UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CYNICISM AND INSTRUCTIONAL CHANGE

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

VICKI L. BEARD
Norman, Oklahoma
2019

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHP BETWEEN CYNICISM AND INSTRUCTIONAL CHANGE

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

Dr. Curt Adams, Chair

Dr. Patrick B. Forsyth

Dr. Keith E. Ballard

Dr. Beverly J. Edwards

Dr. Vickie E. Lake

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to all the teachers and professors who took this educational journey with me. I am here because of you. You inspired, motivated and challenged me to become the student, educator, and person that I am today. All played an integral role, but some left marks on my life forever; Mrs. Downing, Mrs. Stanley, Mrs. Billingsley, Dr. Mike Hemphill and Dr. Christy Standerfer, thank you!

I also dedicate this dissertation to my late grandmother, Klysta Parlin. She was a strong, independent woman way before her time and I believe I got my grit from her--cheers, Grandma!

Acknowledgements

I am forever grateful to the faculty of the Jeannine Rainbolt College of Education at the University of Oklahoma. I am especially thankful to my chair, Dr. Curt Adams. I appreciate all the time you invested in my success and completion of this program. I would also like to thank Dr. Forsyth for your humor, Dr. Edwards for reminding me to drink water and eat kale, Dr. Ballard for your professional guidance and support of my career choices and Dr. Lake for the tenacity in which you support and believe in teachers.

To my parents who told me my entire life that I could do anything I put my mind to, thank you for your unwavering support and belief in me. Your example of hard work helped me preserve and finish. Daddy, I finally believe that I am smart!

To my husband and children, thank you for the sacrifices each of you made for me to complete my degree. I told you when I began this would be a team effort and it was! I also appreciate all the Hot Tamales!!!

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements……. iv

Abstract……. ix

Chapter 1: Introduction……... 1

Statement of the Problem……. 5

Statement of the Purpose……. 6

Definition of Terms……. 7

Deeper Learning……. 7

Cynicism……. 7

Cynicism Toward the Reading Program…….. 8

Cynicism Toward Administration…… 8

Willingness to Change……. 8

First-Order Change…….. 8

Second-Order Change……... 8

Teacher/Teaching Focused……... 8

Student/Learning Focused……. 9

Teacher as Manager…….. 9

Teacher as Facilitator…… 9

Teacher as Activator……. 9

Organization of Dissertation…… 10

Chapter 2: Review of Literature……. 11

A Shift in Focus: From Teacher/Teaching to Student/Learning…… 11

First-Order and Second-Order Change……... 19

Lack of Change from First-Order to Second-Order…….. 23

Cynicism: Its History, Meaning, and Nature……..... 26

Historical Understanding of Cynicism……. 26

Conceptualizations of Cynicism…….. 27

Personality…… 28

Society/Institutional……. 29

Occupational…… 30

Employee……. 31

Organizational Change…… 31

A Working Definition for this Study…….. 32

Cynicism, Satisfaction, and Trust……... 32

Effects of Cynicism…… 35

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework…… 39

Field Theory…… 39

Group Dynamics……. 41

3-Step Model of Change……. 42

Criticisms of Lewin's Change Theory…… 44

Rational and Hypotheses…… 46

Chapter 4: Research Methods……50

Research Design.……50

Reading Program…….……...50

Data Collection…….. 52

Measures…… 53

Analysis……... 55

Study Limitations…… 56

Chapter 5: Results…….…….. 58

Descriptive Statistics…….……. 58

Exploratory Factor Analysis……... 60

Correlational Analysis……. 67

Multiple Linear Regression Results…… 69

Chapter 6: Discussion…… 70

Cynicism and Instructional Change…… 70

Field Theory…… 70

Group Dynamics……. 72

3-Step Model of Change……..... 75

Other Interesting Findings…….……. 77

Implications for District Leadership……... 77

Conclusion…….……. 79

Bibliography…….…….. 81

Appendix A…… 95

Cynicism Survey Toward School Administration……. 95

Appendix B…… 96

Cynicism Survey Toward Reading Curriculum…… 96

Appendix C…… 97

Willingness to Change Survey……..... 97

Appendix D……... 98

IRB Approval…… 98

Abstract

Instructional practices today remain heavily centered and oriented around the teacher despite decades of educational reform efforts. Curriculum has changed, technology usage has increased, and standards have evolved; however, most instruction is still centered around the teacher or teaching with limited opportunities for students to apply knowledge to unique situations and challenges. While teachers are fundamental to the learning process, instruction must shift focus from teacher to student for deeper learning to take place. The paucity of instructional change leads us to ask: What are possible barriers to teacher's lack of willingness to change instructional practices?

Considering this question through the lens of change theory, this research explores what possible barriers might impede the instructional change process. One possible barrier considered is teacher cynicism. It is considered that teacher cynicism might act as a barrier to teacher's willingness to change their instructional practices. Therefore, this research has application for how teachers and administrators can adjust to improve the implementation process when teachers are asked to make changes to their instructional processes**.**

Chapter 1: Introduction

Despite two centuries of attempted instructional reform, teaching practices today look remarkably similar to those of the early 20th century (Cuban, 1993; Fullan, 2015; Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006; Hattie, 2015; Payne, 2008; Pellegrino & Hilton 2012; Sarason, 1997). Although technology, instructional materials, and curricular standards have evolved, typical elementary and secondary classrooms in the US are still organized around the teacher with minimal opportunities for students to apply knowledge to unique situations and challenges (Ertmer, 1999; Fullan, 2015). Perhaps, the limited success of instructional reforms should be expected (Cuban, 1988; Elmore, 2004; Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988; Fullan, 2015; Hattie, 2012). Researchers who study organizations, argue that institutions "maintained over long periods of time without further justification or elaborations …are highly resistant to change" (Zucker, 1987, p. 446). This seems true for teaching and learning practices as well (Cuban, 1993; Fullan, 2015, Hattie, 2012, 2015).

Within the last four to five decades, teachers have been called on to redefine their role from teacher as manager (Cuban 1988, 1993; Fullan, 1993), to teacher as facilitator (McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007), and now to teacher as activator of deeper learning (Fullan 2013, 2015; Hattie, 2012; Pellegrino & Hilton, 2012). It is claimed that deeper learning cannot occur if classrooms organize instruction around teachers. Instead, deeper learning places students at the center of knowledge acquisition and application (Fullan, 2015; Hattie, 2015; Pellegrino & Hilton, 2012). Deeper learning is a process through which a student becomes capable of taking what was learned in one situation and applying it to new situations and problems—in other words, learning for transfer (Pellegrino & Hilton, 2012). Pellegrino and Hilton (2012) define deeper learning as the skills and knowledge students will need to succeed in a world changing at

an unprecedented pace. The realization of such an ambition for schools requires preparing students to master core academic content, to think critically and solve complex problems, to work collaboratively, to communicate effectively, and learn how to learn (Hattie, 2015; Pellegrino & Hilton, 2012). To achieve these ambitions, student learning needs to replace teaching as the central focus of classrooms (Hattie, 2015; Pellegrino & Hilton, 2012).

Schools throughout the 20th century, and into the first decades of the 21st century, have not been organized to build student competencies beyond basic content knowledge and skills (Dufour & Dufour, 2015; Fullan, 2015). As a result, teaching could achieve standards by being didactic and centered on what the teacher knows (Fullan, 2015). Aspirations for deeper learning are not likely to be realized with this mindset and approach (Dufour & Dufour, 2015; Fullan, 2015). Arguably, the educational system that served generations so well will not prepare students for success in the 21st century (Dufour & Dufour, 2015). Job demands for the 21st century require new skills that will require instructional shifts and change in classroom practices if students are going to meet the demands of a complex, information-based society (Dufour & Dufour, 2015; Fullan, 2015).

The transformation of classrooms and schools to contexts of deeper learning requires more than traditional, surface-level or first-order change (Dufour & Dufour, 2015; Fullan, 2015). First-order change is defined as change that adjusts teaching practices or resources without shifting a teacher's instructional beliefs and assumptions (Brickner, 1995; Fullan, 2015; McCombs & Miller, 2007). Deeper learning depends on second-order change, which is where underlying instructional beliefs held by teachers are confronted and challenged in ways that alter the student-teacher power dynamic in the learning process (Brickner, 1995; Fullan, 2015; McCombs & Miller, 2007). A difference between first and second-order change involves teacher

beliefs and mental representations (Brickner, 1995; Fullan, 2015; McCombs & Miller, 2007). It is argued that second-order change emerges out of a mindset shift that alters the representations teachers use to guide practice (Brickner, 1995; McCombs & Miller, 2007). In theory, once a teacher changes at the level of second-order, he/she would be unlikely to return to previous routines and/or habits (Brownlee, 2000; Waters, Marzan & McNulty, 2003; Ertmer, 2005).

Efforts at technology integration illustrate differences in first and second-order change. In many cases, technology has changed classroom practices (Ertmer, 2005; Kim, Kim, Lee, Spector & DeMeester, 2013). Some of the changes are seen by teachers using Smartboards, many students have personal devices, and online platforms like canvas or Desire to Learn are used. Teachers adapt certain aspects of technology for work efficiency, but are they integrating it in ways that increase student engagement? Most evidence suggests that teachers are not integrating technology on a large scale (Ertmer, 2005; Ertmer, Ottenbreit-Leftwich, Sadik, Sendurur & Sendurur, 2012; Kim, Kim, Lee, Spector & DeMeester, 2013). Instruction with technology, in many cases, looks remarkably the same as instruction before the imbedding of technology. Instructional devices changed, but instruction stayed the same. Devices are merely taking the place of textbooks, and Smartboards are taking the place of chalkboards or overhead projectors. The presence of technology in the classroom or even the increased usage of technology in the classroom is not in and of itself an indicator of deeper learning (Ertmer, 2005; Ertmer, et al, 2012; Kim et al, 2013).

