agreement was established with the local school, the principal met with the researcher after the beginning of the academic school year. The institution requires a letter of understanding from a district before placing students. The researcher filed the letter prior to the experience. The verbal agreement between the researcher and principal is common. The principal requested a delay in
the field component, since the kindergarten teachers were familiarizing the children with the classroom structure and planned to individually assess each student. The classroom assessment was a recognized screener used at the beginning of the year, end of the first semester, and end of the year as part of the assessment cycle. The assessment was literacy based and would assist in the small group assignments. Since this was the initial time the course had been offered at the college and the field experience was new, the researcher delayed the initial field placement until the teachers were prepared.

During the first 4 weeks of the semester, the candidates were engaged in developing their content knowledge about phonemic awareness and phonics and the effective teaching of phonemic awareness and phonics. The candidates demonstrated proficiency in lesson design and content knowledge related to phonics prior to the implementation of small group instruction during the field experience. Proficiency in content knowledge consisted of meeting benchmark scores established by the instructor in a course-based assessment, as noted in the syllabus (see Appendix C). Included in the proficiency requirements was correct pronunciation of phonemes.

The methods aspect of the course included multisensory approaches to phonemic awareness and phonics instruction based upon Orton-Gillingham methods. As noted in the syllabus, the instructor spent 60 minutes of the 75-minute class covering the information and topics noted in the syllabus. The three-part drill, as outlined in the syllabus (Appendix C), included the following:

1. Visual drill: Student looks at letter, speaks letter name and sound;
2. Auditory drill: Student is asked to produce the sound a letter makes;
3. Tactile drill: Student uses tactile element such as a screen or sand to write and practice letters/words. Or kinesthetic drill: Movement is incorporated in the lesson to engage the midline and connect movement to skill.

Content information and pedagogical content knowledge were included in classroom instruction each week when the candidates are on campus. The instructor was able to select the material based on preference and experience. Raskinski and Padak’s (2013) selection met the pedagogy elements required in NAEYC (2008) Standard 5, elements 5.1 and 5.2. Two texts address the content elements of the course. Recipe for Reading (Traub & Bloom, 1975) and How to Teach Spelling (Rudginsky & Haskell, 1997) were primarily content knowledge, but included pedagogy. The two content texts were sequential and systematic. The instructor gave the candidates a deck of cards aligned with Traub and Bloom’s text, and used the deck during the three-part drill. The instructor presented the content knowledge in class and reviewed it at the end of each class. The instructor modeled and practiced the multisensory elements each instructional class time. The use of the deck of cards was the initial visual and auditory practice for the students. As noted in Table 1, the instructor devoted class time to content knowledge and pedagogy, with the instructor modeling supporting vicarious experience as suggested by Bandura (1977).

The required dyslexia content knowledge was represented in the Shaywitz (2005) text. The course designer chose the text because it presents content and transitions to pedagogy. The format for presentation was a class book club. Candidates were assigned required reading prior to book club meetings. Prior to book club discussions, the candidates wrote a reflective paper based on the reading. The candidates discuss during book club the elements of the book that added to their knowledge regarding dyslexia. The paper and discussion also provided an
opportunity for the instructor to monitor student content knowledge understanding. Verbal persuasion and emotional arousal were present in the book club meetings. The use of the book met the content knowledge dyslexia standards, as noted in Appendix C.

One course requirement was lesson writing with approval before instruction. Lesson plan formatting includes cumulative activities, which were designed as a brief review of the previous lesson, and direct instruction incorporating multisensory approaches. In the cumulative activity, the instructor reviewed the letter and sounds previously taught. Each lesson began with the cumulative activity before introducing the new skill. The three-part drill was part of the cumulative activity. The format incorporated standards, objectives, and instruction, including cumulative and VATK activities. Each lesson required two multisensory approaches with documentation. The lesson plan requirements were as follows:

1. Standard (Language Arts Standard);
2. Objective (based on Language Arts Standard);
3. Procedure (step-by-step for implementation);
4. Identified multisensory elements and three-part drill procedure.

The researcher, who also served as the instructor for the content and methods course, met with the candidates at the scheduled beginning of the fall semester. The initial measures of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Morgan and Hoy, 2001) and the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey designed by the researcher were not distributed to the candidates on the first day of class as planned. The content portion of the course began August 25, 2015 with the students meeting on campus for the content portion of the course. The scheduled class meeting days were Tuesday and Thursday, with the time assigned 9:15AM-10:45AM. During the scheduled class meetings, the instructor used Bandura’s principles (1977) to provide vicarious
experiences through lesson demonstrations and verbal persuasion regarding classroom participation by the candidates. During each class, the candidates practiced the three-part drill as part of performance accomplishment and verbal persuasion. The candidates followed this schedule until the field component began. The candidates then met with the instructor after each time in the field to debrief, but did not meet during the scheduled class time. During the debriefing period, the candidates shared their levels of emotional arousal. The instructor did not require a written response, but instead used the verbal persuasion during the debriefing time. The principal and classroom teachers agreed to the Tuesday and Thursday field experience with the candidates in the classrooms at 9:00. The candidates were expected to return to campus by 10:30AM for debriefing. The initial proposed design indicated a field placement beginning the fifth week of the semester. After meeting with the district principal, the initial week for the placement was the sixth week. At the conclusion of the semester, the measures were repeated as approved in the IRB.

Participants

The undergraduate students were pre-service early childhood teachers enrolled in a small liberal arts institution in northwest Ohio. The student body enrollment at the institution is between 600 and 800. Students from within the state and outside of the state may or may not pursue licensure in the State of Ohio. The participants were enrolled in a junior level reading methods course in phonics that included both content related to phonics and methods of how to teach phonics. The candidates were both traditional and nontraditional students. The candidates had completed various field experiences during the previous 2 years, with varied teaching experiences. These included early field experiences and observation, preschool observation, tutoring in a highly structured program and participation in art, music, and physical education
settings. The level of opportunity to teach varied for each candidate, depending upon their placement cooperating teacher. The connection of a field experience to course content had been a requirement in the past, so the course and field experience format was familiar to the candidates. The difference was the direct implementation of phonics knowledge and Orton-Gillingham methods to the field experience, with the expectation that the pre-service teachers would implement the lessons they plan for their small groups. Prior to this experience, the candidates had served as observers or in support roles.

**Instrumentation & Data Sources**

The study included two instruments, with one sense of efficacy measure and the other related to attitude and practice of phonemic awareness and phonics. The researcher created the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey (see Appendix E) for the candidates to indicate their beliefs regarding classroom practices prior to and after the phonics course and field experience. The researcher created the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics survey for the study to measure attitudes and confidence in order to provide a quantitative measure of general practices related to teaching phonics. The Phonemic Awareness and Phonics survey provided background information for qualitative measures related to the content of the course. Since the researcher created the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey for the purpose of the study, the researcher submitted the instrument to a panel of professors for review and feedback. After the researcher applied the professors’ feedback, the researcher submitted the measure to the IRB for approval. This survey provided an opportunity for insight into the participants’ attitudes and confidence regarding classroom practices, including time allotted for phonemic awareness and phonics. The performance accomplishments and confidence in lesson design was evident in the survey. A sense of efficacy is a judgment of individual ability and not content specific for the purpose of
this study. Attitudes and confidence in this study were content specific and included phonemic awareness and phonics.

The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form (Tschannen-Morgan & Hoy, 2001) was developed at The Ohio State University through a series of refining and testing. Once the 52 items were established for testing, the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form was tested three separate times before establishing the long form and short form. The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form provides three sub-scores including classroom management, instructional strategies and student engagement.

**Protection of Human Subjects**

The researcher received University of Findlay IRB approval before administering the research instruments (see Appendix A). The researcher also received IRB approval at Defiance College.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The researcher presented the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics survey to the classroom teachers in a paper form. Two consent forms were also given at the time of the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics survey, as noted in Appendix F. The teachers signed two consent forms and kept one for future reference. The kindergarten teachers completed the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics survey without the researcher in the room to maintain anonymity. The researcher collected the completed Phonemic Awareness and Phonics surveys in a labeled envelope in the central office of the building at the end of the school day. The researcher returned to the school for the completed forms.

The candidates who consented to participate in the study were given the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (see Appendix D) and the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics (see Appendix E)
during the first regularly scheduled fall class. An independent instructor took responsibility for
distribution and collection of both surveys. After the consent form was returned to the collector,
the researcher assigned a number and the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, and the Phonemic
Awareness and Phonics surveys were numbered to match. The numbering of the Teachers’ Sense
of Efficacy Scale and Phonemic Awareness and Phonics surveys was available only to the
researcher for statistical analysis. The designated instructor collected the completed surveys and
sealed them in an envelope. The researcher repeated this procedure at the end of the semester.
The independent instructor kept the envelope with the assigned numbers for reference when
completing the post-test to ensure consistency.

Data Analysis

The researcher gave the undergraduates the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale for an
initial score at the beginning of the semester and repeated at the end of the field experience. The
data analysis utilized a $t$-test using a paired sample. The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale
utilized sub-scores including student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom
management. The researcher analyzed the results of the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics
survey, as outlined in Table 1. The researcher analyzed the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics
survey based on frequency.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Test or measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the efficacy of pre-service teachers be impacted by the practicum experience associated with the phonics course?</td>
<td>Candidate sense of efficacy</td>
<td>Course and field experience</td>
<td>T-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher analyzed the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale using a $t$-test to determine the overall impact on sense of efficacy. All participating candidate scores were included to determine the overall impact. While the overall impact was the first step in answering the research question, the researcher analyzed individual data from the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale using the $t$-test to determine individual impact. The overall score may not have been sufficient information to answer the research question.

The researcher also conducted question level analysis from the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale using a $t$-test. Within the scale, there were identified questions related to classroom strategies. Since the central design of the course was content knowledge mastery and direct classroom application, the questions related to classroom strategies provided support when answering the research question. Analysis was based on individual questions and the overall results of questions identified as classroom strategy questions. The researcher examined the mean and $p$-values for each above mentioned analysis when answering the research question.

The researcher gave the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey to the candidates and classroom teachers for further analysis related to the content. During the initial analysis, the researcher examined the frequency in responses for questions related to lesson length, frequency of teaching lessons, and confidence in lesson design. The researcher examined the overall changes in frequency as indicated by the candidates’ answers. Since the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey was content specific, the data provided comparison regarding pre and post field experience, as well as a comparison to the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale.

The last analysis was the frequency responses from the classroom teachers and the candidates using the data from the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey. The researcher
used the pre field experience and post field experience data in the frequency comparison since
the classroom teachers were given the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey once.

**Record Retention**

The data were stored on a password protected, non-Internet connected computer in the
program chair’s office. Data will be stored for the time prescribed by the law and then deleted.

**Assumptions**

The design of the study assumed that the small group phonics instruction planned through
the phonics course occurs during a school day. The researcher assumed that the kindergarten
teachers participating in the study provided reading instruction throughout the day and include
phonemic awareness and phonics. The researcher was not able to determine if the instruction was
whole or small group in design. The practices of the classroom teachers may have impacted the
candidates’ sense of efficacy scores. The researcher was not able to determine the level of that
influence.

Because the candidates have not previously taken a methods course with a field
experience, the researcher assumed that this field experience included their first experience with
consecutive planning. Previously, the candidates had engaged in singular lesson design or lesson
design without implementation. This experience was the first time they completed a planning
cycle of assessment, instruction, and assessment. While the candidates were not completing the
initial assessment, dialogue with the classroom teacher provided the assessment results and needs
for lesson design. The researcher assumed that the candidates incorporated multiple strategies
that apply to the needs of their small groups, which could not be anticipated prior to the study.
The needs of the small group were determined by district-approved assessment with the resulting
instructional design fitting the needs of the group.
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

The sense of efficacy of candidates may be impacted by the field experience associated with a content related course. Content courses are designed to explain and evaluate mastery specific to the content with methods courses providing an opportunity for application of content. The study examined the impact on candidate sense of efficacy when content and methods were taken concurrently. Within the NAEYC (2010) standards, as noted in Appendix G, Standard 5 provided the rationale elements for the design of the content course and related methods experience. Using Bandura’s (1977) sense of efficacy framework, the researcher examined the connection between standards-based instruction and candidates’ sense of efficacy.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form was developed at The Ohio State University, with the seminar members creating a list of 100 items based on Bandura’s expanded scale and member generated items. The 100 items were nominated, discussed, and revised until the list had 52 items. Once the 52 items were established for testing, the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form was studied three separate times before establishing the long form and short form. The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form provides three sub-scores. The researchers analyzed the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale based on candidates’ and classroom teachers’ responses to determine appropriateness (Tschannen-Morgan & Hoy, 2001). The recommendation for candidates was the long form instead of the short version, which contains 12 test items. The researchers examined the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long and Short Forms for content validity. Since the measure was created at The Ohio State University, the researchers examined the construct validity of both the long and short forms by comparing the
new scale to existing measures. The scores range from one (“nothing”) to nine (“a great deal”), with five (“some influence”) providing the midpoint.

