October 18, 2013

Dear Melinda Hollis:

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit the paper entitled, An Analysis of Teacher Efficacy and Perspectives about Elementary Literacy Instruction. It was with great pleasure that I receive this news. On behalf of my author team, we have made the following adjustments to fulfil the reviewers’ requests.

**Reviewer #1 Comments**

The following sentence was added to the abstract to reflect the results of the study.

Testing data indicated students achieved both because of instruction and teachers’ willingness to implement the reading program with fidelity.

The following wealth of references on page 2, paragraph 2 provide evidence to situate the manuscript alongside previously published research on the topic as mentioned by the reviewer:

(Duffy-Hester, 1999; Hoffman, 1998; Morrow, Tracey, Gee, Woo, & Pressley, 1999; Rivkin & Hanusheck, 1998; Rosenshine & Stevens, 1986; Sanders & Rivers, 1996; Terry, Minor, Onwueglouzie, & Witcher, 2002).

A summary statement about new insights and findings were summarized within the conclusion section of p. 24:

New insight into the relationship between teacher beliefs about reading instruction and their practices was revealed alongside adding substantial data to support the role teachers play in developing the how’s and why’s of literacy instruction in their classrooms. Other factors were also found to be relevant to effective reading instruction, according to the teacher participants in this study. Finally, some questions emerged from the study including the following:

Added on p. 25, paragraph 2

These data can be used to indicate that teacher efficacy is affected by teacher beliefs about students' ability to learn, faculty influence over school policy, and faculty beliefs about student behavior, which is an extension from previous research findings.

The settings/participant selection were revised with succinct language (p.12/13):

Four schools were selected to participate in the study using *intensity case sampling* (Patton, 2002). An equal number of Reading First and Non- Reading First Schools were selected for inclusion. Hollow Brook Elementary and Willow Lane Elementary are currently receiving funding and functioning as Reading First Schools (pseudonyms are used throughout the study to preserve the anonymity of participants).Green Meadows Elementary and Winding Trail Elementary are schools that shadow the Reading First model in similar aspects, but are labeled Non-Reading First Schools due to lack of complete funding for staff and resources. Through the use of *intensity sampling* and *stratified purposeful sampling* (Patton, 2002), the District Curriculum Coordinator was asked to suggest schools with integrity and good intentions for the purposes of the present study. The four first grade teachers were chosen on the same basis with recommendations from the principals. Information gathered reflected the grades, status, school performance score, growth label, and ranking as identified by academic assistance from the beginning of that particular school year. At the time of study, these are the data the school would use to drive the instructional goals in the school improvement plan.

**Reviewer #2 Comments**

Added Table 1 to summarize findings.

Indentified the Dimensions of Teacher Efficacy (Ashton, 1984, p. 29) on page 22:

1. sense of personal accomplishment
2. positive expectations for student behavior and achievement
3. personal responsibility for student learning
4. strategies for achieving objectives
5. positive affect
6. sense of control
7. sense of common teacher-student goals
8. democratic decision-making

All editing recommendations have been corrected.

**Reviewer # 3 Comments**

The meaning of NCLB was added; it is now articulated on p.4 upon its first mentioning in the paper.

The addition of an explanation for what constitutes Reading First schools was added on p.4

Reading First Schools are those that are financially supported to implement scientifically based reading practices alongside instructional and assessment tools deemed to be appropriate by the U.S. Department of Education.

Editing corrections on p.15 and p.20 were made as recommended.

References were also added as mentioned.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

If additional information is warranted, please let me know. All the best

Regards,

Evan Ortlieb