According to several large-scale studies (Ertmer, Ottenbreit-Leftwich, Sadik, Sendurur & Sendurur, 2012; Kim, Kim, Lee, Spector & DeMeester, 2013), teachers have increased technology usage, but for low-level, first-order tasks such as word processing, Internet searches, and emailing (Ertmer, et al, 2012). Technology integration for higher-level, second-order tasks,

such as a student using presentational software as part of his or her presentation to demonstrate knowledge transfer remains minimal (Ertmer, 2005; Ertmer, et al, 2012; Kim et al, 2013). Many teachers are not taking advantage of newer technology to improve instructional practice (Kim et al, 2013).

Teaching for deeper learning requires a type of learning experience different from those teachers are familiar with or experienced when they were in school (Fullan, 2015; McCombs & Miller, 2007). Instruction advancing deeper learning requires a willingness of teachers to embrace change at the second order (Ertmer, et al, 2012), in particular, a willingness to embrace new approaches to teaching. This simple objective remains elusive. Decades of failure to disrupt and change teacher instructional practices have plagued the classroom (Cuban 1988, 1993; Fullan, 2015). School districts spend millions of dollars on professional development to help teachers advance their instructional strategies, better manage their classrooms, and/or learn the latest technology only to have teachers return to their classrooms and deploy the same instructional strategies day after day, year after year (DuFour & DuFour, 2015; Fullan, 2015).

Lewin's classic change theory explains why change is so difficult (1947). He suggests that change requires an acknowledgement that what is being done no longer works. According to Lewin's theory, teachers would need a crisis of belief or be presented with a real need for the change to be willing to change their instructional routines (Lewin, 1947). Applying Lewin's study of change, if a teacher's measure of student success is a score on a standardized state test and his/her students are meeting standard objectives, the teacher might not question his/her instructional strategies and might resist training geared to make instructional shifts. Lewin's (1947) theory would assert that teachers need to unfreeze their current beliefs if they are to move away from instructional practices that limit learning to basic recall. Many well-intentioned

instructional reforms have not resulted in deeper learning processes much less altered teacher instructional belief systems (Cuban 1988, 1993; Fullan, 2015). Herein lies the problem addressed by this research.

Statement of the Problem

Evidence suggests that the place to begin an organizational change is with the knowledge and attitudes of individuals (Dent & Goldberg, 1999). For example, cynicism is an attitude held by employees and individuals (Abraham, 2000; Andersson & Bateman, 1997). Understanding how cynical attitudes affect employees is a starting point for addressing change (Andersson, 1996; Andersson & Bateman, 1997). The relationship between teacher cynicism and willingness to change instructional practices has not been explored and only a handful of studies exist that examine cynicism in an educational context (Akin, 2015; Aslan & Yilmaz, 2013; Chang, 2009; Pietarinen, Pyhalto, Soini & Salmela-Aro, 2013; Polatcan & Titrek, 2014; Pyhalto, Pietarinen, Salmela-Aro, 2011; Saha & Dworkin, 2009). Research in politics and other organizations, suggests that cynicism does influence the social and psychological mechanisms of behavioral change in organizations; this same relationship may persist between teacher cynicism and willingness to change instructional practice (Bouckenooghe, 2012; Boukes & Boomgaarden, 2015).

Cynicism and its effects on the workplace have been studied extensively with evidence indicating that cynicism has negative effects on employee performance, such as emotional exhaustion, job dissatisfaction, absences, distrust of management and willingness to participate in change activities (Andersson & Bateman, 1997; Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999; Hochwarterm, James, Johnson, & Ferris, 2004; Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly, 2003; Pugh, Skarlicki & Pasell, 2003; Stanley et al., 2005; Wanous, Reichers & Austin, 2000). The cynicism evidence in

educational context largely supports the finding that cynical beliefs are related to low identification with the school, poor communication, and high distrust (Ayki, 2015; Sagir & Ojuz, 2012). No research has examined the relationship between cynicism and willingness to change instructional practice. (Ayik, 2015; Polat, 2013; Polatcan & Titrek, 2013; Sagir & Ojuz; 2012;). The lack of evidence relating to the instructional effects of cynicism has created a knowledge-gap that this study sought to address.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between teacher cynicism and willingness to change instructional practice. This study explored the literature on cynicism and instructional practice as a means of understanding the complexities of both constructs in order to provide the foundation for the study. The review of literature on cynicism and instructional change and Lewin's Change Theory (Lewin, 1947) provided the lenses through which the possibility of an existing relationship was examined. Lewin's Change Theory guided the discussion by defining the context in which a change is likely to occur and led the discussion of possible psychological forces required to move teachers to change or not to change.

Change in instructional practice has indeed occurred; however, this study examines the level of change. Theoretical literature on leadership and change makes the case that not all change is of the same magnitude (Brickner, 1995; Cuban, 1993; Fullam & Stiegelbauer, 1991). The type of change required to move from a teacher/teaching focus to a student/learning focus would challenge a teacher's existing beliefs (Brickner, 1995; McCombs & Miller, 2007). A student/learning focus requires a change in one's mindset or a paradigm shift. This level of change is referred to as second-order change. Second-order change has proven elusive for instructional practices. This study attempts to determine if cynicism is acting as a possible

barrier to the limited amount of change in instructional practice and the elusiveness of second-order change.

The evidence on the effects of cynicism largely comes from police cynicism and cynicism within other various fields and organizations. Very few studies exist that examine cynicism in an educational context (Chang, 2009; Pietarinen, Pyhalto, Soini & Salmela-Aro, 2013; Pyhalto, Pietarinen, Salmela-Aro, 2011; Polatcan & Titrek, 2014; Akin, 2015; Aslan & Yilmaz, 2013; Saha & Dworkin, 2009). This evidence does demonstrate the affects of cynicism on the social and psychological mechanisms of behavioral change in organizations. Therefore, this study attempts to add to the body of research examining the affects of cynicism within the context of education. Specifically, this study sought to answer the question: could a teacher's cynicism act as a psychological force affecting his or her implementation of a new instructional approach?

Definition of Terms

Deeper Learning

Deeper learning is the process through which a person becomes capable of taking what was learned in one situation and applies it to a new situation; therefore, learning is transferred (VanderArk & Schneider, 2012).

Cynicism

Cynicism is defined as an attitude of contempt, frustration, hopelessness, disillusionment and distrust toward an object or multiple objects, susceptible to change by exposure to factors in the environment and will also include the same characteristics in regard to organizational change (Abraham, 2000; Reichers, Wanous & Austin, 1997; Anderson & Bateman, 1997).

Cynicism Toward the Reading Program

An attitude of contempt, frustration, hopelessness, disillusionment and distrust toward the new reading program (Wonders).

Cynicism Toward Administration

An attitude of contempt, frustration, hopelessness, disillusionment and distrust toward building-level administrator requesting teachers to implement the new reading program.

Willingness to Change

Willingness to change begins with an acknowledgement that the status quo is no longer sufficient and there is an openness to making the necessary alterations (McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007).

First-Order Change

First-order change can be defined as changes that adjust current teaching practices incrementally, making the instruction more effective or efficient, but underlying beliefs are left unchallenged (Brickner, 1995; Fullan, 2015; McCombs & Miller, 2007).

Second-Order Change

Second-order change can be defined as change that confronts underlying beliefs about current instructional practices; thus, leading to new goals, structures or roles (Brickner, 1995; Fullan, 2015; McCombs & Miller, 2007).

Teacher/Teaching Focused

Teacher/Teaching-focused instruction looks at the relationship between the teacher and student and to what extent each is responsible for the learning that takes place within the context of the classroom (Fullan 2015; Hattie, 2015). Conceptually, teacher/teaching focused instruction

can be defined as instruction where the teacher controls what is taught, when it is taught, and under what conditions (Cuban, 1993; Fullan 2015).

Student/Learning Focused

Student/Learning focused instruction also looks at the relationship between the teacher and the student and to what extent each is responsible for the learning that takes place within the context of the classroom (Fullan, 2015; Hattie 2015). Conceptually, student-centered instruction is actualized when students are encouraged by the teacher to become owners and/or authors of their learning (McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller 2007). Student-centered instruction is not just about an outcome; it is about the process (McCombs, 2001; Hattie, 2012).

Teacher as Manager

Teacher as manager is synonymous throughout pedagogical research with "sage on a stage". A teacher functions as a manager when he/she controls all the activities of the learners (Fullan, 2015; Hattie 2015).

Teacher as Facilitator

Teacher as facilitator is synonymous throughout pedagogical research with "guide on the side". A teacher functions as a facilitator when he/she no longer controls the activities of the learners. The teacher grants the learners space to be creative and innovative in their learning; thus, giving the student more control of their own learning outcomes (Fullan, 2015; Hattie 2015).

Teacher as Activator

The teacher is an activator of student learning by playing a more active role in the classroom than a 'guide on the side'. The teacher uses a range of instructional strategies to support and extend learning. These strategies are contextually relevant and align with the student-centered approach (Fullan, 2015; Hattie 2015).

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter 1 explains the significance of this study in relation to addressing the lack of second-order change within the classroom and the effects teacher cynicism might play in the lack of change. A statement of problem, definition of terms, limitations of the study, and assumptions were also presented.

Chapter 2 provides a review of literature in which Lewin's Change Theory is the lens for presenting and explaining the hypotheses. Key concepts are defined and described: teacher-centered instruction, student-centered instruction, first-order change, second-order change and cynicism. This theory and key concepts lay the framework for the hypothesis and research.

Chapter 3 presents the hypotheses and rationale. Lewin's Change Theory is used as the lens to explain the hypothesized relationship between teacher cynicism and willingness to change instructional practice.

Chapter 4 presents the methods used to analyze the data. The research context, research design, and evaluation tool are explained. The data source and measures are described, and analytical techniques are explained with justification for their use.

Chapter 5 presents the results of the study. Results include findings from descriptive statistics and exploratory factor analyses are presented. Results from a correlational analysis and multiple linear regressions are also presented.