Table 2

*Mean for Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form Including the OSTES and Three Sub-scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’s Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form (Tschannen-Morgan &amp; Hoy, 2001)</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSTES</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher gave the candidates the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form. Tschannen-Morgan and Hoy (2001) developed this instrument, which is also referred to as the Ohio Teacher Efficacy Scale. The researchers tested this measure in three separate studies to determine final selection of items for the scale and reliability. The researchers established validity by addressing the correlation of the new measure with previous measures, since previous measures were examined in the construction of the new scale. The analysis indicated that the new measure could be reasonably valid. The current researcher used the long form and included sense of efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale is comprised of 24 questions. The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale ranges from one to nine. The question design of the instrument is general and can be applied to the field experience utilized in the study. Candidates completed the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale by answering all 24 questions. The researcher utilized the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale twice during the study, once at the beginning of the course and again at the end, to address the research question about sense of efficacy.
Table 3 addresses the reliability of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale. As listed in the table, the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale incorporates three separate elements: engagement, instruction, and management. The researcher examined sub-scores for each area, since all impact efficacies. The mean is the average of the summed values divided by the number of values. The standard deviation is the measure of how clustered the scores are to the mean. The lower the standard deviation, the tighter the scores are clustered to the mean. The higher the standard deviation, the greater the spread in scores.

Table 3

*Reliability for Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Sense of Teacher Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement Sub-score</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Strategies Sub-score</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management Sub-score</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in Table 3, there are three sub-scores within the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale: motivation, engagement, and instructional strategies can be analyzed. The researcher analyzed the pre and post scores in each sub-score to note significance. The researcher used a *t*-score to compare the sub-scores for each category.
Table 4

*Questions Included in Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Sub-score category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?</td>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to help your students think critically?</td>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?</td>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?</td>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to help your students value learning?</td>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to foster student creativity?</td>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?</td>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well can you respond to defiant students?</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?</td>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 1**

The research question that guided this study was, “Will the self-efficacy of pre-service teachers be impacted by the practicum experience associated with the phonics course?”

The mean scores using The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M=7.62-7.67$) are noted in Table 5. Results indicated that $t(167) = 0.46, p=0.65$. The $p$-value of 0.65 ($p<0.05$) indicates that the results failed to reject the null hypothesis. There was no evidence to suggest that scores changed from pre to post experience. Table 5 provides a group score for the sample.
Table 5

Candidates’ Pre- and Post-Experience Mean, Standard Deviation, T-Value and P-Value Scores from Candidates Using Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form (N=7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pre-experience mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Post-experience mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire candidate sample</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form provided individual scores for each candidate. The researcher performed a t-test with two tails to compare the sample (n=7) prior to field experience and post field experience. The pre-experience score mean ranged from 6.26 to 8.74, and post scores ranged from 7.21 to 7.96, as noted in Table 6. Four candidates’ scores indicated a decreased mean score, while three candidates had increased mean scores. Three candidates’ scores (n=7) had a p-value greater than 0.05, so the results fail to reject the null hypothesis. Four of the candidates indicated p-value less than 0.05, so the researcher rejected the null hypothesis as related to the research question.

Table 6

Individual Candidate Pre-Experience and Post-Experience Mean, Standard Deviation, T-Value and P-Value Scores from Candidates Using Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form (N=7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Pre-experience score mean (SD)</th>
<th>Post-experience score mean (SD)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #4</td>
<td>8.47 (0.84)</td>
<td>7.91 (1.24)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #10</td>
<td>6.26 (0.98)</td>
<td>7.96 (1.84)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #12</td>
<td>8.13 (0.95)</td>
<td>7.33 (0.82)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #17</td>
<td>7.25 (0.74)</td>
<td>7.21 (0.83)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #18</td>
<td>7.20 (1.21)</td>
<td>7.75 (1.03)</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #24</td>
<td>8.75 (0.44)</td>
<td>7.91 (0.72)</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #27</td>
<td>7.29 (1.04)</td>
<td>7.66 (0.87)</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Established in the creation of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form, the scale provided three sub-scores. Each sub-score consisted of eight questions. The researcher analyzed the candidates’ sub-scores using a two-tailed t-test. Pre-experience student engagement mean scores, as noted in Table 7, ranged from 6.38 to 8.88, while post-experience mean scores ranged from 6.63 to 8.50. Four candidates’ scores of the sample (n=7) had a p-value greater than 0.05, so the results failed to reject the null hypothesis. Three of the candidates’ scores indicated p-value less than 0.05, so the researcher rejected the null hypothesis as related to student engagement.

Table 7

*Individual Candidate Pre-Experience and Post-Experience Student Engagement Mean, Standard Deviation, T-Value and P-Value Scores from Candidates Using Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (N=7)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student engagement</th>
<th>Pre-experience score mean (SD)</th>
<th>Post-experience score mean (SD)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #4</td>
<td>7.75 (1.04)</td>
<td>6.63 (0.74)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #10</td>
<td>6.38 (0.92)</td>
<td>8.50 (0.76)</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #12</td>
<td>7.75 (1.16)</td>
<td>7.50 (0.92)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #17</td>
<td>7.40 (0.92)</td>
<td>7.00 (1.20)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #18</td>
<td>6.75 (0.87)</td>
<td>7.50 (1.20)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #24</td>
<td>8.88 (0.35)</td>
<td>7.75 (0.70)</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #27</td>
<td>7.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>7.75 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-experience classroom management mean scores, as noted in Table 8, ranged from 6.75 to 8.88, while post-experience mean scores ranged from 7.25 to 8.63. Five candidates’ scores of the sample (n=7) had a p-value greater than 0.05, so the results failed to reject the null hypothesis. Two of the candidates indicated p-values less than 0.05, so the researcher rejected the null hypothesis as related to classroom management.
Table 8

Individual Candidate Pre-Experience and Post-Experience Classroom Management Mean, Standard Deviation, T-Value and P-Value Scores from Candidates Using Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form (N=7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom management</th>
<th>Pre-experience score mean (SD)</th>
<th>Post-experience score mean (SD)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #4</td>
<td>8.88 (0.35)</td>
<td>8.63 (0.52)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #10</td>
<td>6.75 (0.71)</td>
<td>7.25 (3.01)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #12</td>
<td>8.50 (0.76)</td>
<td>7.50 (0.76)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #17</td>
<td>7.40 (0.74)</td>
<td>7.50 (0.53)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #18</td>
<td>8.13 (0.99)</td>
<td>8.00 (0.93)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #24</td>
<td>8.63 (0.52)</td>
<td>7.75 (0.89)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #27</td>
<td>7.25 (1.49)</td>
<td>7.88 (0.64)</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-experience instructional strategies mean scores, as noted in Table 9, ranged from 5.50 to 8.88, while post-experience mean scores ranged from 7.00 to 8.50. Four candidates’ scores of the sample (n=7) had a p-value greater than 0.05, so the results failed to reject the null hypothesis. Three of the candidates’ scores indicated p-values less than 0.05, so the researcher rejected the null hypothesis as related to instructional strategies.

Table 9

Individual Candidate Pre-Experience and Post-Experience Instructional Strategies Mean, Standard Deviation, T-Value and P-Value Scores from Candidates Using Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form (N=7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional strategies</th>
<th>Pre-experience score mean (SD)</th>
<th>Post-experience score mean (SD)</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #4</td>
<td>8.88 (0.35)</td>
<td>8.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #10</td>
<td>5.50 (0.92)</td>
<td>8.00 (0.76)</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #12</td>
<td>8.13 (0.83)</td>
<td>7.00 (0.76)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #17</td>
<td>7.00 (0.53)</td>
<td>7.13 (0.64)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #18</td>
<td>6.75 (1.28)</td>
<td>7.75 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form provided question level analysis for the study. The researcher conducted a two-tailed t-test to compare sub-scores prior and post field experience. The pre-experience mean scores for the sub-scores ranged from 7.45 to 7.93, as indicated in Table 10. The post-experience mean scores for the sub-scores ranged from 7.52 to 7.79. The p-values ranged from 0.22 to 0.79, as indicated in Table 10. Student engagement classroom management and instructional strategies questions had a p-value greater than 0.05, so the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pre-experience mean (SD)</th>
<th>Post-experience mean (SD)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>7.45 (1.13)</td>
<td>7.52 (1.03)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>7.93 (1.11)</td>
<td>7.79 (1.32)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>7.46 (1.36)</td>
<td>7.71 (0.99)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher conducted a Phonemic Awareness and Phonics survey to compare weekly planning and teaching of phonemic awareness based on frequency of weekly lesson instruction and instruction time for each lesson. The Phonemic Awareness and Phonics survey was given prior to and post field experience. As indicated in Table 11, one candidate expressed in the pre-experience survey that phonemic awareness should be taught daily. The number of candidates
indicating phonemic awareness should be taught daily increased to three in the post-experience survey. The remaining candidates in the sample indicated that phonemic awareness should be taught two or three times per week. None of the sample indicated one time per week either time the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics survey was given. When analyzing the data in terms of percentages, the pre-experience responses indicated that 14% of the sample would teach phonemic awareness daily, compared to 43% in post responses. The response to 2-3 times weekly was 86% pre-experience and 57% post.

Table 11

*Frequency of Responses from Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey of Recommended Number of Phonemic Awareness Lessons Taught Weekly (N=7)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonemic awareness</th>
<th>Pre-experience responses (percentage)</th>
<th>Post-experience responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3 times weekly</td>
<td>6 (86%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time weekly</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The time for each lesson is indicated in Table 12, with the change in candidate response in the 20-30 instructional minute lesson and 10 minutes or less. The pre- and post-Phonemic Awareness and Phonics survey indicated that six of the seven candidates would design instructional lessons 10-19 minutes in length. One candidate indicated in the pre-experience survey that lessons should be 20-30 minutes in length. The post-experience survey noted that one student selected the option for less than 10 minutes, while no one marked the 20-30 minute length.
Table 12

*Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey Responses Regarding Instructional Phonemic Awareness Lesson Length (N=7)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonemic awareness</th>
<th>Pre-experience responses (percentage)</th>
<th>Post-experience responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30 minutes</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 minutes</td>
<td>6 (86%)</td>
<td>6 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher conducted a Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey to compare weekly planning and teaching of phonics based on frequency of weekly lesson instruction and instruction time for each lesson. The Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey was given pre-experience and post-experience to the candidates. As indicated in Table 13, two candidates indicated the need for daily instruction prior to the field experience. This increased to five candidates post-experience. None of the sample indicated one time per week on either survey. When analyzing the data in terms of percentages, the pre-experience responses indicated that 28% of the sample would teach phonics daily, compared to 57% in post responses. The response to 2-3 times weekly was 71% pre and 43% post.

Table 13

*Frequency of Responses from Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey of Recommended Number of Phonics Lessons Taught Weekly (N=7)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonics</th>
<th>Pre-experience responses (percentage)</th>
<th>Post-experience responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>2 (28%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3 times weekly</td>
<td>5 (71%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time weekly</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The time for each lesson is indicated in Table 14, with the change in candidate response in the 20-30 instructional minute lesson and 10-19 instructional minutes. The pre-Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey indicated that three of the seven candidates would design instructional lessons 20-30 minutes in length, with two indicating so post-experience. None of the candidates indicated less than 10 instructional minutes on either the pre or post survey.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonics</th>
<th>Pre-experience responses (percentage)*</th>
<th>Post-experience responses** (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30 minutes</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
<td>2 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 minutes</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
<td>5 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *n=5, **n=7

The researcher conducted the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey to compare weekly planning and teaching of phonemic awareness based on frequency of weekly lesson instruction and instruction time for each lesson. The Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey was given pre- and post-experience to the candidates. The Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey asked the candidates to indicate a level of confidence in lesson design. As noted in Table 15, 28% of the candidates indicated “very confident” and the same percentage in “confident” in phonemic awareness design in the pre-response. Unsure responses were 43% in the pre-survey and 14% in the post-survey. The percentages in the pre-experience responses did not include the entire sample, due to a problem with the double-sided copying. The researcher printed the pre-experience Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey on both sides, and two candidates did not complete the back questions.
Table 15

*Candidate Responses from Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey Based on Phonemic Awareness Lesson Design Confidence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonemic Awareness</th>
<th>Pre-experience responses (percentage)*</th>
<th>Post-experience responses (percentage)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Confident</td>
<td>2 (28%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>2 (28%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Confident</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *n=5, **n=7

The Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey asked the candidates to indicate a level of confidence in lesson design. As noted in Table 16, 28% of the candidates indicated that they were confident; the same percentage reported that they were unsure of phonics design in the pre-experience responses. The percentages changed in the post-experience responses, with 28% very confident and 57% confident. The percentages in the pre-experience responses did not include the entire sample, due to the double-sided copying issue described earlier. The researcher therefore printed the post-experience Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey on two separate sheets of paper.

Table 16

*Candidate Responses from Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey Based on Phonics Lesson Design Confidence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonics</th>
<th>Pre-experience responses (percentage)*</th>
<th>Post-experience responses (percentage)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Confident</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>2 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>2 (28%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2 (28%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Confident</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *n=5, **n=7
The Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey asked the classroom teachers to indicate the number of times that they taught phonemic instruction and phonics per week. When compared to the post-experience candidates’ responses, the classroom teachers reported teaching phonemic awareness and phonics with greater regularity than the candidates, as noted in Tables 17 and 18.