Chapter 6 provides a discussion and summary of the findings. This section restates each hypothesis, explains data pertaining to each claim, states whether the data supports or disputes the claim, and makes an argument as to why the data supports or disputes each claim. The chapter provides an explanation for the findings based on theoretical and speculative analysis

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

The review of literature explores the possible relationship between cynicism and instructional change. The review begins by examining the concept of instructional change through two teaching paradigms – teacher/teaching focused instruction and student/learning focused instruction. Additionally, the difference between first-order and second-order change is explained. After an examination of instructional change, the literature review turns to the nature and function of cynicism. A historical perspective of cynicism is provided along with conceptualizations of the different types of cynicism. A discussion is offered to distinguish cynicism from other constructs, such as job satisfaction and trust.

A Shift in Focus: From Teacher/Teaching to Student/Learning

At the heart of educational reform is the intent to change instructional practice for the purpose of improved student outcomes (Cuban, 1988; Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988; Fullan, 1992; Fullan, 2012, 2015; Hattie, 2012). Unfortunately, the reality of meaningful change has not lived up to the vision behind so many initiatives (Cuban, 1988; Elmore, 2004, Fullan, 2015). Classroom instruction remains heavily centered and oriented around the teacher (Felder & Brent, 1996; McCombs, 2001; Quintana, Krajcik, Soloway, Fisherman & O'Connor-Divelbiss, 2013). While teachers are fundamental to the learning process, for deeper learning to take place the organization of classroom instruction must shift focus from teacher to student. As Pellegrino and Hilton (2012) argue, the work of educators should revolve around student learning

In classrooms focused on the teacher/teaching, the teacher controls what material is to be taught, how the material is to be taught, and how the teacher presents the material (Cuban, 1993; Fullan 2015). Observable features of teacher/teaching focused instruction include: 1) teacher talk exceeds student talk during instruction, 2) instruction occurs frequently with the whole class;

small group or individual instruction occurs less frequently, 3) use of class time is determined by the teacher, and 4) the classroom is usually arranged into rows of desks or chairs facing a blackboard with a teacher's desk nearby (Cuban, 1993; Hattie, 2012). The teacher/teaching focused approach is defined by teacher practice, not student construction and application of knowledge.

Teacher/teaching focused instruction as the primary instructional approach might be effective with a homogeneous group of students, but as the student population becomes more diverse a one-size-fits-all teaching method does not work with all students and often fails to meet the needs of many children and adolescents (Fullan, 2012; Hattie, 2012). The classroom of the 20th Century may have served a different generation well; however, Dufour and Dufour (2015) argue, it is now outdated and is not adequately preparing students to be successful in the current workplace. Required skills for a 21st Century workforce are different from those that prepared students for an industrial-based economy (Bellanca; 2015), and thus require instruction to center on learning and application.

To be sure, changes have occurred in contemporary classrooms. Instructional technologies change rapidly, instructional materials are new, assessments have advanced, and curricular standards emphasize different content knowledge and skills (Ertmer, 1999; Fullan, 2015). The notion of student as driver of his/her own learning and the teacher as activator of this process, however, has failed to reach the depth of practice in many schools in the United States and abroad (Fullan, 2015). That is to claim that instructional change has largely consisted of adopting new tools of the craft, but not adjusting the paradigm used to guide how learning is activated (Ertmer, 1999, 2005; Ertmer el al, 2012; Fullan 2015; Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2003). The paradigm adjustment calls for re-imagining teacher and student roles in the learning

process, or what Fullan and Langworthy (2014) call for as “a new learning partnership between and among students and teachers” (p. 7). So, what might a student/learning focus approach look like and how is it different than teacher/teaching focus?

In contrast to teacher-centric classrooms, student/learning focused classrooms use each student’s unique perspectives and interests as means of guiding personalized instruction aimed at unique individual and group needs (Fullan 2015). Observable features of student/learning focused instruction include: 1) Student talk on learning tasks is at least equal to, if not greater than, teacher talk; 2) most instruction occurs either individually, in small (2 to 6 students) or moderately sized (7-12) groups rather than the whole class; 3) students help choose and organize the content to be learned, and the teacher permits students to determine, partially or wholly, rules of the behavior and penalties in classroom and how they are enforced; 4) varied instructional materials are available in the classroom so that students can use them independently or in small groups,

(e. g., interest centers, teaching stations, and activity centers); 5) use of these materials is either scheduled by the teacher or determined by students for at least half of the academic time available; 6) classroom is usually arranged in a manner that permits students to work together or separately in small groups or in individual work space; no dominant pattern exists and much movement of desks, tables, and chairs occurs in realigning furniture and space (Cuban, 1993; Hattie, 2012).

Tucker, Wycoff and Green (2017) explain that personalized learning takes place when the teacher creatively differentiates curriculum for increasing student engagement and deeper learning. An example of this type of differentiation might be a teacher using stations that allow students to interact with materials in different ways instead of delivering content via lecture to

students. Delivering information by lecture does not mean that learning will be ignited and occur uniformly across students. Students bring unique needs to a learning situation and require unique stimulators to match these needs. A system of equality for all students will not prepare students for success in the 21st century, creating a moral imperative for changing the traditional practices of schooling (Dufour & Dufour, 2015).

Student/learning focused instruction is actualized when students are encouraged by the teacher to become owners and/or authors of their learning (McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller 2007). Teachers who are student/learning focused begin to use each student's unique perspectives, different backgrounds, interests and abilities as individual pathways to understanding; instead of viewing differences as just more ways they must differentiate a lesson. For example, an English teacher might allow student choice when selecting novels, or a math teacher might use real world problems for students to solve using math formulas. Teachers must work harder to develop creative learning opportunities for students. Student/learning focused instruction is not just about an outcome; it is about the process (McCombs, 2001; Hattie, 2012).

There are a couple of noteworthy differences between teacher/teaching focused and student/learning focused pedagogical approaches. A significant difference is between teacher as 'manager' (Fullan, 1993) and teacher as 'activator' (Fullan, 2015; Hattie, 2012; Quintana et al, 2013). Teacher/teaching focused instruction is characterized as the teacher being a manager of students, content, and practice. The teacher determines all aspects of the instructional process. Hattie argues that a manager allows one pathway to the content - the teacher has the content/knowledge and the teacher gives the content/knowledge to the students in a standardized way (2012). Facilitators begin to offer some release of ownership of learning to students and a few pathways to learning while activators, on the other hand, rely on multiple pathways to

deliver learning (Fullan, 2012, 2015). Activators of student learning offer immediate feedback, access thinking, support challenging goals and monitor learning (Fullan, 2015). Student/learning focused instruction allows each student to determine his/her own path to understanding content and ultimately gaining knowledge and skills (Hattie, 2012; McCombs, 2001).

Student learning ownership is activated as teachers provide differentiated instruction that allows student discovery through multiple avenues and at multiple levels of knowledge (Hattie, 2012; McCombs, 2001). Another way to differentiate teacher/teaching focused and student/learning focused is through the lens of how knowledge is generated. Student/learning instruction enables students to build knowledge as they interact with the materials and assimilate it with their own existing interests and experiences (Hattie, 2012; McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007). The emphasis and responsibility of learning is placed on the student and the teacher 'facilitates and/or activates' the necessary resources, interests, content to enable the optimal learning environment. Educators might mistakenly assume that a student/learning focused approach to learning is "unstructured"; however, according to Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006), "the past half century of empirical research on this issue has provided overwhelming and unambiguous evidence that minimal guidance during instruction is significantly less effective and efficient than guidance specifically designed to support the cognitive process necessary for learning (p.75). Student/learning focused instruction requires teachers thoughtfully and purposefully to design instruction to illustrate key subject-matter concepts, balance students' need for direct instruction with opportunities to inquire, provide extensive scaffolding of the learning, model effective strategies for inquiry give frequent feedback and develop and use assessment to guide the learning process (Barron & Darling-

Hammond, 2008). As teachers move from managers to activators, there are observable differences in classroom roles.

Three differences are observable in the shift from teacher/teaching focused to student/learning focused: student engagement, depth of knowledge and knowledge creation (Peters, 2010; Ryan & Patrick, 2001; Vescio, Ross & Adams, 2008). Student engagement generally looks different in a teacher/teaching focused classroom compared to a student/learning classroom. Teacher/teaching focused classrooms tend to address only the behavioral elements of the students, such as, minding the social ques of a teacher-focused classroom (Ryan & Patrick, 2001). Is the student sitting quietly at a desk, taking notes during the lecture, giving proper nonverbal feedback to the teacher? Whereas the student-centered classroom recognizes and maintains the psychological development, performance and well-being of students must be satisfied for individuals to have an optimal experience (Deci & Ryan, 1975; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2008). The student/learning focused classroom encompasses the behavioral, emotional and cognitive aspects of each student. Student engagement is likely to increase as teachers embrace all aspects of their student's needs and address their needs in the instructional routines implemented (Peters, 2010; Wu & Huang, 2007). New instructional practices are required of students and teachers to change how students create knowledge in a student/learning focused classroom.

Depth of knowledge is a second difference that emerges in a more student/learning focused classroom (Vescio, Ross & Adams, 2008). Webb (2002) developed a framework to classify knowledge by its use. Level one requires students to receive or recite facts or to use simple skills or abilities. This level requires only a shallow understanding of a concept, fact, or process. An example of level one might be using a dictionary to find the meaning of a word. Level two

knowledge involves the engagement of some mental processing beyond recalling or reproducing a response; it requires both comprehension and subsequent processing of text or portions of text (Webb, 2007). An example of level two might include using context cues to identify the meaning of unfamiliar words. At level three, students can apply the knowledge by connecting it to other ideas. Students are encouraged at this level to go beyond the text; however, they are still required to show understanding of the ideas in the text. Students may be encouraged to explain, generalize, or connect ideas. An example of level three would be students determining the author's purpose and describing how it affects the interpretation of a reading selection. At Level four, higher order thinking is central, and knowledge is deep. Students take information from at least one passage and are asked to apply this information to a new task. They may also be asked to develop hypotheses and perform complex analyses of the connections among texts. An example of level four might be students analyzing and synthesizing information from multiple sources (Webb, 2002, 2007).