Table 17

*Frequency of Responses from Classroom Teachers and Candidates Using the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey of Recommended Number of Phonemic Awareness Lessons Taught Weekly*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonemic Awareness</th>
<th>Classroom teacher responses* (percentage)</th>
<th>Candidate post-experience responses** (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3 times weekly</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time weekly</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *n=5, **n=7

Table 18

*Frequency of Responses from Classroom Teachers and Candidates Using the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey of Recommended Number of Phonics Lessons Taught Weekly*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonics</th>
<th>Classroom teacher responses* (percentage)</th>
<th>Candidate post-experience responses** (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3 times weekly</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time weekly</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *n=5, **n=7

The Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey also asked the classroom teachers to indicate the resources used when designing lessons. Responses indicated that 60% of the teachers
used the adopted series for half of phonemic awareness lesson design and used half teacher-created materials (see Table 19).

Table 19

*Frequency of Classroom Teachers’ Responses Regarding Materials Used for Phonemic Awareness Lesson Design (N=5)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonemic Awareness</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always Use Published Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half from series/Half-created</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Use Published Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=5

The phonics item appeared at the top of the second page, and when the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Surveys were returned, the second page on one survey was not included. Responses are noted in Table 20. The researcher was not able to use the data from the items related to instructional lesson length. Several teachers indicated multiple responses for each item indicated they taught phonemic awareness and phonics at multiple times for multiple lengths.

The classroom teachers also indicated they taught phonemic awareness and phonics in small and large group design.

Table 20

*Frequency of Classroom Teachers’ Responses Regarding Materials Used for Phonics Lesson Design (N=5)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always Use Published Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half- from series/Half-created</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Use Published Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=5
When comparing the two measures, Candidates #4 demonstrated a decrease in overall and instruction mean scores on the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form and remained very confident in lesson design as indicted on the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey. Candidate #24 also demonstrated a decrease in mean scores and remained unchanged in confidence. The mean scores for Candidate #27 increased and confidence in lesson design also increased. Candidate #10 indicated an increase in mean scores but did not respond on the initial survey in lesson design so the comparison cannot be made. Candidate #12 demonstrated a decrease in mean scores and decrease in phonemic awareness lesson design. The initial survey was unanswered in the phonics lesson design question. Candidate #17 indicated an increase in instructional strategy mean scores and an increase lesson design confidence. Candidate #18 remained unsure in confidence when designing both phonemic awareness and phonics lessons.
Table 21

Change in Mean Scores in Overall Score and Instructional Strategies Questions on Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form based on Pre-Experience and Post-Experience and Change in Confidence in Lesson Design in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics (N=7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Overall mean score</th>
<th>Instructional strategies mean score</th>
<th>Confidence in phonemic awareness lesson design (post survey)</th>
<th>Confidence in phonics lesson design (post survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #4</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Very confident (Very confident)</td>
<td>Very confident (Very confident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #10</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #12</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #17</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Unsure (Confident)</td>
<td>Unsure (Confident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #18</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Unsure (Unsure)</td>
<td>Unsure (Unsure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #24</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Confident (Confident)</td>
<td>Confident (Confident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #27</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Confident (Very confident)</td>
<td>Confident (Very confident)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *=candidate did not complete pre survey

Summary

The results of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale and Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey indicated changes in sense of efficacy and attitudes toward content related instruction. Research Question 1 asked how the field experience in phonics might affect the sense of efficacy of the candidates as measured by Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale. While the whole Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale results may have caused the researcher to accept the null hypothesis, the individual results cause further examination. Overall, the null hypothesis must be retained. The overall experience did not impact the sense of efficacy of the candidates.
Applying the research question to individual candidates, the results were mixed. Four of the candidates’ sense of efficacy was impacted by the experience, while three of the candidates’ sense of efficacy was not.

The use of the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey provided insight regarding the changes in attitudes of the candidates. The items on the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey were content specific to further measure any changes based on the content course and field experience relationship. The overall responses in the survey indicated that the candidates were more confident in phonemic awareness and phonic lesson design, as noted in the post-experience survey. The candidates also indicated that phonemic awareness and phonics should be taught with more regularity when compared to the pre-experience survey.
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Bandura’s (1977) framework for efficacy was the theoretical foundation for this study. The current researcher examined the impact on candidates’ sense of efficacy, as measured at the beginning of a semester and repeated at the end of the semester after completing a content course and related field experience.

Review of the Study

The relationship between content course expectations and field related experiences may have impacted the sense of efficacy of candidates. The content course and field experience are standards based with objectives and activities designed to meet the standards. With a Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale and Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey as measures, the researcher examined the impact on candidates’ sense of efficacy based on the field related experience as connected to a content and methods course.

Discussion

Research Question 1. The research question asked, “Will the self-efficacy of pre-service teachers be impacted by the practicum experience associated with the phonics course?”

Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale. When initially analyzing the data from the overall pre-experience and post-experience Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale results, the acceptance of a null hypothesis must be made indicating the field experience did not impact candidates’ sense of efficacy based on the $p$-value 0.645, $p<0.005$. Since the initial analysis provided an overall view of the experience, it failed to address the impact on the individual, so further analysis was critical. Bayraktar (2011) failed to determine the impact of content and method courses in the attitudes and beliefs of the candidates. Based on this initial analysis, the current study provides no clear connection between attitudes and beliefs as related to a content and methods course. It is
reasonable to assume that there is an overall lack of impact on sense of efficacy. The generalization, based on the overall $p$-value, requires further analysis to determine the potential impact on individuals. Bayraktar did conclude the attitudes of pre-service teachers evolved over the 4 years of undergraduate studies. This study provided only a semester examination of one small sample.

The individual scores provided greater insight regarding the change in sense of efficacy. Three of the candidates’ overall scores on the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale had $p$-value scores greater than 0.05, so the conclusion may be made the field experience did not impact their level of sense of efficacy. The four remaining candidates indicated a $p$-value less than 0.05, meaning that sense of efficacy was potentially impacted. The changes in mean scores suggested that the impact may be attributed to individual factors not examined in this study. The overall mean scores demonstrated a decrease for five of the candidates, but increased for two. Garvis et al. (2011) concluded that the decrease in mean scores might be contributed to a more realistic view of the profession. These researchers noted the lowest mean scores in the final semester of study. The same conclusion might be made in this study. The candidates involved in the study were enrolled in their third year of undergraduate studies. It is possible the candidates entered the experience with elevated mean scores and exited with realistic mean scores. If this conclusion is accurate, the experience did impact the sense of efficacy in a positive way since the candidates might have a better and a more realistic understanding of the challenges of teaching. This new realization might lead teacher candidates to a lower sense of self-efficacy even as their teaching skills increase. To further examine the impact, the researcher categorized mean scores and $p$-values. Mean scores were classified as decrease and increase when comparing the pre-experience and post-experience scores.
Table 22

*Change in Mean Scores in Overall Score, Student Engagement, Classroom Management and Instructional Strategies Questions on Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form based on Pre-Experience and Post-Experience (N=7)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Overall mean score</th>
<th>Student engagement mean score</th>
<th>Classroom management mean score</th>
<th>Instructional strategies mean score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #4</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #10</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #12</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #17</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #18</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #24</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #27</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23

*Change in P-Value Scores in Overall Score, Student Engagement, Classroom Management and Instructional Strategies Questions on Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form based on Pre-Experience and Post-Experience (N=7)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Overall p-value score</th>
<th>Student engagement p-value score</th>
<th>Classroom management p-value score</th>
<th>Instructional strategies p-value score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #17</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate #27</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyzing each candidate highlights the complex results of the study and leads to future research. Candidate #4 demonstrated a decrease in mean scores on Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale in overall score, student engagement, classroom management, and instructional strategies. The lowest score occurred in student engagement, which might lead to the conclusion that the candidate has higher levels of sense of efficacy in classroom management and instructional strategies. A possible conclusion for the candidate could be that sense of efficacy is adequate in selecting strategies and managing students, but deficient in engagement. Garvis et al. (2011) note that a changing sense of self-efficacy may be related to candidate’s experience under actual teaching conditions. Therefore, the differences in field placement may also impact the sense of self-efficacy, with less challenging placements contributing to a higher sense of self-efficacy in classroom management and more challenging placements contributing to a lower sense of self-efficacy in classroom management. Similar conclusions might be made regarding self-efficacy in student engagement and instructional strategies. Lesson implementation in the field could have impacted the results. The candidate might have experienced several lessons where the students were not engaged. Without further information from the field, the researcher must consider outside influences.

Continuing the candidate analysis, Candidate #10 demonstrated an increase in mean scores in overall, student engagement, classroom management and instructional strategies. The p-value scores indicated that classroom management was not significantly impacted by the experience. Again, this score could have been influenced by the field experience. As discussed in Chapter I, the researcher was not able to attend and observe each lesson taught by the candidates. The management strategies used by classroom teacher may have influenced the score. The
candidate may have been placed with a teacher who exhibited similar management as the candidate or the candidate was very comfortable with the management.

Candidate #12, similar to Candidate #4, indicated lower post-experience mean scores in the four measured areas on the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale. The $p$-value indicated student engagement was not significantly impacted. Once again, the role of the experience may have impacted the response by the student. Candidate #17 was not significantly impacted by the experience in all of the areas examined on the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale. While not significant, the mean scores in classroom management and instructional strategies increased.

Candidate #18 demonstrated an increase in mean scores for student engagement and instructional strategies. One potential influence for the increase could be the content portion of the experience. The candidate may have applied the content learned in the classroom prior to the field experience and the impact is noted in the increased mean scores. The focus of the content, in addition to the basic knowledge associated with phonemic awareness and phonics, included field application and practice. Although the mean increased in the two areas mentioned, there was only significant impact in instructional strategies.

Candidate #24 provided a strong argument for the relationship between mean scores decreasing and p-values significance. The mean scores for all areas decreased while the p-values demonstrated significance. The study by Garvis et al. (2011) might apply to Candidate #24. Once again, the study conducted by Garvis et al. concluded the decrease in mean score could account for a greater understanding of the profession. The candidate may have entered the semester with an elevated or unrealistic level of sense of efficacy. The experience impacted the level of sense of efficacy and the candidate exited with a realistic and authentic sense of sense of efficacy.
The last candidate analyzed, Candidate #27, noted an increase in mean scores and no marginally significant impact on sense of efficacy. As with the previous student analysis, the study by Garvis et al. (2011) might provide a possible explanation. The evidence suggested Candidate #27 entered with a very low level of sense of efficacy.

The complexities of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale analysis within each candidate did not prove conclusive. The limitations of the study potentially impacted the results. The small sample, one district for the field experience, the college instructor, and the classroom teacher all contributed to the results with the researcher unable to determine the specificity of the influence. The relationship between the candidate and classroom teacher could have greatly influenced the post experience results. The complexities of the structure of the study and limitations can suggest further study.

The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale results were not content specific. While Atiles et al. (2012) modified the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale questions for content specific collection, the researcher in this study chose to create a survey to measure content knowledge. Since the analysis of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale generated individual patterns in general, the content measure viewed the changing attitude toward instruction specifically in phonemic awareness and phonics.

**Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey.** Since the researcher created the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey to determine the content-related impact of the course, the evidence contributes to the overall impact of the experience. Unfortunately, the P.A.P.S. could not be determined to be valid or reliable. Therefore, the finding generated by this instrument may be suggestive and invite further inquiry but not conclusive. However, the researcher did have outside experts review the survey and make recommendations. The survey was also approved by
the IRB committee at both of the involved institutions of higher education. The researcher designed the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey to determine the attitudes regarding weekly instruction, timing of lessons, and confidence in lesson design prior and post experience. In the area of phonemic awareness, the candidates demonstrated a change in their beliefs about weekly instructional practices. The weekly frequency of phonemic awareness lessons taught increased from two or three times per week with more candidates indicating daily in the post-experience results. Similar results applied to phonics instruction. The candidates indicated a change in attitude toward the frequency of lesson delivery and indicated after the experience that phonics instruction should happen with more frequency in a weekly schedule. Candidates reported similar responses in both the pre- and post-Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey, indicating a preferred instructional lesson length for 10-19 minutes. The decrease in responses in the 20-30 minute instruction could be due to the field experience since they provided small group instruction that could not exceed an instructional lesson length of 19 minutes. These results align with typical lessons designed for kindergarten students. The candidates may have become aware of the limited attention span of kindergarten children through the experience.

The responses in designing lesson indicated more candidates were very confident and confident in phonemic awareness lesson design at the end of the field experience. The same can be applied to phonics lesson design. The phonics pre-experience score does not total 100%, since two candidates did not complete the back side of the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey. The results from the survey conclude the candidates are more confident in lesson design. Comparing the overall frequency of responses on the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey to the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale sub-score in instructional design, the results are not consistent. The candidates indicated more confidence on the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics
Survey, but the $p$-value for Instructional Strategies on Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale was not significant. It is important to consider the general nature of the questions on Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale. The viewpoint of the candidates would have been general when answering the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale even though the measures were administered in the same setting.