Teacher/teaching focused instruction largely falls at level one and level two on Webb's (2002, 2007) Depth of Knowledge (DOK) taxonomy. Teacher/teaching focused instruction stops here. For example, students would only be able to provide simple definitions to words in a passage or summarize major events in a narrative (Webb, 2002). As teachers become more student/learning focused, teachers activate deeper learning by pushing students to think strategically at level three and by extending thinking at level four. Strategic and extended thinking requires more cognitive demands as students apply knowledge to new situations, work to identify and solve problems, and engage in longer term projects where ideas are tested, and evidence examined (Vescio, Ross & Adams, 2008). The difference between teaching focused and learning focused instruction is that teaching focused instruction tends to stop at level two and

does not penetrate to deeper cognitive demands. Learning focused instruction tends to engage students across all four DOK levels (Felder & Brent, 1996).

Knowledge creation is the third observable difference. Knowledge creation looks different in a teaching focused classroom compared to a learning focused classroom. With a teaching focus, information is transmitted by teachers with the expectation that information transmission will stimulate cognitive processes (Peters, 2010). Whereas, in a learning focused classroom, students actively participate in the creation of knowledge (Wu & Huang, 2007). Knowledge creation is fluid and uses strategies like cooperative learning or research where students generate the questions, background information and possible solutions instead of the teacher handing them the prescribed research (Peters, 2010; Wu & Huang, 2007). This type of student owned inquiry is linked to many positive student outcomes, such as growth in conceptual understanding, increased content knowledge, building relationship between student and teacher and enhanced research skills (Benford & Lawson, 2001; Holliday, 2001; Peters 2010). In learning focused classrooms, students create and apply knowledge, whereas in teaching focused classrooms, students build knowledge by memorizing content and processes and demonstrate knowledge by repeating the same procedures on tests or worksheets (Vescio, Ross & Adams, 2008).

These three differences in a student/learning versus teacher/teaching focused classrooms paint a picture in which students are engaged, active, and applying knowledge to new situations and circumstances. Teacher focused classrooms tend to be places where students are less engaged, recite facts, use simple skills/abilities and the only transference of knowledge takes place during assessment when students regurgitate facts on a test (DuFour & DuFour, 2015; Zhoa, 2015). Instruction focused on the learner can emphasize deeper, more meaningful learning through knowledge application and transfer, rather than limited learning to tasks that

require low cognitive demand (National Research Council, 2012). Zhoa (2015) argues that an approach focused on the learner better prepares students for the complexity of living and working in a modern society. That stated, teacher/teaching focused classrooms remain the norm today (DuFour & DuFour, 2015; Elmore, 2004; Fullan, 2015; Hattie, 2012). Student/learning focused instruction, although frequently identified as the signature pedagogy of many educators, remains more of an espoused theory than a dominant practice (Fullan, 2015). A reason for this can be found in the tendency of schools to undergo first order change and not second order change (Brickner, 1995; Cuban, 1993; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Waters, et al, 2003).

First Order and Second Order Change

The theoretical literature on leadership, change, and the adoption of new ideas makes the case that not all change is of the same magnitude (Brickner, 1995; Cuban, 1993; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Waters, et al, 2003). Some changes have greater implications than others for teachers, students, parents and other stakeholders (Waters, et al, 2003). Instructional change can be as simple as using a new textbook, assessment, or curriculum. In these instances, the teacher does something differently than he/she has in the past, but the change does not challenge the teacher's underlying beliefs (Brickner, 1995). This type of superficial change, however, is not the type of instructional change required to move from teacher/teaching focused to student/learning instruction where underlying beliefs are challenged (Brickner, 1995; Fullan, 2015; McCombs & Miller, 2007). This is an example of first-order change. Student/learning focused instruction requires a change in one's mindset or view of student learning as a process controlled by teachers to a process activated by teachers (Fullan 2015; Hattie, 2012, McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007; Tsai & Chai, 2012). Changing guiding assumptions to transform practice defines second-order change (Ertmer, 1999; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Tsai

& Chai 2012; Ertmer et al, 2012; Kim et al 2013). The following are distinct delineations of first-order and second-order change.

First-order change can be defined as changes that adjust current teaching practices incrementally, making the instruction more effective or efficient, but underlying beliefs are left unchallenged (Brickner, 1995; Fullan, 2015; McCombs & Miller, 2007). For example, a teacher might have students use a computer for basic skills review instead of a worksheet.

Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2003) in their efforts to create an evaluation system for teachers and administrators further delineate the differences between first- and second-order change based on Elmore (2004) who concluded that having the right focus of change is a key to improving schools and increasing student achievement. In the following table outlined in Waters, et al (2003), Balanced Leadership, the authors denote the differences between first and second-order change.

As indicated in Table 1, first-order change is indicative of simple alterations of behaviors, tools, or resources that are used within existing paradigms or mental models (Waters, et al, 2003). It is the extension of the past that reinforces existing paradigms, values, and norms. At best, change is marginal and can occur effectively with existing knowledge and skills. First order change defines most instructional reforms (Waters, et al, 2003). For example, teachers being encouraged to embed technology in their instruction might believe they accomplished this directive by setting up a class webpage in lieu of a printed class newsletter. In this example teachers are making changes, but they are not challenging their underlying beliefs (Waters, et al, 2003). While teachers are struggling to take technology integration from first-order change to second-order change, technology usage is increasing (Ertmer et al, 2012).

A number of large-scale studies found that teacher technology use has increased in classrooms across the nation (Barron, Kemker, Harmes, & Kalaydijian, 2003; Ertmer et al, 2012; Kim et al, 2013). Increased use has been attributed to increased levels of access and skill, as well as the current favorable policy environment for 1:1 reform initiatives where students are given their own mobile device by the district or allowed to bring their own device (Ertmer, 2005; Ertmer et al, 2012; Kim et al 2013). Although many teachers are using technology for numerous low-level tasks (word processing, Internet research, sending emails), higher level uses consistent with student-centered instruction (spreadsheets, presentation software or digital imaging to enhance their lessons) are still very much in the minority (Ertmer, 2005; Ertmer et al, 2012; Kim et al 2013). In general, low-level technology use typifies first-order type change (Ertmer et al, 2012). Higher-level of technology use occurs when students use technology for growing intellectually and increasing knowledge understanding and application, not merely for developing an isolated skill (Ertmer et al, 2012). Higher technology use is consistent with second-order type of instructional change (Becker, 1994; Becker & Riel, 1999; Ertmer et al, 2012; Kim et al 2013).

Table 1. First Order vs. Second Order Change

First Order Change	Second Order Change
An extension of the past	**A break with the past**
Within existing paradigms	**Outside of existing paradigms**
Consistent with prevailing values and norms	**Conflicted with prevailing values and norms**
Marginal	**A disturbance to every element of a system**
Implemented with existing knowledge and skills	**Requires new knowledge and skills to implement**

Another example of second order change is where a teacher might have students communicate electronically with an author to explore the cultural and political context of a story rather than writing a book report. Second order change calls for a break from the past but shifting paradigms behind practices. The change exists outside the old paradigm and the change is in total conflict with previous held values and norms. Second order change is a complete departure from what was (Waters et al, 2003). The second set of characteristics speaks to the depth of change. Second order change is about a complete disturbance to the system. It is a complete departure from what was and cannot be implemented without acquiring new knowledge and skills (Waters et al, 2003). Second-order change culminates with learning that is connected across subject areas and students build connections between subject matter to solve real-world problems (Ertmer, 1999). For example, students might use software to determine how to arrange the furniture in their classroom so that the floor space is maximized.

While most educators would agree that second-order changes need to be made, most instructional reforms remain defined by first-order change. The following offers several possible explanations as to why.

Lack of Change from First-Order to Second-Order

Researchers offer three explanations for the prevalence of first-order change and the lack of substantive second-order changes in instructional practices. The first explanation is based on student socialization to mainstream society. Schools serve the purpose of preparing students for participation in society; they teach students social norms, values and behaviors (McCombs, 2001; Fullan, 2000). The structure of school life mirrors the norms of the larger class and economic system. Dominant teaching practices endure because they produce student behaviors required by the larger society (Fullan, 2000). High schools serve as college preparatory institutions; in that, the external demands of universities shape the school's structure and teaching. Schools carry out the social sorting and control functions through courses offered in the curriculum, by Carnegie units required to graduate, and by exams and curriculum that match the vocational choices of students (Cuban, 1988; Fullan, 2013, McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007).

The second explanation deals with school and classroom structures. Researchers maintain that the way school space is physically arranged, how content and students are organized into grade levels, how time is allotted to tasks, and how rules govern the behavior and performance of both adults and student's attributes to instruction constancy (Fullan, 2013; McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007). Teachers are expected to maintain control, teach a prescribed content, capture student interest in the subject matter, and vary levels of instruction according to student differences and show tangible evidence that students have performed satisfactorily

(Cuban, 1988; Fullan, 2013, McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007). Teaching the entire class at one time is simply an efficient and convenient use of the teacher's time and makes it possible to cover the mandated content and to maintain control (Fullan, 2013; McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007).

The third explanation offered for the constancy of the teacher-centered instruction is the fact that, "the occupational ethos of teaching breeds conservatism and resistance to change" (Cuban, 1984, p. 256). Cuban explains that the conservatism (preference for stability and caution toward change) is rooted in the people recruited into the profession. People attracted to teaching are those who are seeking to work with children and value a flexible work schedule because the school calendar is compatible with family obligations and vacations; therefore, people join the profession because of their personal alignment with it; they generally do not enter the profession for the purpose of seeking to challenge and/or change it (Fullan 2013, McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007). Teachers are also informally socialized for the 12-13 years they sit in classrooms as students. This socialization also breeds conformity to the norms. Teachers are typically people who value the school system; the system worked for them and they join the institution already socialized to it and help to maintain and promote it, not change it (Cuban, 1984: Felder & Brent, 1996).