The casual relationship between the candidates and the classroom teachers is undetermined and could have impacted the responses on both measures. The classroom teachers indicated on the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey that phonics lessons are both used from the approved series and created by the teacher. Similar responses were given in phonemic awareness, with the exception of one teacher, who indicated lessons are never taken from the basal. The practices of the classroom teachers and influence on the candidates were not measured in the study but could have contributed to the responses on the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale in the instructional strategies sub-score. Kotaman et al. (2007) interviewed first grade teachers and discovered the plurality of the understanding of phonics. If the candidates were placed with teachers who expressed differing viewpoints regarding phonics compared to the content presented by the instructor, there could have been individual discord. Examining the practices of the classroom teachers might provide insight. The classroom teacher and field experiences are critical to professional dispositions. The responses on the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey indicating increased confidence in lesson design could be attributed to the college instructor and the content portion of the experience. The influence can only be hypothesized since quantitative data does not support or disprove the influence. Repeating the study with a larger sample might provide greater insight.
The ultimate effect on the candidates might be individual and related to sense of efficacy in reading related skills. The candidates’ background and experience in learning to read may have been a factor and individual growth could have occurred. Guyer and Sabatino (2001) used Orton-Gillingham training with college students and found significant progress in reading. The candidates in the study may have entered with limited experience in phonemic awareness and phonics and the course impacted what could have been labeled as their personal sense of efficacy. The current researcher did not evaluate the reading ability of the candidates, but the possibility exists there could have been an increase in candidate reading ability. The influence may or may not be evident in the measures since the two measures focused on the role of a teacher and not a student.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the sub-scores related to student engagement, classroom management, and instructional strategies were not significant.

The correlation between the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale and Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey might provide additional insight regarding the impact on efficacy and the confidence in lesson design. The validity of the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey was not established so the study cannot make conclusions. Since the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale included a sub-score for instructional strategies, the comparison can be made between the
individual sub-scores and the individual responses regarding confidence in lesson design. Bayraktar (2011) noted an increase in attitudes as measured in the freshman year to the senior year, but failed to note the impact of a methods course on attitude. Bayraktar noted that the lowest mean scores were in the final semester of undergraduate studies. The same could be possible in this study. If the researcher evaluated the attitudes of the candidates during each of the 4 years the candidates were enrolled, the impact of methods might be evident.

The results of the study were not conclusive for the individuals, since an identifiable correlation between mean scores on the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale and changes in confidence on the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey were not consistent. The researcher was also not able to determine the impact of the field experience on the change in confidence. The failure of the study to address the impact leads to further questions regarding the influence of the implementation of lessons and the relationship to change in confidence.

The researcher could hypothesize that candidates who were able to design and implement lessons demonstrated a positive change in confidence regarding lesson design. The researcher must be careful to hypothesize that the change in mean score would increase, since an increased mean score does not necessarily indicate an increase in confidence. Rushton (2003) concluded that field experience impacted the candidates, but failed to determine the level of influence.

Since the field experience and course content incorporated multisensory instruction, Putney and Cass (1998) examined the attitudes of candidates toward math prior and post a course designed where manipulatives were used. The results of the study also indicated a positive increase in attitudes when using manipulatives. This study included multisensory instruction, but the researcher was unable to determine the role of multisensory instruction in the field component. Once again, the ability or inability of the candidate to practice and deliver lessons
using the methodologies and strategies modeled in the content class could have impacted the level of confidence.

**Conclusion**

Based on the results, it appears that the field experience failed to have an overall positive impact on candidates’ sense of efficacy. Individual candidates may or may not have experienced an impact on sense of efficacy. The changes in individual scores and the lack of measurable differences in the aggregate study population suggests that several factors may be at work. One possibility is that the study failed to adequately identify and/or measure the factors that impact teacher candidates’ sense of self-efficacy. Another possibility is that changes in teacher candidates’ sense of self-efficacy is highly individualized and personal in nature. Thirdly, changes to self-efficacy may be related to the teaching context. Fourthly, no change to or even a decrease in teacher candidates’ sense of self-efficacy may be a normal part of teacher candidate development as they encounter the realities of teaching, as suggested by prior research. Finally, a combination of these factors may be impact each individual teacher candidate’s sense of self-efficacy.

The conclusion may not be made that a decrease in mean score indicated a negative impact on sense of efficacy and the same conclusion could be made for an increase in mean scores. The analysis of the individual scores on the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale did not provide a clear conclusion or pattern for future field experiences. Several factors may have influenced the individual results. One factor may be previous field experiences—both positive and negative—which impacted sense of efficacy. There is no established data regarding the candidates and their level of sense of efficacy. Another factor could have been the classroom teacher and the feedback. Since Bandura’s (1977) framework includes verbal persuasion, the
feedback from the classroom teacher could have been a factor. The feedback from the course instructor may also have impacted any changes in sense of efficacy. The researcher did not document the dialogue with each candidate. As Bandura indicated, verbal persuasion is readily accessible and frequently used. Qualitative measures would have provided insight regarding the influence of verbal persuasion. The influence of the classroom teacher deserves further examination, but the study failed to include qualitative appropriate measures.

It appears from the responses on the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey that the candidates’ attitudes changed toward the frequency in weekly instructional opportunities. Several factors may have impacted this change. The consistent schedule may have influenced this change because the candidates were in the classrooms twice a week and experienced the value of routine. They also may have been influenced by the attitudes of the classroom teachers and their practices. The study did not include such data, but there is a possibility that the practices of the classroom teacher influenced the candidates. As indicated by the classroom teacher, over half of the responses indicated the classroom teachers use the adopted series half of the time when designing lessons. This might have impacted the candidates since they are expected to design lessons in the content class based on standards without an adopted series. The practices of the classroom teachers might have impacted the candidates’ responses. It is also possible that the candidates were able to identify academic growth in the students and were influenced. Since lesson design and implementation were requirements of the course and field component, the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey indicated that the candidates are more confident. When examining the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey, it was difficult to determine if the change in attitudes is related to the field experience or the course content. The use of a control group would provide insight since question design might not be sufficient.
**Recommendations**

When making recommendations, the researcher focused on the impact—as related to a content course and related field experience—on a candidate’s sense of efficacy. The instructor met with classroom teachers after the experience for anecdotal feedback. Based on the feedback, the classroom teachers would like to schedule planning/debriefing time with the candidates. This was not possible in the initial study because the campus schedule was set and the individuals involved needed to accommodate the established schedule. Blocked times have been included for the course and field experience to address the concern. The building principal also indicated a desire for the candidates to work with limited students instead of the entire class. She was interested in analyzing the impact of the small group instruction on screening scores.

Once again, anecdotal feedback was gathered from the candidates regarding the program and experience. The candidates indicated the failure to execute plans they designed. Often, the failure was due to the request of the classroom teacher to teach another lesson or address another concern. Since the information was not collected during the study, the program needs to include a system for collecting lessons that are designed and taught and lessons that are designed and not taught. Failure to teach lessons designed might have impacted the candidates and led to frustration. The program also did not require written feedback and reflection from the candidates after each time in the field. The candidates returned from the field and debriefed with the instructor but the feedback was oral. Since it was the initial offering of the course and the students were also enrolled in a separate methods course, the instructor was hesitant to require the written reflective feedback. In the future, the written feedback could prove insightful.

The overall recommendation is the continued connection of the field experience to the content course as designed with minor modifications. The researcher cannot clearly state the
field experience will impact the sense of efficacy of future candidates. This study should be replicated for the next 5 years to establish data for recommendation to continue or abandon the field experience. Once the data is collected and analyzed, examination of other field experiences may be considered.

**Future Research Opportunities**

This study should be replicated with a further controls or methods of accounting for the limitations of the study, including instructor and field influences. By repeating the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, researchers could make comparisons and conclusions regarding the impact of the field experience with a different cohort. It was unclear from the current study if the impact on sense of efficacy was related to the field experience, since the sample was limited and the experience was new for the instructor and classroom teachers. By repeating the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, the researcher could compare the 2 years, considering the district is interested in a continued relationship. The district and instructor could be potential consistent variables in future studies. The cohort would be the variable that would change. The instructor and classroom teachers might also change and potentially impact the results. If the instructor and classroom teachers remain constant, the instructional strategies of the instructor may be adjusted based on the anecdotal feedback. The study design could be repeated with the same course and field experience using the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale and Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey with modifications. The Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey would need to be tested for validity and reliability and modified as necessary. The current researcher did not determine if the results were consistent with the course and field experience or an anomaly. Using the study as baseline for further research could be valuable in determining the impact on sense of efficacy when a field experience is required with a content course. The results of this
study could provide a baseline data for future comparison at this institution or institutions with similar experiences. The data could be part of a study to determine the impact of a field experience as related to content courses, as originally intended. The possibility also is present to use the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale during the spring semester of the junior year and repeat during the senior year of undergraduate studies with a cohort population. The current researcher failed to compare the sample with other similar field experiences. The cohort in the study would have an additional two semesters of field experience prior to student teaching. Repeating the measure could determine trends in sense of efficacy.

It would be beneficial to compare similar candidates both enrolled and not enrolled in the course for an authentic conclusion. Comparing the cohort in the study to future cohorts enrolled in the course at the institution, the researcher might be able to determine the impact. The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale used in the study had been given to practicing teachers and candidates when validating and establishing reliability. If the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale had been given to the classroom teachers, the comparison between candidate and classroom teacher might have created an argument for the impact of the field experience on the candidate. De la Torre Cruz and Arias (2007) examined both candidates and practicing teachers and discovered experience does impact sense of efficacy. The impact might be evident in this study, but without a clear measure the increase and decrease of mean scores does not provide the necessary clarity.

Since the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale is general, there needs to be a content specific measure to evaluate the attitudes and confidence of the candidates as related to the content. If the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey is used again, several of the prompts could remain the same. Also, a Likert scale to mirror the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale
would be appropriate. Modification of the instrument would provide richer data to the researcher. It would provide the researcher with more data and an understanding of the level of change in attitudes and confidence in lesson design. There needs to be a clear connection to the field with prompts related to lesson design and ability to implement the designed lessons. The size of the groups also needs to be include because group size may impact efficacy.

Another consideration when replicating the study is the sample group. The candidates in the study were entering their senior years with anticipated spring student teaching. Administering the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale at multiple points during their senior year would further clarify the impact of the field experience on sense of efficacy. By establishing the data from this study as a baseline for the candidates in the cohort, administering the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale at specific junctures in the senior year might substantiate the pre- and post-scores. As Garvis et al. (2011) noted, efficacy mean scores decreased over the course of several experiences, leading to the potential conclusion the candidates develop a more realistic view of the profession as they spend more time in the field. If this hypothesis is applied to the cohort in this study, it would assist in examining the impact of the field experience.

The current study provided an opportunity for an instructor to design content lessons and evaluate the candidates in an authentic field experience. If the instructor is able to coach the candidates in the field when lesson implementation occurs, the instructor could monitor content accuracy and field proficiency. The instructor did not observe the candidates while in the field, but relied on debriefing after the experience. The study could be replicated with the additional observations of the candidates. When the coach is a third individual, there is an assumption of content knowledge and that deficiencies will be addressed when content is not accurate. The impact of the model used in the study is the assessment of candidates in two areas. The
candidates’ reflections after teaching the lessons were not written, but requiring a written reflection might provide additional insight. Through debriefing with the candidates, the candidates did not always execute designed lesson plans. The classroom teachers altered the lessons or requested the candidates to present other lessons. While this was presented in the limitations, providing an opportunity for documentation would be valuable. The connection between pre- and post-experience sense of efficacy scores could be impacted by the ability of the candidate to implement lessons. Atiles et al. (2012) concluded that the impact on sense of efficacy is not related to hours spent in the field, but the ratio of students working with each candidate. Tracking hours spent might assist in drawing conclusions but noting the ratio of candidate/students might yield more insight. Future researchers could include a measure to determine if the candidates are consistently designing lessons for a small group of students or a flexible group based on classroom teacher requirements, or even the whole group. The potential exists for both impact on candidate and student learning, as well as using data to support practices.
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APPENDIX B. INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Title of study: A study of Pre-service teacher efficacy when using Orton-Gillingham methods during field experience

Researcher:
Rachel Eicher
Assistant Professor of Practice of Early Childhood Education
Defiance College
701 N. Clinton Street
Defiance, OH 43512
Phone: 419-783-2373
Email: reicher@defiance.edu

This study will examine the effectiveness of small group multisensory phonics and phonemic awareness instruction on student achievement using DIBELS measures given by the school district. The study will also examine the self-efficacy of candidates before and after participation in EDUC 307 and EDUC 310. The study is part of a dissertation study conducted by Rachel Eicher as a student enrolled in The University of Findlay’s Doctor of Education program. The study will include the results of the scale and survey as related to the course and practicum experience.

You will be asked to complete the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale and survey pre- and post-practicum experience.

Your answers will be confidential. You will not be asked to put your name on the survey that you will be given but will be assigned a number for pre- and post-practicum experience comparison. The researcher will analyze the results of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale and survey to determine the impact of course instruction and related practicum experience. The results of the study will be given to you by contacting Rachel Eicher upon completion of the study.

You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this study.
Your participation in the study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. If you have questions about the study you may contact Rachel Eicher via email or phone.
You are to keep one copy of this consent form.

I, ______________________________________________________, agree to participate in this study.

(participant’s printed name)

________________________________________________________
(participant’s signature) (Date)
This survey and consent have been approved by The University of Findlay Institutional Review Board, which guarantees that research involving human subjects follows federal regulations. The IRB chair is Jennifer Fennema-Bloom; and she can be reached at irb@findlay.edu. You will be made aware of any information that varies from what has been provided to you and/or might affect your willingness to continue to participate in the project.
Consent for Kindergarten Teachers to Participate in Research Project

Title of study: **A STUDY OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EFFICACY WHEN USING ORTON-GILLINGHAM METHODS DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE**

Researcher:
Rachel Eicher
Assistant Professor of Practice of Early Childhood Education
Defiance College
701 N. Clinton Street
Defiance, OH 43512
Phone: 419-783-2373
Email: reicher@defiance.edu

This study will examine the effectiveness of small group multisensory phonics and phonemic awareness instruction on student achievement using DIBELS measures given by the school district. The study will also examine the self-efficacy of candidates before and after participation in EDUC 307 and EDUC 310. The study is part of a dissertation study conducted by Rachel Eicher as a student enrolled in The University of Findlay’s Doctor of Education program. The study will include the results of the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey as related to the course and practicum experience.

You will be asked to complete the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey prior to the practicum experience.

Your answers will be confidential. You will be asked to put your name on the survey that you will be given. The researcher will analyze the results of the Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Survey to determine the impact of course instruction and related practicum experience on the DIBELS scores of the children in the study. The results of the study will be given to you by contacting Rachel Eicher upon completion of the study.

**You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this study.**

Your participation in the study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. If you have questions about the study you may contact Rachel Eicher via email or phone.

You are to keep one copy of this consent form.

I, ________________________________________________________, agree to participate in this study.

(participant’s printed name)

________________________________________ (Date)

(participant’s signature)

This survey and consent have been approved by The University of Findlay Institutional Review Board, which guarantees that research involving human subjects follows federal regulations. The IRB chair is Jennifer Fennema-Bloom; and she can be reached at irb@findlay.edu. You will be made aware of any information that varies from what has been provided to you and/or might affect your willingness to continue to participate in the project.
APPENDIX C. SYLLABUS FOR PHONICS AND WORD STUDY

Defiance College
EDUC 307 Phonics and Word Study

Instructor: R. Eicher
Credit Hours: 3
Semester: Fall 2015
Meeting Time: T/R 9:30-10:45
Office Hours: Monday 1:00-2:00, T/R 2:30-3:30 by appointment
Office Number: Dana 16
Office Phone: 419-783-2373

Course Description
ED 307 Phonics and Word Study (3) The theoretical and historical aspects of phonemic awareness and phonics will be studied. Students will examine phonemic awareness and phonics as related to language development and reading achievement. Identification of the grapheme, phoneme and morphological skills in relation to reading development and language acquisition for English language learners and dyslexic students will be addressed. The recommendations of the National Reading Panel will be incorporated. Must be taken with ED 310 Prerequisites: ED 221, 230, 231 and PY 225

College of Education Framework

The College of Education aspires to prepare exemplary, reflective professionals to serve a diverse global community; it seeks to achieve that end through teaching, scholarship, outreach, and partnership at the local, state, and national levels. Students will be expected to use methods and pedagogies that have been documented as appropriate and validated for young learners, thus, demonstrating a commitment to truth. Secondly, students will be able to extend their knowledge through preparation. Third students will need to synthesize information from multiple sources as they plan and implement their units and activities, thus expanding the tie between prior knowledge and practice. Lastly they will use problem solving as a tool for implementing, evaluation and revising classroom routines, strategies and protocols to meet instructional goals and improve their practice.

Academic Integrity Policy

All members of the DC community are expected to engage in their academic tasks with integrity and respect for others. A major part of the learning accomplished in college is the development of critical thinking skills, and these skills are only developed when each person’s work reflects his or her own original thought. Defiance College is committed to helping each student to understand and practice the highest degree of integrity in his or her academic work, and to take from that work the greatest intellectual and ethical benefit.
The basic rule for academic honesty is that a student’s work should always be his or her own. Any misrepresentation in academic work, including plagiarism, is a form of academic dishonesty. Examples of dishonest academic practices include, but are not limited to, using unauthorized notes or materials during an exam, exchanging information with another student during an exam (regardless of whether or not both students are aware of the exchange), falsifying data on which the student’s conclusions are based, having another student take an exam in place of the student registered in the course, and submitting the same work in two different classes without the permission of both instructors.

Examples of plagiarism (a non-exclusive list):

- Using the exact words from a source, including cutting and pasting from a Web site, without BOTH quotation marks to indicate the extent of the material borrowed and a citation of the original source.
- Paraphrasing or summarizing ideas from a source without proper citation. Changing the words while maintaining the ideas from a source is paraphrase that must be cited.
- Submitting for credit a work written or created by another, whether such work is written by a friend, a recognized scholar or is downloaded from the internet.
- Quoting from an unacknowledged source during an oral presentation.
- Using data other than that produced by the student’s own original research without proper citation of the source.
- Patching together a work using phrases and ideas borrowed from a number of different sources.
- Accepting assistance or collaborating with other students beyond what is explicitly permitted by the instructor.

All violations for academic dishonesty, even those involving only remedial actions, are required to be reported to the Academic Dean for possible further consequences. Please refer to the Defiance College catalog for the complete Defiance College Academic Integrity Policy.

Assignment submitted violating the academic dishonesty policy would be scored a zero without the opportunity to resubmit.

ACCOMMODATION POLICY FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Defiance College is committed to providing educational opportunities for qualified students with documented disabilities through the provision of reasonable accommodations, in compliance with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504). The purpose of accommodations is to provide equal access to educational opportunities without altering essential elements of programs or courses. All requests for accommodations are evaluated on an individual basis after review and evaluation of documentation. It is the responsibility of the student to request necessary accommodations and the student should do so as early as possible, as some accommodations may require time to implement.
Students with a physical, psychological, or learning disability must meet with Defiance College’s Accessibility Services Coordinator, Tracy Armey at extension 2349 or tarmey@defiance.edu mailto:tarmey@defiance.edu. Please refer to pages 21-22 of the Course Catalog for Defiance College’s Accommodations Policy for Students with Disabilities which includes the documentation required for accommodations.

Student Support Services
For extra help in this class or many of your other courses, please be sure to visit the Learning Commons in the Pilgrim Library, Rooms 214 & 216. The Learning Commons provides an array of academic support services such as peer tutoring, writing consultations, supplemental instruction, scheduled structured study, study skill development through workshops and individual consultation, and print and online study and writing resources. For hours and further information visit our website at: http://libguides.defiance.edu/learningcommons, or to make an appointment with a writing consultant or peer tutor, call 419-783-2389, or email learningcommons@defiance.edu.

Student Course Evaluations
Student course evaluations are an important source of information for curricular and teaching improvement. As such, students are strongly encouraged to complete the online course evaluation. Information is provided toward the end of the term to students through email explaining how to complete the evaluation online.

Class Attendance and Policies
Attendance is required. Students are expected to arrive prepared and on time. If unable to attend, prior arrangements must be made by e-mail with the instructor. Students are expected to complete all assignments prior to next class meeting.
Following deduction in final average:
2 unexcused absences: 5%
3 unexcused absences: 10%
4 or more unexcused absences: 25%

Use of Technology
Students will be expected to use and regularly check email accounts. Assignments may be submitted electronically at the instructor’s request. Cell phone and electronic devices will need to be turned off during class unless arrangements are made prior to class with the instructor. The use of digital recording is prohibited unless approved by instructor.
Moodle will be utilized during the course and students are responsible to check for updates.

Defiance College
Candidate Outcomes

Basis in Liberal Arts Pillar 1 - To Know

1. Value learning in the liberal arts and sciences and have content knowledge to establish credibility as teachers and leaders in helping Ohio’s children master the content that is articulated in the Academic Content Standards.
Commitment to Truth Pillar 1 - To Know

2. Use information that is reliable, credible and reflects the best contemporary thinking about teaching and enhancing student learning and have the ability to disarm the misconceptions about professional practice that are based on incorrect information.

Competency in Problem Solving Pillar 1 - To Know

3. Use problem solving strategies as a tool for implementing, evaluating and revising classrooms routines, strategies and protocols to meet instructional goals and improve practice.

Ability to Synthesize Information Pillar 1 - To Know

4. Identify what is known (from action) and what is to be learned (in action) (Munby et al, 2001) as a way to facilitate synthesis and connection between experience, content knowledge and methodology.

Capacity for Self-directed Learning Pillar 1 - To Know

5. Value and demonstrate the capacity for self-directed learning in order to foster continual growth.

Sensitivity to Others in a Global Community Pillar 2 – To Understand

6. Choose instructional dialogue and discourse that reflect sensitivity to each member of the global community of learners and underscore an ethical obligation to understanding that dialogue and discourse have power and significance in the way that each learner perceives and responds to that discourse.

Develop Awareness of Diverse Cultures – Pillar 2 - To Understand

7. Understand the major constructs related to diversity …and “make this knowledge useful in the organization of teaching and learning” (Gallego et al, 2001).

Self-Reflection – Pillar 3 - To Lead

8. Value self reflection and use the knowledge from reflection to inform and improve practice and aspire to the role of instructional leader.

Growth Through Service in Chosen Field of Study – Pillar 4 - To Serve

9. Serve the field of education by acting in professionally moral ways and putting aside one’s personal preferences as the source of choosing professional behavior and action and base one’s professional behavior on the profession’s code of ethics in order to support all learners.

10. Transform passion to one’s profession through service beyond the requirements

Required Text


Academic Content Standards

Supplemental Resources:

**Overcoming Dyslexia by Dr. Sally Shaywitz * The Yale Center for Dyslexia**

Manipulatives will be supplied for use in class and practicum. Included are folders, screens, sand, blending boards, and display cards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24</td>
<td>State law and requirements/History of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition and introduction to <em>Overcoming Dyslexia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consonant Phonemes as presented in <em>Recipe for Reading</em> (including short vowels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce c –qu (pages 35-71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapters 1-3 Rasinski (Assessment) Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Visual, auditory and blending drill introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31</td>
<td>Sight word drill introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students assessed on phoneme identification (mastery expected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 4 Rasinski (Lecture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Students demonstrate in class visual, auditory and blending drill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7</td>
<td>Introduce tactile and kinesthetic drill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blends, and multisyllabic words covered (pages 72-93) in *Recipe for Reading*

Chapters 5 & 6 Rasinski (Lecture)

**Week 4**
Long vowels including magic –e

**September 14**
Open/closed syllables (pages 94-108) CLOVER
Book club discussion over Part 1 of *Overcoming Dyslexia*
Chapters 7 Rasinski (Lecture)

**Week 5**
Vowel pairs

**September 21**
R-controlled sounds
Endings (pages 111-158) in *Recipe for Reading*

**Week 6**
Lessons presented in class

**September 28**
*Students design and present VATK lessons*
Taping in the role of teacher with reflection

**Week 7**
Diphthongs

**October 5**
Sounds of c and g (pages 159-174) in *Recipe for Reading*

**Week 8**
Book Club over Part 2 of *Overcoming Dyslexia*

**October 12**
Irregular vowel pairs

**October 19**
Schwa (pages 175-201) in *Recipe for Reading*

**Week 10**
Irregular vowel sounds (pages 202-213) in *Recipe for Reading*

**October 26**
Affixes (page 214) in *Recipe for Reading*

**November 2**
Chapters 8 Rasinski (Lecture)

**Week 12**
Book Club over Part 3

**November 9**
Role of Phonemic Awareness/Phonics in Comprehension,
Vocabulary, Fluency and Writing
Lessons presented in class
*Students design and present VATK lessons*
Taping in the role of teacher with reflection

**Week 13**
Connection to writing including types of text

**November 16**
Chapters 9, 10 & 11 Rasinski (Lecture)

**Week 14**
Handwriting

**November 23**
Chapters 12 & 13 Rasinski (Lecture)

**Week 15**
Lessons presented in class

**November 30**
Chapters 16 & 17 Rasinski (Lecture)

**Week 16**
Case Study Due

**December 7**

Explanation of Drill:

**Visual Drill:** Student looks at letter, speaks letter name and sound.

**Auditory Drill:** Student is asked to produce the sound a letter makes.

**Tactile Drill:** Student uses tactile element such as a screen or sand to write and practice letters/words.

**Kinesthetic Drill:** Movement is incorporated in the lesson to engage the midline and connect movement to skill.
Drill is practiced each class with students alternating role of teacher/student. The last fifteen minutes of class are devoted to the drill to emphasize the cumulative nature and direct relation to dyslexic learners.

Required Assignments:

Case Study (100 points)
Students will complete a case study based on provided information. Information included in the case study will be pre assessment, methods, materials, post assessment and recommendations for future instruction.