It is important for researchers, practitioners and policymakers who rely on teachers to implement change within the classroom to understand their unwillingness to break from traditional practices in favor of a new instructional paradigm. The three previously mentioned explanations present help and explain the lack of second-order change, but they miss important psychological process that may be at play as well. As Duffy and Roehler (1986) argue,

> "Getting teachers to change is difficult. They particularly resist complex, conceptual, longitudinal changes as opposed to change in management routines, or temporary change...teacher educators and researchers interested in making substantive change in curricular and instructional practice need to understand this resistance" (p. 55).

Fullan (2015) in his New Pedagogy for 'True Reform' of Teacher-Student Instruction identifies a missing component of study for changing educational practices. Fullan recalls the work of Farber (1991) who found that teachers begin their careers with a tremendous sense of personal satisfaction and that they find their work to be socially meaningful. However, as the difficulties of teaching increase, a teacher's sense of purpose can dissipate, leading to a sense of frustration and a reassessment of their career selection (Farber, 1991).

These difficulties for some teachers can be linked to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 (Crocco & Costigan, 2007). NCLB had a noble goal to eliminate the nation's reading deficit by redistributing time spent each day on subjects. More time each day was now spent on reading and math (Demko, 2010). Teachers associate this well-intentioned piece of legislation to what lead to the "narrowing of curriculum" where they believe their personal identity, creativity, and autonomy were undermined (Crocco & Costigan, 2007; Demko, 2010; Milner, 2013).

As a result of the curricular impositions of scripted lessons, mandated curriculum, narrowed options for pedagogy, teachers have developed negative perceptions of the possibility of establishing a satisfying teaching practice (Boote, 2006; Milner, 2013). This phenomenon known as "narrowing of curriculum" has created a stressful work environment for teachers due to their lack of perceived autonomy which has led to mental and emotional exhaustion, feelings of anger, tension, depression and anxiety (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). While studies show that

stressful work environment has led to job dissatisfaction for teachers, it might also explain why they have resisted change initiatives like NCLB and other reforms in the past (Boote, 2006; Miler, 2013).

These feelings of loss of control, anger, exhaustion, depression could not only lead teachers to resist change efforts, but they could manifest into cynical attitudes. Cynicism is in fact defined as an attitude of contempt, frustration, hopelessness, disillusionment and distrust (Bouckenooghe, 2012). This begs the question, what part in one's resistance or unwillingness to change instructional practice might cynicism play?

Cynicism: Its History, Meaning, and Nature

The writing and evidence on cynicism builds a strong case for its likely influence on instructional change. To understand how a cynical orientation may affect teachers, it is necessary to explore the history and meaning of the concept. What follows is a brief historical account of cynicism and a contemporary conceptualization of the construct used in the literature. The section concludes with relevant evidence on the behavioral effects of cynicism.

Historical Understanding of Cynicism

Cynicism dates back to the Cynic School in the 4th century B. C. (Dudley, 1937). The cynic school was actually founded by Diogenes as a haven for idealists who wished to live an exemplary life free of worldly goods. The ancient Greek cynics aspired to high standards of ethics and morality, often viciously attacking those who did not uphold these virtues (Dudley, 1937). Diogenes viewed cynicism as one of the minor Socratic schools of virtues and ethics; while others thought of cynicism as a type of philosophy, not one of the ten ethical schools (Dudley, 1937).

In modern times, cynics saw little benefit in strict adherence to ethics and morality, and instead disassociated themselves from the evils of power and manipulation which they believed society endorsed (Dudley, 1937). Today's cynics express apathy and resignation toward specific events, situations, leaders, or other objects of their disdain (Mirvis & Kanter, 1989). Contemporary cynicism, with its implicit sense of alienation and hopelessness, can undermine leaders and institutions and the practices they support (Goldfarb, 1991).

Cynicism is alive and well in the 21st century. Read a poll, listen to the news or jump on social media and you will find that Americans are more cynical than ever in regard to the economy, big business, government and even public education (Eisinger, 2000; Price & Stroud, 2005). But, what is cynicism? What does it mean to be cynical?

Conceptualizations of Cynicism

Examining the five major conceptualizations of cynicism will help to define cynicism for this study. The five conceptualizations are: personality, society/institutional, occupational/work, employee and organizational (Andersson & Bateman, 1997; Dean, Brandes & Dharwadkar, 1998;). Notice in table 2 that the five types differ by their referent, or object of negative beliefs, but they share the common element of disillusionment or disdain. Personality cynicism differs from the others in that it is defined as a trait (Anderson & Bateman, 1997; Dean, Brandes & Dharwadkar, 1998;), a part of a person's personality. In comparison, the other four conceptualizations reflect a similar attitude/belief of mistrust, lack of respect for, frustration and/or dissatisfaction with a person, group of people, and/or organization (Abraham, 2000; Dean, Brandes & Dharwadkar, 1998). These attitudes/beliefs are seen as fluid and situational and under the right set of circumstances can be changed (Andersson & Bateman, 1997). The following descriptions delineate each conceptualization of cynicism in further detail.

Table 2. Conceptualizations of Cynicism

Type	**Researchers**	**Referent**	**Measure**
Personality	Hostility (Cook & Medley, 1954) Abraham (2000)	People/Human Behavior: Negative perceptions of and hostility toward others. A generally negative perception of human behavior.	Cynical hostility subscale from Cook and Medley (1954).
Society/Institutional	Cynicism (Kanter & Mirvis, 1989)	Society: Unmet expectations of society, institution, or other authorities. Closed minded and disillusioned.	Kanter and Mirvis (1989) scale.
Occupational	Work cynicism (Neiderhoffer, 1967)	Occupation: Disparaging mistrust toward the service of the people and enforcement of the law; lost respect/pride for the job…specifically in regards to police work.	Measured using O'Connell, Holzman and Armandi's (1986) Work Cynicism subscale of their organizational cynicism scale
Employee	Employee cynicism (Andersson, 1996; Andersson & Bateman, 1997).	Leadership of an Organization and/or Organization: An attitude characterized by frustration, hopelessness, and disillusionment, as well as contempt and distrust of business organizations, executives, and/or other workplace objects.	Measured using Andersson and Bateman (1997) scale.
Organizational Change	Organizational Change Cynicism	Change: is a reaction to failed change efforts, consisting of pessimism about the success of future efforts and the belief that change agents are lazy and incompetent.	Measured by Reichers et al (1997) scale.

Personality Cynicism. Researchers using a personality-based approach generally discuss cynicism as an overall outlook on human nature (Abraham, 2000). As Abraham (2000) argues, "personality cynicism is the only form of cynicism that is an innate, stable trait reflecting a

generally negative perception of human behavior. It is characterized by cynical contempt and weak interpersonal bonding" (p. 270). This cynical view of humanity stems from a deep-rooted mistrust of others based on the sweeping generalization that the world is filled with dishonest, conniving, uncaring, and selfish people who are incapable of being pleasant in social interactions (Abraham, 2000). Research on personality-based cynicism assumes that little can be done to change one's negative orientation or disposition (Dean et al, 1998). This is an important distinction between the other conceptualizations of cynicism which associate the belief as a malleable characteristic that is controllable by actions of individuals or conditions in organizations and society.

Society/Institutional Cynicism. Society/institutional cynicism accounts for beliefs directed toward society as a whole and the institutions that comprise society. Mirvis and Kanter (1989) explain that Americans' cynical outlook on life has resulted from fluctuating fortunes in American society in the twentieth century. Other contributors to society/institutional cynicism include exploitation of workers during the early stages of industrialization to improve life at work. Mirvis and Kanter (1989) see cynicism as involving disillusionment with society, self, institutions, or others. Their conceptualization deals with people's impressions of others in general. There is some overlap between cynicism as a personality trait and as a function of views toward society (Dean et al, 1998). Both of these conceptualizations are characterized by a lack of confidence in society, a feeling that society has failed them and that most people are dishonest, unsocial, immoral and mean (Cook & Medley, 1954; Wanous, Reichers & Austin, 2000). The lack of confidence in society breeds their cynical personality; therefore, perpetuating a self-fulfilling prophecy spiral (Wanous, Reichers & Austin, 2000).

Mirvis and Kanter's (1989) analysis indicates that cynicism has become an inherent characteristic of many Americans, suggesting that 43 percent of the workforce is cynical. However, their description of the evolution of cynicism as a response to the failed promises of society, as well as their attention to demographic variables (e.g., gender, race, education, and income), suggests a situational component that is counter to the personality approach (Mirvis & Kanter, 1989). They propose that cynicism levels can be managed, and they offer several ways that institutions can create work cultures to counter it (Dean et al, 1998). Society/institutional cynicism suggest that cynical beliefs are alterable; whereas, a person with a cynical personality remains cynical regardless of the circumstances.

Occupational Cynicism. Another conceptualization of cynicism is occupational or work cynicism. The majority of research on this type was examined by law enforcement and police work (Neiderhoffer, 1967; O'Connell, Holzman & Armandl; 1986). Neiderhoffer (1967), for example, studied the formation and effects of cynicism in his studies on urban policing. He explained that police cynicism developed over time due to police officers constantly dealing with individuals who lack social and ethical standards of any kind; yet, they must remain professional in doing their job as police officers. O'Connell, Holzman, and Armandl (1986) found that officers had two targets for their cynicism: (1) the organization (organizational cynicism) and (2) the service of the people and of the law (work cynicism). This conceptualization differs from the personality cynicism because like the society/institutional cynicism, efforts can be made to the environment and/or profession in order to change the cynicism of employees and police officers. It is similar to personality cynicism in that it is tied to the loss of trust and faith in society and all its institutions.