Rubric for Case Study

Score of 3
In order to earn a score of 3, the case study must provide detailed descriptions of items required for section and provide information that supports the use/understanding of best practice.

Score of 2
In order to earn a score of 2, the case study must provide detailed descriptions of items required for section but does not provide sufficient information regarding the use/understanding of best practice.

Score of 1
In order to earn a score of 1, the case study has insufficient information regarding the required topics in each section.

Score of 0
In order to earn a score of 0, the case study provides no evidence or understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Topic</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1: Description of the Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide background of the student using inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2: Description of Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe assessment and parts administered/Reliability and Validity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide details of administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3: Pre-test Assessment Results and Data Analysis including charts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4: Narrative of Tutoring Sessions including lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Domain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Strengths**

**Weaknesses**

---

**Section 5: Post-test Assessment Results and Data Analysis including charts**

**Strengths**

**Weaknesses**

---

**Section 6: Conclusions and Implications**

**Strengths for student**

**Weaknesses for student**

**Recommendations for future instruction**

---

**Section 7: Personal Reflection**

**Personal**

**Professional**

---

**Section 8: Attachments**

**All results from diagnostic testing**

Not Scored

---

**Attachments are not scored but must be included with case study.**

**Participation/Attendance (100 points)**

Participation will be monitored through a checklist. Throughout the course, students are required to master the three part drill (review, teach, extend). A checklist will be used to monitor progress. Mastery is expected by the end of the semester with remediation and assistance provided as necessary. Attendance will be as follows:

- Deduction in final average:
  - 2 unexcused absences: 5%
  - 3 unexcused absences: 10%
  - 4 or more unexcused absences: 25%

**Example of Checklist:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Short Vowels</th>
<th>R-controlled</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
<th>Irregular Vowels</th>
<th>Blends</th>
<th>Affixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Eicher</td>
<td>IP= In Progress M=Mastered with 95% accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presentations (50 points)**

Students will prepare and present a phonemic awareness or phonics lesson incorporating standards and developmentally appropriate practices. Students will use Teacher Education abbreviated lesson plan form and one page reflection.

**Journal Entries (25 points for each-100 point total)**

Students will participate in book club discussions over assigned chapter and respond to reflective prompts. *Overcoming Dyslexia* will be the text used for journal entries. Students may incorporate other resources as appropriate. Each entry will be a minimum of 1200 words. APA format will be required for additional resources.
Part One: Prompts included but not limited to: Historical analysis, brain connection, who it affects and impact over time
Part Two: Prompts included but not limited to: Clues, diagnosis, identification of children and adults
Part Three: Prompts included but not limited to: Assisting in reading process
Part Four: Prompts included but not limited to: Teaching dyslexic readers, accommodations

Grading and Evaluation
All assignments are due at the beginning of class. Students should arrive prepared. There will be a 25% deduction per day for late work unless the instructor approves extension.

Grading Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>84-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>74-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Below 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do not e-mail the instructor requesting current grade. You need to make arrangements to speak with the instructor at a mutually convenient time to discuss grades.

Goals for Course
- Understand phonemic awareness/phonics and the role in reading development for all students including dyslexic students
- Identify the elements of an explicit and systematic phonics program
- Understand the role of assessment as related to phonemic awareness and phonics
- Distinguish grapheme, phoneme and morpheme in relation to reading acquisition
- Understand the role of phonemic awareness and phonics in language acquisition with comprehension, vocabulary and fluency
- Identify the role of phonemic awareness and phonics in writing development

International Literacy Association Standards:
Standards 2010: Standard 1
Foundational Knowledge
Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.
Element 1.1
Candidates understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections
Element 1.2
Candidates understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components.
Element 1.3
*Candidates understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students’ reading development and achievement*

International Dyslexia Association and Practice Standards for Teachers of Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Evaluating the Alignment of Educator Preparation Programs with International Dyslexia Association Knowledge and Practice Standards for Teachers of Reading</th>
<th>No mention in course syllabi; no relevant or current assigned readings</th>
<th>One type of evidence of standard (syllabus, activity, lecture, reading, graded assessment, graded assignment)</th>
<th>Two types of evidence of standard (syllabus, activity, lecture, reading, graded assessment, graded assignment)</th>
<th>Three or more types of evidence of standard (syllabus, activity, lecture, reading, graded assessment, graded assignment)</th>
<th>Three or more types of evidence and includes practicum with authentic student; competencies in the Standards are observed, coached, and evaluated. (only Standard E: Structured)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Foundation Concepts about Oral and Written Language</td>
<td>Understand and explain the language processing requirements of proficient reading and writing</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand and explain other aspects of cognition and behavior that affect reading and writing</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define and identify environmental, cultural, and social factors that</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute to literacy development</td>
<td>Know and identify phases in typical developmental progressions.</td>
<td>Understand and explain the known causal relationships among phonological skill, phonic decoding, spelling, accurate and automatic word recognition, text reading fluency, background knowledge, verbal reasoning skill, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing.</td>
<td>Know reasonable goals and expectations for learners at various stages of reading and writing development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Knowledge of the Structure of</td>
<td>Phonoology (The Speech Sound System)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1. Identify, pronounce, classify, and compare the consonant and vowel phonemes of English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orthography (The Spelling System)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Understand the broad outline of historical influences on English spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture Activity Assessment (Drill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns, especially Anglo-Saxon, Latin (Romance), and Greek.</td>
<td>3. Define grapheme as a functional correspondence unit or representation of a phoneme.</td>
<td>Lecture Activity Assessment (Drill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recognize and explain common orthographic rules and patterns in English.</td>
<td>5. Know the difference between high frequency and irregular words.</td>
<td>Lecture Activity Assessment (Drill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identify, explain, and categorize six basic syllable types in English spelling.</td>
<td>7. Identify and categorize common morphemes in English, including Anglo-Saxon compounds, inflectional suffixes, and derivational suffixes; Latin-based prefixes, roots, and derivational suffixes; and Greek-based combining forms.</td>
<td>Lecture Activity Assessment (Drill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>Semantics</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Understand and identify examples of meaningful word relationships or semantic organization.</td>
<td>Lecture Activity Assessment (Drill)</td>
<td>Lecture Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Define and distinguish among</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Identify the parts of speech and the grammatical role of a word in a sentence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Explain the major differences between narrative and expository discourse.</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Identify and construct expository paragraphs of varying logical structures (e.g., classification, reason, sequence).</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Identify cohesive devices in text and inferential gaps in the surface language of text.</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Knowledge of Dyslexia and Other Learning Disorders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand the most common intrinsic differences between good and poor readers (i.e., cognitive, neurobiological, and linguistic).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recognize the tenets of the NICHD/IDA definition of dyslexia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recognize that dyslexia and other reading difficulties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
exist on a continuum of severity.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify the distinguishing characteristics of dyslexia and related reading and learning disabilities (including developmental language comprehension disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, disorders of written expression or dysgraphia, mathematics learning disorder, nonverbal learning disorders)</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Identify how symptoms of reading difficulty may change over time in response to development and instruction.</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Understand federal and state laws that pertain to learning disabilities, especially reading disabilities and dyslexia.</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Interpretation and Administration of Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand the differences among screening, diagnostic, outcome, and progress-monitoring assessments.</td>
<td>Practicum Lecture Activity Assessment (Drill) Case Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Understand basic principles of test</td>
<td>Practicum Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
construction, including reliability, validity, norm-referencing, & know the most well-validated screening tests designed to identify students at risk for reading difficulties.

3. Understand the principles of progress-monitoring and the use of graphs to indicate progress.

4. Know the range of skills typically assessed by diagnostic surveys of phonological skills, decoding skills, oral reading skills, spelling, and writing.

5. Recognize the content and purposes of the most common diagnostic tests used by psychologists and educational evaluators.

6. Interpret measures of reading comprehension and written expression in relation to an individual child’s component profile.

1. Identify the general and specific goals of phonological skill instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Assessment (Drill)</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-1. Structured Language Teaching: Phonology</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practicum</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Assessment (Drill)</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-1. Structured Language Teaching: Phonology</td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Know the progression of phonological skill development (i.e., rhyme, syllable, onset-rime, phoneme differentiation).

3. Identify the differences among various phonological manipulations, including identifying, matching, blending, segmenting, substituting, and deleting sounds.

4. Understand the principles of phonological skill instruction: brief, multisensory, conceptual, and auditory-verbal.

5. Understand the reciprocal relationships among phonological processing, reading, spelling, and vocabulary.

6. Understand the phonological features of a second language, such as Spanish, and how they interfere with English pronunciation and phonics.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Know or recognize how to</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment (Drill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Structured Language Teaching: Phonics and Word Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Book Club Discussion Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Phonics Concepts from Easier to More Difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understand principles of explicit and direct teaching: model, lead, give guided practice, and review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State the rationale for multisensory and multimodal techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Know the routines of a complete lesson format, from the introduction of a word recognition concept to fluent application in meaningful reading and writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understand research-based adaptations of instruction for students with weaknesses in working memory, attention, executive function, or processing speed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E-3. Structured Language Teaching: Fluent, Automatic Reading of Text**

| 1. Understand the role of fluency in word recognition, oral reading, silent reading, comprehension of written discourse, and motivation to read. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment (Drill) Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Activity Assessment (Drill) Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Activity Assessment (Drill) Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Club Discussions Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understand reading fluency as a stage of normal reading development; as the primary symptom of some reading disorders; and as a consequence of practice and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Define and identify examples of text at a student’s frustration, instructional, and independent reading level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Know sources of activities for building fluency in component reading skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Know which instructional activities and approaches are most likely to improve fluency outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Understand techniques to enhance student motivation to read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-4. Structured Language Teaching: Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand the role of vocabulary development and vocabulary knowledge in comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understand the role and characteristics of direct and indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(contextual) methods of vocabulary instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Know varied techniques for vocabulary instruction before, during, and after reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Understand that word knowledge is multifaceted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understand the sources of wide differences in students’ vocabularies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-5. Structured Language Teaching: Text Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Be familiar with teaching strategies that are appropriate before, during, and after reading and that promote reflective reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contrast the characteristics of major text genres, including narration, exposition, and argumentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Understand the similarities and differences between written composition and text comprehension, and the usefulness of writing in building comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify in any text the phrases, clauses,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sentences, paragraphs and — academic language that could be a source of miscomprehension.

5. Understand levels of comprehension including the surface code, text base, and mental model (situation model).

E-6. Structured Language Teaching: Handwriting, Spelling, and Written Expression

Handwriting

1. Know research-based principles for teaching letter naming and letter formation, both manuscript and cursive.

2. Know techniques for teaching handwriting fluency.

Spelling

1. Recognize and explain the relationship between transcription skills and written expression.

2. Identify students' levels of spelling development and orthographic knowledge.

3. Recognize and explain the influences of phonological, orthographic, and morphemic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand the major components and processes of written expression and how they interact (e.g., basic writing/transcription skills versus text generation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Know grade and developmental expectations for students’ writing in the following areas: mechanics and conventions of writing, composition, revision, and editing processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Understand appropriate uses of assistive technology in written expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Follow Ethical Standards for the Profession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defiance College  
EDUC 310 Phonics Practicum  

Instructor: R. Eicher  
Credit Hours: 1  
Semester: Fall 2015  
Meeting Time: Arranged  
Office Hours: Monday 1:00-2:00, T/R 2:30-3:30 by appointment  
Office Number: Dana 16  
Office Phone: 419-783-2373  

Course Description  
ED 310 Phonics Practicum (1) Students facilitate small group instruction in a school setting (one half day per week/40 hours total). Student led instruction will focus on literacy skills including but not limited to phonemic awareness and phonics. Students will incorporate best practices when designing and implementing lessons. Will be taken concurrently with ED 307  
Prerequisites: ED 221, 230, 231 and PY 225 (Graded Pass/Fail)  

Field Requirement Meets NAEYC Standard 7 (7a & 7b) for Early Childhood Majors  
Assignments/Schedule:  
  Week 1  
  August 24  
  Meet with classroom teacher  
  Week 2  
  August 31  
  Visit class and observe  
  Week 3  
  September 7  
  Analyze data for small group placement (on campus)  
  Week 4  
  September 14  
  Prepare plans for small group instruction (on campus)  
  Week 5  
  September 21  
  Begin small group instruction  
  Week 6  
  September 28  
  Small group instruction  
  Week 7  
  October 5  
  Small group instruction  
  Week 8  
  October 12  
  Small group instruction  
  Week 9  
  October 19  
  Small group instruction  
  Week 10  
  October 26  
  Small group instruction  
  Week 11  
  November 2  
  Small group instruction  
  Week 12  
  Small group instruction
November 9
Week 13
Small group instruction

November 16
Small group instruction

Week 14
Small group instruction

November 23
Small group instruction/final assessment

Week 15

November 30
Case Study Due

Week 16
December 7

Lesson Plan Elements:
Cumulative review
Drill
Literacy Activities

*Lesson plans must be submitted to the course instructor the week before instruction.

Explanation of Drill:
Visual Drill: Student looks at letter, speaks letter name and sound.
Auditory Drill: Student is asked to produce the sound a letter makes.
Tactile Drill: Student uses tactile element such as a screen or sand to write and practice
letters/words.
Kinesthetic Drill: Movement is incorporated in the lesson to engage the midline and connect
movement to skill.

Students are required to submit monthly logs to the practicum instructor. Time sheets are due the
last day of the month. Please submit to R. Eicher in person. Do not slide under office door.
This course has a required disposition to be completed by the classroom teacher. It is due by the
end of the 14th week of the semester. The instructor will supply the form with direction for
submission. Students will not be responsible for disposition.

Required Text
teaching of decoding and reading fluency in the elementary school* (3rd
Knopf.

Service.

Pub. Service.
Academic Content Standards

Supplemental Text:

Goals for Course
- Understand phonemic awareness and the role in reading development
- Understand phonics and the role in reading development
- Identify the elements of an explicit and systematic phonics program
- Understand the role of assessment as related to phonemic awareness and phonics

International Reading Association Standards:
Standards 2010: Standard 3
Assessment and Evaluation
*Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.*
Element 3.1
*Candidates understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.*
Element 3.2
*Candidates select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes.*
Element 3.3
*Candidates use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.*
Element 3.4
*Candidates communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences.*

Term of Practicum:
College of Education Framework

The College of Education aspires to prepare exemplary, reflective professionals to serve a diverse global community; it seeks to achieve that end through teaching, scholarship, outreach, and partnership at the local, state, and national levels. Students will be expected to use methods and pedagogies that have been documented as appropriate and validated for young learners, thus, demonstrating a commitment to truth. Secondly, students will be able to extend their knowledge through preparation. Third students will need to synthesize information from multiple sources as they plan and implement their units and activities, thus expanding the tie between prior knowledge and practice. Lastly they will use problem solving as a tool for implementing, evaluation and revising classroom routines, strategies and protocols to meet instructional goals and improve their practice.

Academic Integrity Policy
All members of the DC community are expected to engage in their academic tasks with integrity and respect for others. A major part of the learning accomplished in college is the development of critical thinking skills, and these skills are only developed when each person’s work reflects his or her own original thought. Defiance College is committed to helping each student to understand and practice the highest degree of integrity in his or her academic work, and to take from that work the greatest intellectual and ethical benefit.

The basic rule for academic honesty is that a student’s work should always be his or her own. Any misrepresentation in academic work, including plagiarism, is a form of academic dishonesty. Examples of dishonest academic practices include, but are not limited to, using unauthorized notes or materials during an exam, exchanging information with another student during an exam (regardless of whether or not both students are aware of the exchange), falsifying data on which the student’s conclusions are based, having another student take an exam in place of the student registered in the course, and submitting the same work in two different classes without the permission of both instructors.

Examples of plagiarism (a non-exclusive list):

- Using the exact words from a source, including cutting and pasting from a Web site, without BOTH quotation marks to indicate the extent of the material borrowed and a citation of the original source.
- Paraphrasing or summarizing ideas from a source without proper citation. Changing the words while maintaining the ideas from a source is paraphrase that must be cited.
- Submitting for credit a work written or created by another, whether such work is written by a friend, a recognized scholar or is downloaded from the internet.
- Quoting from an unacknowledged source during an oral presentation.
- Using data other than that produced by the student’s own original research without proper citation of the source.
- Patching together a work using phrases and ideas borrowed from a number of different sources.
- Accepting assistance or collaborating with other students beyond what is explicitly permitted by the instructor.

All violations for academic dishonesty, even those involving only remedial actions, are required to be reported to the Academic Dean for possible further consequences. Please refer to the Defiance College catalog for the complete Defiance College Academic Integrity Policy.

Assignment submitted violating the academic dishonesty policy would be scored a zero without the opportunity to resubmit.

ACCOMMODATION POLICY FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Defiance College is committed to providing educational opportunities for qualified students with documented disabilities through the provision of reasonable accommodations, in compliance with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504). The purpose of accommodations is to provide equal
access to educational opportunities without altering essential elements of programs or courses. All requests for accommodations are evaluated on an individual basis after review and evaluation of documentation. It is the responsibility of the student to request necessary accommodations and the student should do so as early as possible, as some accommodations may require time to implement.

Students with a physical, psychological, or learning disability must meet with Defiance College’s Accessibility Services Coordinator, Tracy Armey at extension 2349 or tarmey@defiance.edu. Please refer to pages 21-22 of the Course Catalog for Defiance College’s Accommodations Policy for Students with Disabilities which includes the documentation required for accommodations.

Student Support Services
For extra help in this class or many of your other courses, please be sure to visit the Learning Commons in the Pilgrim Library, Rooms 214 & 216. The Learning Commons provides an array of academic support services such as peer tutoring, writing consultations, supplemental instruction, scheduled structured study, study skill development through workshops and individual consultation, and print and online study and writing resources. For hours and further information visit our website at: http://libguides.defiance.edu/learningcommons, or to make an appointment with a writing consultant or peer tutor, call 419-783-2389, or email learningcommons@defiance.edu.

Student Course Evaluations
Student course evaluations are an important source of information for curricular and teaching improvement. As such, students are strongly encouraged to complete the online course evaluation. Information is provided toward the end of the term to students through email explaining how to complete the evaluation online.

Class Attendance and Policies
Attendance is required. Students are expected to arrive prepared and on time. If unable to attend, prior arrangements must be made by e-mail with the instructor. Students are expected to complete all assignments prior to next class meeting.

Use of Technology
Students will be expected to use and regularly check email accounts. Assignments may be submitted electronically at the instructor’s request. Cell phone and electronic devices will need to be turned off during class unless arrangements are made prior to class with the instructor. The use of digital recording is prohibited unless approved by instructor. Moodle will be utilized during the course and students are responsible to check for updates.

Defiance College
Candidate Outcomes

Basis in Liberal Arts Pillar 1 - To Know
1. Value learning in the liberal arts and sciences and have content knowledge to establish credibility as teachers and leaders in helping Ohio’s children master the content that is articulated in the Academic Content Standards.

Commitment to Truth Pillar 1 - To Know

2. Use information that is reliable, credible and reflects the best contemporary thinking about teaching and enhancing student learning and have the ability to disarm the misconceptions about professional practice that are based on incorrect information.

Competency in Problem Solving Pillar 1 - To Know

3. Use problem solving strategies as a tool for implementing, evaluating and revising classrooms routines, strategies and protocols to meet instructional goals and improve practice.

Ability to Synthesize Information Pillar 1 - To Know

4. Identify what is known (from action) and what is to be learned (in action) (Munby et al, 2001) as a way to facilitate synthesis and connection between experience, content knowledge and methodology.

Capacity for Self-directed Learning Pillar 1 - To Know

5. Value and demonstrate the capacity for self-directed learning in order to foster continual growth.

Sensitivity to Others in a Global Community Pillar 2 – To Understand

6. Choose instructional dialogue and discourse that reflect sensitivity to each member of the global community of learners and underscore an ethical obligation to understanding that dialogue and discourse have power and significance in the way that each learner perceives and responds to that discourse.

Develop Awareness of Diverse Cultures – Pillar 2 - To Understand

7. Understand the major constructs related to diversity …and “make this knowledge useful in the organization of teaching and learning” (Gallego et al, 2001).

Self-Reflection – Pillar 3 - To Lead

8. Value self reflection and use the knowledge from reflection to inform and improve practice and aspire to the role of instructional leader.

Growth Through Service in Chosen Field of Study – Pillar 4 - To Serve
9. Serve the field of education by acting in professionally moral ways and putting aside one’s personal preferences as the source of choosing professional behavior and action and base one’s professional behavior on the profession’s code of ethics in order to support all learners.

10. Transform passion to one’s profession through service beyond the requirements

Grading and Evaluation

All assignments are due at the beginning of class. Students should arrive prepared. There will be a 25% deduction per day for late work unless the instructor approves extension.

This course is Pass/Fail. Students are expected to meet the hour requirement of 40 hours in a classroom setting. Verification form will be submitted to instructor. Failure to meet the required hours will result in failure of the course.

Do not e-mail the instructor requesting current grade. You need to make arrangements to speak with the instructor at a mutually convenient time to discuss grades.

Term of Practicum:

DEFIANCE COLLEGE DRESS CODE FOR CLINICAL EXPERIENCES

Candidates are expected to dress professionally at all times when they are in the field. We provide you some common, acceptable guidelines here. Keep in mind that on your first day in the school it is better to err on the side of formal rather than casual. Think of your practicums as an extended interview (because they really are) and dress appropriately. If you are not sure what is acceptable, ask your mentor teacher or principal about the school’s dress code and follow his or her lead.

- Teachers usually dress in business casual. At a minimum, defiance college teacher candidates are expected to wear the following:
  - Dress Slacks, Dresses, or Knee Length (or longer) Skirts
  - Button up, Collared Shirts, Blouses or Sweaters with Sleeves (Be sure they cover your midriff/back and cleavage).
  - Men should wear a tie on the first day.
  - Clean and Polished Dress Shoes
  - You hair should be cleaned, combed and styled
  - If you wear nail polish, make sure to keep it up so its not chipped or peeling

- Be cautious of the following. Remember, you want to make yourself as presentable as possible because your practicums are like extensive interviews.
  - Be sure your clothes are ironed.
  - If your pants drag on the ground or are frayed have them hemmed.
  - Always wear a belt to make sure your pants don’t sag at the waist.
  - Wearing hats while you teach can be seen as disrespectful

- Many schools have special events
  - If your school has a jeans day, please feel free to wear jeans, but be sure there are no holes in them.
  - Your school may have “funny hat” day or “pajama” day, or other such theme days related to school spirit or a special event. You are encouraged to dress to fit in
with whatever the occasion may be as long as the building teachers are permitted to participate.

Instructor will provide placement information for students. The instructor is to be notified by email/phone if student is unable to attend placement. The student is responsible for making arrangements with the cooperating school/teacher regarding notification procedures for absence.
### Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale

**Directions:** This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Beliefs</th>
<th>How much can you do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much can you do to help your students value learning?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How well can you respond to defiant students?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey for Candidates

I plan to teach phonemic awareness
  daily
  • 2-3 times per week
  • 1 time per week
  • N/A

I plan to teach phonics
  daily
  2-3 times per week
  1 time per week
  N/A

When I teach phonemic awareness, the lesson will be
  20-30 minutes
  10-19 minutes
  less than 10 minutes
  N/A

When I teach phonics, the lesson will be
  20-30 minutes
  10-19 minutes
  less than 10 minutes
  N/A

I feel confident using Orton-Gillingham methods to teach phonemic awareness and phonics in small group situations.
  Very confident
  Confident
  Unsure
  Not confident
  Not able to answer

Phonics lessons should be taught as whole group instruction.
  Always
  Never
  N/A

I am able to design phonemic awareness lessons incorporating multisensory strategies.
  Very confident
  Confident
  Unsure
  Not confident
I am able to design phonics lessons incorporating multisensory strategies.
   Very confident
   Confident
   Unsure
   Not Confident
   Not able to answer

Describe phonemic awareness in your own words.

Describe phonics in your own words.

Explain dyslexia in your own words.

Explain the role of multisensory instruction as related to phonemic awareness and phonics.
Survey for Classroom Teachers

I teach phonemic awareness

- Daily
- 2-3 times per week
- 1 time per week
- N/A

I teach phonics

- Daily
- 2-3 times per week
- 1 time per week
- N/A

When I teach phonemic awareness, the lesson is

- 20-30 minutes
- 10-19 minutes
- Less than 10 minutes
- N/A

When I teach phonics, the lesson is

- 20-30 minutes
- 10-19 minutes
- Less than 10 minutes
- N/A

I teach phonemic awareness lessons as whole group.

- Always
- Never
- N/A

I teach phonics lessons as whole group.

- Always
- Never
- N/A

The lessons I use when I teach phonemic awareness were created by the reading series adopted by the district.

- Always
- Half from the series/Half created
Never
N/A

The lessons I use when I teach phonics were created by the reading series adopted by the district.
Always
Half from the series/Half created
Never
N/A

I am able to design phonemic awareness lessons using VATK (visual, auditory, tactile and kinesthetic) methods.
Very confident
Confident
Unsure
Not confident
Not able to answer

I am able to design phonics lessons using VATK (visual, auditory, tactile and kinetic) methods.
Very confident
Confident
Unsure
Not confident
Not able to answer

Describe phonemic awareness in your own words.

Describe phonics in your own words.

Explain dyslexia in your own words.

Describe the Orton-Gillingham approach to literacy instruction.
Explain your educational background and training in phonemic awareness/phonics instruction, including whether you have had training in Orton-Gillingham methods.
APPENDIX G. CAEP STANDARDS 2013

2013 CAEP Standards

Standard 1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 IN/ASIC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

Provider Responsibilities:
1.2 Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students’ progress and their own professional practice.

1.3 Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).

1.4 Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).

1.5 Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning, and enrich professional practice.

Standard 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice
The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students’ learning and development.

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation:
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

Clinical Educators:
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates’ development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

Clinical Experiences:
2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students’ learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates’ development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program’s meeting of Standard 4.

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs:
3.1 The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America’s P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability:
3.2 The provider meets CAEP minimum criteria or the state’s minimum criteria for academic achievement, whichever are higher, and gathers disaggregated data on the enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.