Employee Cynicism. Employee cynicism reflects employee attitudes toward aspects of the organization. Andersson (1996) and Andersson and Bateman (1997) suggest three potential targets for this referent of cynical beliefs: (1) business organizations in general, (2) corporate executives, and (3) "other" workplace objects. Employee cynics are noteworthy for their negative feelings, such as contempt, frustration, and hopelessness toward different elements of the organization in which they work (Andersson & Bateman, 1997). Researchers see employee cynicism as a result of violations of psychological contracts and describe this cynicism within the realm of attitudes affecting work behaviors (Dean et al, 1996).

Organizational Change Cynicism. Reichers, Wanous and Austin (1997) describe this cynicism as an attitude consisting of the futility of change along with negative attributions of change facilitators. Vance, Brooks and Tesluk (1996) suggest that organizational cynicism is a learned belief that fixable problems at work will not be resolved due to factors beyond the individual's control. However, Reichers et al (1997) suggest that cynics believe that things could be better. Cynicism about organizational change has a specific target, organizational change efforts, but does not preclude other forms of cynicism from creeping into the consciousness.

Although acknowledging the effect of personality variables in organizational change cynicism, Reichers et al (1997) emphasize the predominant influence of situational variables on employee beliefs—being an hourly employee, perceiving less participation in decisions, and perceiving poor information flows and follow-ups--all are related cynicism about organizational change. It is important to note that Reichers et al (1997) offer several recommendations for managing cynicism, which include efforts at involving people in decisions that affect them, enhancing the credibility of management, and keeping surprising changes to a minimum.

A Working Definition for this Study

Cynicism has been defined by the majority of researchers as an attitude of contempt, frustration, hopelessness, disillusionment and distrust toward an object or multiple objects, susceptible to change by exposure to factors in the environment (Abraham, 2000; Reichers, Wanous & Austin, 1997; Anderson & Bateman, 1997; Anderson, 1996; Choi, 2011; Chiaburu, Peng, Oh, Banks & Lomeli 2013; Bouckenooghe, 2012). Most researchers disagree with Abraham (2000) that cynicism is an unalterable personality trait. Instead, they argue it is a psychological state that varies based on multiple factors and conditions affecting our lives and work (Reichers, Wanous & Austin, 1997; Anderson & Bateman, 1997; Anderson, 1996). Organizational cynicism is an attitude of pessimism and hopelessness toward organizational change induced by repeated exposure to mismanaged change attempts (Wanous et al., 1994). For example, if a person was cynical toward his/her occupation or workplace, changing careers or moving to a different company could reduce, if not eliminate, cynical beliefs.

A general definition of cynicism is used for this study. Cynicism is defined as an attitude of contempt, frustration, hopelessness, disillusionment or distrust toward an object or multiple objects, susceptible to change by exposure to factors in the environment (Abraham, 2000; Anderson & Bateman, 1997; Reichers, Wanous & Austin, 1997). This general definition accounts for the psychological state, but as previously described, cynical states have multiple referents or targets of these beliefs. This study is concerned with teacher cynicism toward building-level administration/leadership and the instructional change being asked of teachers.

Cynicism, Satisfaction, and Trust

Stanley, Meyer and Topolnytsky (2005) stated that cynicism is commonly viewed as a complex, multi-facetted construct that has similarities with other beliefs. Thus, it is important to

differentiate it from similar concepts so that cynical attitudes do not get mistaken for other psychological states. Job satisfaction and trust are two constructs associated with cynicism, making it easy to mistake cynicism as distrust or dissatisfaction (Stanley, Meyer & Topolnytsky.

Job Satisfaction is defined by many researchers as, "an affective (that is, emotional) reaction to one's job" (Cranny, Smith & Stone 1992, p. 1). Locke (1969) defined job satisfaction as "a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating one's job values. Job dissatisfaction is the un-pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as frustrating or blocking attainment of one's values" (p. 317). An affective reaction is a physical and emotional reaction that a person has to a situation (Weiss, 2002). Therefore, job satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction would be an affective reaction toward a job. This is in contrast to cynicism as defined here as an attitude referring to a set of emotions, beliefs, and behaviors toward an object or referent (Abraham, 2000).

Researchers hypothesize that some of the conceptualizations of cynicism actually induce job dissatisfaction (Abraham, 2000; Smith, Pope, Sanders, Allred & O'Keefe, 1988). For example, personality, society and occupational cynicism are likely to foster job dissatisfaction because a person who has a cynical personality, mistrusts society and institutions, maintains a general state of disappointment and hopelessness would likely transfer those negative feelings toward their job (Abraham, 2000). Cynicism and job dissatisfaction share an element of frustration; however, cynicism also incorporates disillusionment and distrust toward a variety of persons or objects where job dissatisfaction is specific to 'the job' (Wanous et al., 1994; Andersson & Bateman, 1997; Mirvis & Kanter, 1986).

The second construct easily confused with cynicism is trust. Forsyth, Adams and Hoy (2011) define trust as a generalized expectancy held by the work group that the word, promise,

and written or oral statement of another individual, group, or organization can be relied upon. This definition is based on work of previous researchers who see honesty as a pivotal feature of trust, to the point that honesty is assumed (Rotter, 1967; Golembiewski & McConkie, 1975; Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985). As noted in the definition, trust is a perception of another party based largely on the perceived trustworthiness of an individual or group. Such perceptions form over time through repeated social exchanges that provide the evidence to discern another party's intentions (Forsyth, Adams, & Hoy, 2011).

Dean et al (1998), argue that trust and organizational cynicism differ in several ways. First, trust involves risk. Without risk there is no need to trust (Baier, 1986). The trusting party takes a risk based on confidence that the other party will act benevolently, openly, competently, honestly, and reliably (Forsyth, Adams, & Hoy, 2011). In contrast, cynicism, whether toward society, an organization, or organizational change, is a psychological state of disillusionment brought about through a pattern of negative experiences with the object of the belief (Reichers, Wanous & Austin, 1997; Anderson & Bateman, 1997). Distrust would certainly be an aspect of cynicism, but the disenchantment of the cynic runs deeper than a violation of trust beliefs (Wanous, Reich & Austin, 2000).

Second, trust requires a certain amount of vulnerability to another party to perform a particular action that considers the well-being of the trust(er) (Forsyth, Adams, & Hoy, 2011). For example, a teacher who trusts her principal will risk vulnerability by discussing her challenges and frustrations in the classroom. Cynicism, in contrast, does not require interpersonal vulnerability as a precondition of the attitude (Wanous, Reichers & Austin, 2000). A person can be cynical without being vulnerable to another party (Abraham, 2000; Wanous, Reichers & Austin, 2000). For instance, I can feel disillusioned about an organizational change

irrespective of my vulnerability to management. Trust in turn requires one to risk vulnerability in the face of change; trust is not needed in the absence of vulnerability (Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

Third, the definition of trust also suggests that it is oriented toward facilitating cooperation between two or more parties. Trust grows, or attenuates, through interdependent relationships between two parties (Forsyth, Adam, & Hoy, 2011). The definition of cynicism makes no such connection to interdependence and cooperation (Anderson & Bateman, 1997). One does not need to cooperate with another party to be cynical. In fact, cynicism lessens cooperation and interactions with the object of the belief (Anderson & Bateman, 1997; Wanous, Reichers, & Austin, 2000).

In summary, it can be argued that cynicism, job satisfaction, and trust are unique constructs that share some conceptual features. Job satisfaction/dissatisfaction is an affective reaction to a job; whereas, cynicism is an attitude referring to a set of emotions, beliefs, and behaviors toward an object or referent. Trust differs from cynicism in several ways-- it requires risk, vulnerability and cooperation whereas cynicism does not.

Effects of Cynicism

As previously stated, cynicism has been defined as an attitude of contempt, frustration, hopelessness, disillusionment and distrust toward an object or multiple objects, susceptible to change by exposure to factors in the environment (Abraham, 2000; Wanous, Reichers & Austin, 2004; Anderson & Bateman, 1997; Choi, 2011; Chiaburu, Peng, Oh, Banks & Lomeli 2013; Bouckenooghe, 2010). Evidence on the effects of cynicism largely comes from studies on police cynicism (Niederhoffer,1967; Regoli, 1976; Richardsen, Burke, & Martinussen,2006; Caplan, 2003, Hickman, 2008; Kaariainen &Siren, 2012), psychosocial aspects of cynical hostility

(Tindle, Chang, Kuller, Manson, Robinson, Rosal & Matthews, 2009; Smith &Pope, 1990; Janicki, Cohen & Doyle, 2010), cynicism in social work (Abraham, 2000; Johnson, O'Leary-Kelly 2003), employee cynicism (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006; English & Chalon, 2011; Richards & Kosmala, 2013; Byrne & Hochwarter, 2008), and organizational change cynicism (Wanous, et al, 2000, 2004; Brandes, et al, 2007; Chiaburu et al, 2013; Watt & Piotrowski, 2008; Brown & Cregan 2008).

Some of the most current research regarding cynicism examines the relationship between cynicism and politics (deVreese, 2005; Dancey, 2012; Schuck, Boomgaarden & de Vreese, 2013; Pedersen, 2012; Shehata, 2014; Jebril, Albaek &deVreese, 2013; Boukes & Boomgaarden, 2015). Only a handful of research studies exist that examine cynicism in an educational context (Chang, 2009; Pietarinen, Pyhalto, Soini & Salmela-Aro, 2013; Pyhalto, Pietarinen, Salmela-Aro, 2011; Polatcan & Titrek, 2014; Akin, 2015; Aslan & Yilmaz, 2013; Saha & Dworkin, 2009). The educational studies found that cynical beliefs were related to low identification with the school, poor communication, and high distrust (Ayik, Ahmet, 2015; Sagir & Ojuz; 2012).