The CAEP minimum criteria are a grade point average of 3.0 and a group average performance on nationally normed assessments or substantially equivalent state-normed assessments of mathematical, reading and writing achievement in the top 50 percent of those assessed. An EPP may develop and use a valid and reliable substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement. The 50th percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021.
2010 Standards for Initial Early Childhood Professional Preparation

STANDARD 1. PROMOTING CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING
Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs are grounded in a child development knowledge base. They use their understanding of young children’s characteristics and needs, and of multiple interacting influences on children’s development and learning, to create environments that are healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging for each child.

Key elements of Standard 1
1a: Knowing and understanding young children’s characteristics and needs, from birth through age 8.
1b: Knowing and understanding the multiple influences on early development and learning
1c: Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging learning environments for young children

STANDARD 2. BUILDING FAMILY AND COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS
Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs understand that successful early childhood education depends upon partnerships with children’s families and communities. They know about, understand, and value the importance and complex characteristics of children’s families and communities. They use this understanding to create respectful, reciprocal relationships that support and empower families, and to involve all families in their children’s development and learning.

Key elements of Standard 2
2a: Knowing about and understanding diverse family and community characteristics
2b: Supporting and engaging families and communities through respectful, reciprocal relationships
2c: Involving families and communities in young children’s development and learning

STANDARD 3. OBSERVING, DOCUMENTING, AND ASSESSING TO SUPPORT YOUNG CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs understand that child observation, documentation, and other forms of assessment are central to the practice of all early childhood professionals. They know about and understand the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment. They know about and use systematic observations, documentation, and other effective assessment strategies in a responsible way, in partnership with families and other professionals, to positively influence the development of every child.

Key elements of Standard 3
3a: Understanding the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment – including its use in development of appropriate goals, curriculum, and teaching strategies for young children
3b: Knowing about and using observation, documentation, and other appropriate assessment tools and approaches, including the use of technology in documentation, assessment and data collection.
3c: Understanding and practicing responsible assessment to promote positive outcomes for each child, including the use of assistive technology for children with disabilities.
3d: Knowing about assessment partnerships with families and with professional colleagues to build effective learning environments

STANDARD 4. USING DEVELOPMENTALLY EFFECTIVE APPROACHES
Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs understand that teaching and learning with young children is a complex enterprise, and its details vary depending on children’s ages, characteristics, and the settings within which teaching and learning occur. They understand and use positive relationships and supportive interactions as the foundation for their work with young children and families. Candidates know, understand, and use a wide array of developmentally appropriate approaches, instructional strategies, and tools to connect with children and families and positively influence each child’s development and learning.

Key elements of Standard 4
4a: Understanding positive relationships and supportive interactions as the foundation of their work with young children
4b: Knowing and understanding effective strategies and tools for early education, including appropriate uses of technology
4c: Using a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning approaches
4d: Reflecting on own practice to promote positive outcomes for each child

STANDARD 5. USING CONTENT KNOWLEDGE TO BUILD MEANINGFUL CURRICULUM
Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs use their knowledge of academic disciplines to design, implement, and evaluate experiences that promote positive development and learning for each and every young child. Candidates understand the importance of developmental domains and academic (or content) disciplines in early childhood curriculum. They know the essential concepts, inquiry tools, and structure of content areas, including academic subjects, and can identify resources to deepen their understanding. Candidates use their own knowledge and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curriculum that promotes comprehensive developmental and learning outcomes for every young child.

Key elements of Standard 5
5a: Understanding content knowledge and resources in academic disciplines: language and literacy; the arts – music, creative movement, dance, drama, visual arts; mathematics; science, physical activity, physical education, health and safety; and social studies.
5b: Knowing and using the central concepts, inquiry tools, and structures of content areas or academic disciplines
5c: Using own knowledge, appropriate early learning standards, and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate developmentally meaningful and challenging curriculum for each child.

STANDARD 6. BECOMING A PROFESSIONAL
Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs identify and conduct themselves as members of the early childhood profession. They know and use ethical guidelines and other professional standards related to early childhood practice. They are continuous, collaborative learners who demonstrate knowledgeable, reflective and critical perspectives on their work, making informed decisions that integrate knowledge from a variety of sources. They are informed advocates for sound educational practices and policies.

Key elements of Standard 6
6a: Identifying and involving oneself with the early childhood field
6b: Knowing about and upholding ethical standards and other early childhood professional guidelines
6c: Engaging in continuous, collaborative learning to inform practice; using technology effectively with young children, with peers, and as a professional resource.
6d: Integrating knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives on early education
6e: Engaging in informed advocacy for young children and the early childhood profession

STANDARD 7. EARLY CHILDHOOD FIELD EXPERIENCES
Field experiences and clinical practice are planned and sequenced so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions necessary to promote the development and learning of young children across the entire developmental period of early childhood – in at least two of the three early childhood age groups (birth – age 3, 3 through 5, 5 through 8 years) and in the variety of settings that offer early education (early school grades, child care centers and homes, Head Start programs).

Key elements of Standard 7
7a. Opportunities to observe and practice in at least two of the three early childhood age groups (birth – age 3, 3-5, 5-8)
7b. Opportunities to observe and practice in at least two of the three main types of early education settings (early school grades, child care centers and homes, Head Start programs)

Note: The Initial Standards are used in NAEYC Accreditation and Recognition of undergraduate and graduate programs providing initial early childhood studies. Advanced Standards include advanced key elements and are used in NAEYC Recognition of graduate programs preparing accomplished teachers, administrators, policy specialists, professional development specialists, teacher educators, and researchers. For associate degree programs seeking accreditation from the NAEYC Commission on Early Childhood Associate Degree Accreditation, Standard 7 is addressed in Accreditation Criterion 5. See full standards here http://www.naeyc.org/ecada/standards
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APPENDIX I. OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS READING REQUIREMENTS

12 Semester-Hour Reading Requirement
Ohio Educator Licensure Program Standards

For Ohio Educator Licensure Reports:
Early Childhood, Middle Childhood, & Intervention Specialist

A minimum of twelve semester hours in the teaching of reading as required in section 3319.24 of the Revised Code, including at least one separate three semester hour course in the teaching of phonics, and coursework on knowledge and beliefs about reading; knowledge base; individual differences; reading difficulties; creating a literate environment; word identification, vocabulary, and spelling; comprehension; study strategies; writing; assessment; communicating information about reading; curriculum development; professional development; research; supervision of paraprofessionals; and professionalism for the early childhood license, the middle childhood license, the intervention specialist license; and the early childhood intervention specialist license.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1</th>
<th>Phonics Course—3 Semester Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 2</th>
<th>Knowledge Base and Beliefs about Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 The candidate recognizes the importance of teaching the processes and skills of reading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The candidate understands and respects cultural, linguistic, and ethnic diversity and recognizes the positive contributions of diversity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 The candidate demonstrates an understanding of reading as the process of constructing meaning through the interaction of the reader’s existing knowledge, the information suggested by the written language, and the context of the reading situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the influence of development (physical, perceptual, emotional, social, cultural, environmental, and cognitive) and background experiences on what the reader brings to the reading/literacy situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the interrelation of reading and writing, and listening and speaking.

2.6 The candidate understands how various factors such as content, purpose, tasks and setting influence the reading process.

2.7 The candidate understands the role of metacognition in reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

### Standard 3
**Creating a Literate Environment**

3.1 The candidate understands and accepts the importance of reading as a means to learn, access information and to enhance the quality of life.

3.2 The candidate uses texts and trade books to stimulate interest, promote reading growth, foster appreciation for the written word and increase the motivation of learners to read widely and independently for information, pleasure, and personal growth.

3.3 The candidate recognizes the value of reading aloud to learners.

3.4 The candidate provides opportunities for learners to select from a variety of written materials, to read extended texts, and to read for many authentic purposes.

3.5 The candidate uses instructional and information technologies to support literacy learning.

3.8 The candidate demonstrates an understanding of emergent literacy and designs experiences to support it. (Early Childhood/Intervention Specialist reports)

3.8.1 The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the theoretical and research foundations of emergent literacy.

3.8.2 The candidate is able to design and implement appropriate emergent literature instruction and assessment practices.

3.8.3 The candidate uses effective techniques and strategies to ensure children’s literacy development and growth.

### Standard 4
**Individual Differences**

4.1 The candidate understands and is sensitive to differences among learners and how these differences influence reading.

4.2 The candidate demonstrates an understanding and respect for cultural, linguistic, and ethnic diversity in the teaching process.

4.3. The candidate creates and implements reports designed to address the strengths and needs of individual learners.

4.4 The candidate communicates with students about their strengths, areas for improvement, and ways to achieve improvement in reading.

4.5 The candidate collaborates with parents, support personnel, and others to support students’ reading and writing development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 The candidate provides direct instruction and models what, when, and how to use reading strategies with narrative and expository texts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 The candidate models questioning strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 The candidate teaches students to connect prior knowledge with new information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 The candidate teaches students strategies for monitoring their own comprehension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 The candidate ensures that students can use various aspects and structures of text to facilitate comprehension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 The candidate teaches effective study, time management, and test taking strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 The candidate provides opportunities to locate and use a variety of print, nonprint, and electronic reference strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 The candidate teaches students to vary reading rate according to the purpose(s) and difficulty of the material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 6</th>
<th>Word Identification, Vocabulary, and Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 The candidate teaches students to monitor their own word identification through the use of syntax, semantic, and graphophonemic relations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 The candidate teaches students to use context to identify and define unfamiliar words.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 The candidate demonstrates understanding of developmental spelling and applies this knowledge to spelling instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 The candidate teaches students to recognize and use various spelling patterns in the English language as an aid to word identification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 The candidate employs effective techniques and strategies for the ongoing development of independent vocabulary acquisition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 7</th>
<th>Curriculum Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 The candidate creates individualized and group instructional interventions based on a range of authentic literacy tasks using a variety of texts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 The candidate adapts instruction to meet the needs of different learners to accomplish different purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 The candidate selects and evaluates instructional materials for literacy, including those that are technology-based.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 The candidate aligns curriculum and instruction with state and local standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 8</td>
<td>Assessment and Diagnosis of Reading Difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>The candidate recognizes assessment as an ongoing and indispensable part of reflective teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>The candidate is knowledgeable about the characteristics and appropriate application of widely used and evolving assessment approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>The candidate conducts assessments that involve multiple indicators of learner progress and takes into account the context of teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>The candidate uses information from norm-referenced tests, criterion-referenced tests, formal and informal inventories, constructed response measures, portfolio-based assessments, student self-evaluations, work/performance samples, observations, anecdotal records, journals, and other indicators of student progress to inform instruction and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>The candidate creates assessments that take into account the complex nature of reading, writing and language and that are based on a range of authentic literacy tasks using a variety of texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>The candidate aligns assessment with curriculum and instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 9</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>The candidate teaches students planning strategies most appropriate for particular kinds of writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>The candidate teaches students to draft, revise, and edit their writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>The candidate teaches students the conventions of standard written English needed to edit their compositions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 10</th>
<th>Professionalism, Professional Development, and Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>The candidate uses multiple indicators to judge professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>The candidate models ethical professional behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>The candidate reflects on practice to improve instruction and other services to the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>The candidate applies research for improved literacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 11</th>
<th>Field Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>There are logical, sequential, and planned reading experience(s) integrated into coursework where candidates participate in classroom(s) with certified/licensed, experienced teacher(s) and work with P-12 students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Requirements

Candidates seeking some Ohio educator licenses must receive preparation in effective methods of instruction for individuals with dyslexia. Preparation programs requiring this component are:

- Early Childhood License
- Middle Childhood License (All Subject Areas)
- Adolescence to Young Adult License (All Subject Areas)
- Intervention Specialist License (Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe)
- Early Childhood Intervention Specialist License
- American Sign Language License
- Career Technical License (All Subject Areas)
- Ohio Reading Endorsement

Candidates must be prepared to:

a. know and recognize that assessment, prevention, and remediation for students with dyslexia are critical factors in raising reading proficiency rates throughout the state;

b. understand the content of effective instruction that emphasizes the structure of language including phonology (speech/sound system), orthography (the writing system), syntax (sentence structure), and morphology (meaningful parts of words);

c. develop requisite skills critical for providing differentiated reading instruction to at-risk readers of varying ages and ability levels;

d. recognize the principles that form the basis of the NICHD/IDA definition of dyslexia and identify distinguishing characteristics of this reading disorder; and

e. recognize the effectiveness of systematic, explicit, multisensory (the simultaneous incorporation of visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile pathways for learning) reading instruction to ameliorate reading failure.

Providing Evidence to Ohio Department of Higher Education

To document that a program is providing dyslexia training for candidates, Ohio educator preparation programs must provide one of the three items as evidence when submitting programs for new or continuing approval by the Chancellor:

A. Program of Study document demonstrating that program candidates are required to successfully complete a Phonics Course; or

B. A completed Course Evaluation Tool for a required course that aligns to International Dyslexia Association (IDA) guidelines; or

C. Require program candidates to pass the Ohio Foundations of Reading Assessment (available beginning fall 2016).