In broad strokes, evidence across multiple contexts indicates that cynicism affects the social and psychological mechanisms of behavioral change in organizations. The following studies offer evidence that cynicism can affect organizations. Bedeian (2007) found that cynicism undermines affective states that provoke an internal drive for engaging deeply in change initiatives. Bedeian's (2007) study of cynicism and its relationship to organizational identification, affective commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions among university faculty found that university faculty with higher levels of cynicism were less likely to experience a sense of oneness with the organization, were less committed to the mission of the university,

had higher levels of job dissatisfaction, were more likely to look for employment elsewhere and less likely to participate in change activities.

Similarly, Wilkerson, Evans and Davis (2008) found a positive relationship between coworkers who badmouth the organization and employee organizational cynicism. They suggest the possibility of a chain-reaction effect—as employees become cynical toward the organization, they are more likely to engage in badmouthing behavior and possibly fuel the development of other organizational cynics which greatly decreases the likelihood of employees who would willingly participate in organizational change.

Stanley et al. (2005) addressed the important issue of whether cynicism was a factor contributing to employee resistance to organizational change. They asked employees who were currently experiencing organizational change to indicate if they intended to resist the change or to indicate on a continuum from resistance to championing how they would characterize their current change-relevant behavior. In both cases, they found evidence of a relationship between cynicism and resistance to change; however, they found change-specific cynicism correlated more strongly with intention to resist change than the more global forms of cynicism.

Brandes and his colleagues (2008) found that cynicism predicts unfavorable outcomes, but that negative outcomes and cynical attitudes can be utilized for favorable results as well. For instance, cynical employees tended to communicate frankly with organizational leaders about challenging practices. Such openness uncovered critical problems before they became debilitating crises. In this case, cynicism had beneficial consequences for the organization. (Brandes, et al, 2008).

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between teacher cynicism and willingness to change instructional practice. Although no empirical research exists that links

teacher cynicism to resistance to change instructional practice, research findings in business and organizations provide a rationale for a possible relationship worthy of exploring. Prior to exploring the possible link between cynicism and instructional change; change theory is examined to determine what conditions need to exist for change to occur.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

Kurt Lewin's change theory provides a theoretical explanation for the relationship between cynicism and instructional change. Lewin (1947) relied on four interdependent elements to study and explain behavior of individuals within social settings: field theory, group dynamics, action research, and the 3-step model of change. While researchers tend to isolate these elements, Lewin (1947) meant for them to work as an integrated system (Allport, 1947). For the purpose of this study, all will be discussed, as each provides its own thread to the theoretical framework of change theory.

Field Theory

Kurt Lewin was one of the leading psychologists of his generation and his work provided the foundations of Organization Development (OD) and is still considered by many as central to it (Burnes & Cooke, 2013). Lewin was best known for the development of field theory, which provided the underpinning of all his applied work (Burnes &Cooke, 2013). Lewin, drawing from his study of physics, developed field theory over a 25-year period to understand the social influence on individual behavior. He argued that "the order of coexisting facts in a psychological or social situation can be viewed as [a life] space" (Lewin & Lorsch, 1939, p. 401). Lewin's field theory explains that if we understand all the factors influencing individuals within their life space, it is possible to understand and even predict the basis for changing the behavior of individuals and/or behaviors of groups (Burnes & Cooke, 2013).

Field theory is an approach to understanding group behavior by trying to map out the totality and complexity of the field in which the behavior takes place (Back, 1992). Lewin maintained that to understand any situation it was necessary that one should view the present situation as being maintained by certain conditions or forces (Burnes & Cooke, 2013). He argued that group

behavior is the result of dynamic interactions and forces that affect group structures and modify individual behavior (Burnes & Cook, 2013). In other words, individual behavior is a function of the group environment or 'field', as Lewin termed it.

Consequently, any change in behavior stems from changes, be they small or large, in the forces within the field (Burnes, 2004). Lewin defined a field as "a totality of coexisting facts which are conceived of a mutually interdependent" (Lewin, 1946, p.240). Lewin believed that a field was in a continuous state of adaptation and that change, and constancy are relative concepts; group life is never without change, merely differences in the amount and type of change exist (Lewin, 1947). Lewin used the term 'quasi-stationary equilibrium' to indicate that while there might be a rhythm and pattern to the behavior and processes of a group, these tended to fluctuate constantly depending on forces or circumstances facing the group (Burnes, 2004).

Lewin's view was that if one could identify, plot, and establish the potency of these forces, then it would be possible to understand why individuals, groups, and organizations act as they do, as well as to understand what forces would need to be diminished or strengthened in order to bring about change (Burnes, 2004). Lewin viewed change as a slow process; however, under the right circumstances, such as personal, organizational or societal crisis, the forces in the field can shift quickly and radically (Burnes & Cook, 2013). Crises break down established routines and behaviors, allowing new patterns of activity to emerge (Burnes, 2004).

Field theory helps us understand the role cynicism may play within a life space of teachers. For crises to change the space in which teachers operate, these events would need to either lessen any cynical views teachers hold or possibly leverage cynical views to build a case for change. Cynicism acts as a psychological force for teachers as they determine the changes they will

implement or not. The extent of this force for instructional change is not known. Further, how the object of cynical belief factors into the change process is not understood either.

Group Dynamics

Lewin was the first psychologist to write about group dynamics and the importance of the group in shaping the behavior of its member (Burnes, 2004). Cartwright (1951) explained that dynamics comes from the Greek word meaning force. Group dynamics refers to the all the forces operating within a group. Understanding the conditions associated with the forces, provides explanation of a group's behavior.

Group Dynamics stresses that group behavior, rather than that of individuals operates as a powerful force for change (Bernstein, 1968). Lewin (1947) maintained that it is fruitless to concentrate on changing the behavior of individuals without altering shared beliefs of groups. Group norms tend to have a constraining effect on individuals. Group pressure may indeed be a prevailing force for individual behavioral change, but it remains that social influence operates through psychological states of individuals to produce a behavioral response (Shein, 1988). That is, group dynamics in the form of norms, roles, interactions and socialization processes affect the subjective experiences and mindsets of individuals that ultimately shape their behavioral responses (Shein, 1988).

With group dynamics in mind, instructional change that disrupts past mindsets and practices must contend with established norms and shared beliefs of faculty within a school. Cynical beliefs are likely to exist across individuals within groups, meaning that altering such dispositions requires intentional actions to form a new shared understanding. If cynical beliefs spread across a faculty, it will be difficult to gain support for an initiative without gaining support of the faculty group.

3-Step Model of Change

The 3-Step model of change is often called Lewin's key contribution to the study and explanation of individual and organizational change (Burnes, 2004). It provides the primary theoretical explanation for the postulated link between cynicism and instructional change (Burnes, 2004). Successful change, Lewin (1947) argued, involved three steps: unfreezing, moving and refreezing.

Step one is unfreezing. Recall from field theory that Lewin (1947) believed human behavior was based on a quasi-stationary equilibrium supported by a complex field of driving and restraining forces. He argued that for an individual to change in authentic and meaningful ways the equilibrium needs to be destabilized (unfrozen). Destabilization creates the cognitive space for old behavior to be discounted (unlearned) and new behavior successfully adopted. Due to the behaviors Lewin (1947) was addressing, he did not believe that change would be easy or that the same approach could be applied in all situations. He asserts,

> The 'unfreezing of the present level may involve quite different problems in different cases. Allport has described the 'catharsis' which seems necessary before prejudice can be removed. To break open the shell of complacency and self-righteousness it is sometimes necessary to bring about an emotional stir up (Lewin, 1947, p. 229).

Schein (1996) argues that the key to unfreezing is to recognize that change, whether at the individual or group level, was a profound psychological dynamic process. He identified three processes necessary to achieve unfreezing: disconfirmation of the validity of the status quo, the induction of guilt or survival anxiety, and creating psychological safety. Schein (1996) argued that unless sufficient psychological safety is created, the disconfirming information will be denied or in other ways defended against; no survival anxiety will be felt and consequently no

change will take place. In other words, those involved in the change have to feel safe from loss and humiliation before they will accept the new information and reject their old behaviors.

Step two is moving. As Schein (1996) notes, unfreezing is not an end in itself; it creates motivation to learn but does not necessarily control or predict the direction in which new behavior will follow. Moving is the stage in the cognitive process whereby individuals experiment with new behavior in order to discern its value and future worth (Lewin, 1947). Group dynamics are instrumental in the moving process. Group norms, interactions, and member roles shape the degree to which individuals will experiment with new practices and learn from their actions (Lewin, 1947).

Lewin argued that any attempt to predict or identify a specific outcome from planned change is very difficult because of the complexity of the forces concerned. Instead, one should seek to consider all the forces at work and identify and evaluate on a trial and error basis all the available options (Lewin, 1947). Such a process involves action research. Action research is the iterative process of research and action that Lewin argued enabled groups and individuals to move from a less acceptable to a more acceptable set of behaviors. However, as noted above, Lewin (1947) recognized that without reinforcement, change could be short-lived.

Step three is refreezing. This is the final step in the 3-Step model. Refreezing seeks to stabilize the group at a new quasi-stationary equilibrium in order to ensure that the new behaviors are relatively safe from regression. The main point about refreezing is that new behavior must be, to some degree, congruent with the rest of the behavior, personality and environment of the learner or it will simply lead to a new round of disconfirmation (Schein, 1996). This is why Lewin saw successful change as a group activity because unless group norms and routines are also transformed, changes to individual behavior will not be sustained. In

organizational terms, refreezing often requires changes to organizational culture, norms, policies and practices (Cummings & Huse, 1989).

Cynicism provides a possible explanation as to why teachers are not willing to change instructional practices. Cynicism could be acting as a barrier to allowing the 3-step change process to start. If a teacher or teachers as a group are cynical toward the change initiative, they would not 'unfreeze' or a destabilization would not occur allowing them to start the change process; therefore, their cynical beliefs act as a barrier to their willingness to change. The 3-Step Model highlights the harm that cynical beliefs have on a change process. Cynicism prevents a change from taking hold even before it may begin. It is hard to envision unfreezing the cynical teacher. Thus, for instructional change processes to occur efforts to create cognitive dissonance must control any cynical views.

Criticisms of Lewin's Change Theory

While some may say Lewin's work has become "unfashionable" in the last two decades, Hendry (1996, p. 624) states,

> "scratch any account of creating and managing change and the idea that change is a three-stage process which necessarily begins with a process of unfreezing will not be far below the surface."

Criticism of Lewin's work has been addressed by Burnes (Burnes, 2004). The first criticism is that Lewin's Planned approach is too simplistic and mechanistic for a world where change is a continuous and open-ended process. Burnes however, argues that one must view the present situation (status quo) as being maintained by certain conditions/forces. Burnes poses the metaphor of a river which is constantly moving, but keeps a recognizable form. Burnes viewed change as a complex, iterative learning process where the journey was more important than the

destination, where stability was at best quasi-stationery and always fluid and when given the complex forces involved, outcomes cannot be predicted but emerge on a trial and error basis. This refutes the criticism that Lewin's approach was simplistic and mechanistic.

The second criticism is that Lewin's work is only relevant to incremental and isolated change projects and is not able to incorporate radical, transformational change. Burnes responds that this criticism seems to relate to the speed rather than the magnitude of change. Quinn (1980, 82) states that over time, incremental change can lead to radical transformations. Lewin was concerned about behavioral change at the individual, group and societal levels, whereas rapid transformational change is seen as only being applicable to situations requiring major structural change. Even Kanter (1989) maintained that 'bold strokes' often need to be followed by a whole series of incremental changes in order to align an organization's culture and behaviors with the new structures. Lewin did recognize that radical behavioral or cultural change could take place rapidly in times of crisis.

The third criticism is that Lewin ignores the role of power and politics in organizations and the conflictual nature of much of organizational life (Burnes, 2007). Burnes argues that this is a strange accusation given the issues Lewin was addressing like; i.e., racism and religious intolerance. Lewin's approach took into account difference in value systems and power structures of all the parties involved (Raven, 1992).

The fourth and final criticism was that Lewin was seen as advocating a top-down management driven approach to change and ignoring situations requiring bottom-up change. Lewin recognized that pressure to change comes from many quarters and tried to provide an approach which could accommodate this. Regardless of who identified the need to the change—Lewin argued that change could not take place unless there was a 'felt-need' by all those

concerned; he did not see one group or individual as driving or dominating the change process but saw everyone as an equal partner. He maintained that change required a commitment from all those concerned and full involvement in the change process for the change to be effective/successful. It wasn't important where the change started top/bottom/middle…what mattered was that all the participants were active, willing and equal partners in the change process.

Regardless of the criticisms of Lewin's work, his research in the area of change laid the foundation for those who followed. Change theory is the theoretical framework in which this study is rooted and finds explanation because it is hypothesized, a teacher's cynical attitude might provide a possible explanation for why instructional practices have remained frozen in many schools.

Rationale and Hypotheses

The review of literature presented evidence that leads to the argument underlining the hypotheses for this study. First, evidence supports the proportion that cynicism has effects on work outcomes (Niederhoffer, 1967; Abraham, 2000; Cartwright & Homes, 2006; Chaibur et al, 2013; Dancey, 2012; Polatcan & Titrek, 2014). Research further demonstrates that, across various contexts, law enforcement, politics, business organizations and even education, cynicism has effects on employees' attitudes and their attitudes toward change initiatives (Niederhoffer, 1967; Abraham, 2000; Cartwright & Homes, 2006; Chaibur et al, 2013; Dancey, 2012; Polatcan & Titrek, 2014). Some of the effects of workplace cynicism were identified as poor identification with their school/workplace, high distrust of leadership and/or the organization, low commitment to the organization, and low job satisfaction, and high levels of turnover (Ahmet, 2015; Sagir & Ojuz, 2012; Bedeian, 2007). Second, the review of literature also

supports the proposition that cynicism has different referents and that the referent plays an integral role in our understanding of the effects of cynicism within different contexts (Chiaburu, Peng, Oh, Banks & Lomeli 2013; Bouckenooghe, 2012) While some education studies found cynicism to be a factor, none have studied teacher cynicism and its relationship with willingness to change (Chang, 2009; Pietarinen, et al, 2013; Pyhalto, et al, 2011; Akin, 2015).

Lewin's change theory also provides support for the proposed hypotheses of this study. The 3-Step Model helps explain how cynical beliefs can affect a change process. Cynicism can even prevent a change from occurring. If teachers are cynical toward their administrators, it is difficult to envision them unfreezing; therefore, administrators would need to provide a rationale for teachers to let go of the tightly held beliefs to begin the unfreezing process. If a teacher is inclined to protect the status quo and maintain the entrenched institution of teaching, cynicism toward changing it would likely cause resistance to it. Lewin's 3-Step Model requires participants to experience a disconfirmation of the validity of the status quo to start the unfreezing process. Within the entrenched norms and shared beliefs, disconfirmation would not come easy and would likely meet strong resistance and possibly enhance cynical beliefs.

Group Dynamics stress the importance of group behavior over the individual in understanding change. Lewin argued that the norms, roles, interactions and socialization processes of a group, in this case, teachers, affect the subjective experiences and mindsets of individuals that ultimately shape their behavioral responses (Shein, 1988). Understanding this important characteristic of the group (teachers), helps explain resistance to change in general. Teachers must maintain relationships with various groups (students, parents, administrators) but change initiatives would be implemented by administrators. If teachers held cynical views toward their administrators, it might prove difficult for administrators to garner teacher support

for change initiatives. Initiatives that are unsuccessful in gaining support of the group may evoke cynical beliefs and increase the difficulty of gaining support for initiatives. The group dynamics of teachers provides explanation as to why teacher cynicism might create a barrier to their willingness to change instructional practices. Therefore, the literature and theoretical framework of Lewin's change theory supports a plausible connection due to the found effects of cynicism in other documented contexts and due to the gap in research. Thus, it is predicted that, *H1: Teacher cynicism toward building-level administration will have an inverse relationship with willingness to change instructional practices.*

The referent of the cynicism is an important part of the research question. The research question above considers the teacher's cynicism toward their administrator. However, a second referent, the change initiative itself, adopting a new reading curriculum requires consideration.

Field Theory suggests one must understand the life space of an individual or group and all the psychological/social forces acting within the life space to understand and/or or predict behavior. To that end, teachers function within a very complex environment. They are asked to perform at high levels with diminishing resources and under high stress. These forces must be understood and considered to predict/understand their behavior. Teacher cynicism could be one of those forces creating barriers to teacher's willingness to change. Teacher's cynicism toward implementing a new reading program could affect their willingness to change.

The 3-Step Model once again helps provide a rationale for a plausible relationship between cynicism and willingness to change. The premise is the same, but the referent of the cynicism has changed. Here the teacher is cynical toward the new reading program. If a teacher is cynical toward the new reading program, the cynical belief held by the teachers could prevent the change before it begins. Again, it is difficult in envision a cynical teacher unfreezing. Thus, for

instructional change to occur efforts to create inconsistent beliefs associated with the old reading curriculum would need to emerge to begin the unfreezing phase and cynical beliefs would need to be controlled or kept in check. Based on the foundational components of Lewin's change theory of what must be in place and what must happen for change to begin, occur and be sustained over time (Burnes and Cooke, 2013); it is predicted that,

H2: Teacher cynicism toward a new reading curriculum will have an inverse relationship with willingness to change instructional practice.

Chapter 4: Research Methods

Research Design

For the empirical part of the study, a non-experimental, correlational design was used. Correlational research is a method used to determine if a relationship exists between two or more variables while controlling potentially compounding variables. This study was designed to determine if a relationship exists between teacher cynicism and willingness to change. Correlational research only determines the degree to which a relationship exists between the variables. A positive correlation is a relationship between two variables in which both variables either increase or decrease at the same time. A negative correlation is a relationship between two variables when an increase in one variable is associated with a decrease in the other. The final possible outcome in correlational research is zero correlation, no relationship exists between the two variables. Once a relationship is determined through correlational research method, predictions can be made about the two variables one from another.

Reading Program

The new reading program, *Wonders*, is a reading curriculum developed by McGraw-Hill Education. Authored by reading experts such as Dr. Tim Shanahan, Dr. Doug Fisher, Dr. Donald Bear and Dr. Jana Echevarria, this program is built on state standards and claims to use intentional instruction, inspiring content, and purposeful technology to prepare all students for college and career in the 21st century. Wonders is a comprehensive reading program that aligns with more rigorous state standards that require students to comprehend and manipulate more complex texts. Shanahan (2006) claims that texts within reading programs have become easier and easier over the years and states, "just as it's impossible to build muscle without weight or resistance, it's impossible to build robust reading skills without reading challenging text"

(Shanahan, Fisher & Frey, 2012, p. 58). Increasing the rigor of reading curriculum, it is argued, is one example of how the Wonders program may push teachers to move their instructional practices by implementing a program that requires students to engage in a productive struggle with text.

Instruction with Wonders requires a more student-centered approach because of the emphasis placed on student involvement. Students are given opportunities each day to participate in collaborative conversations centered on that week's text—skill/strategy being taught. This is a clear departure from teacher/teaching focused classrooms where little to no student conversation takes place or is even encouraged (Hattie, 2012). Students watch Study Sync videos of their peers demonstrating what a collaborative conversation looks/sound like. Study Sync is a comprehensive ELA program for grades 6-12 with rich multimedia resources embedded. The teacher uses the Study Sync videos as a tool for the 'how' and the 'why' of listening, turn-taking, and respecting the opinions of others before he/she provides a gradual release of responsibility for students to engage in their own collaborative conversations. Students use their listening and speaking skills to participate in literature circles discussing the texts they are reading and how the stories relate to the world around them. This process places the responsibility of learning on the student which is a characteristic of a student-centered approach.

Student's depth of knowledge is assessed differently with Wonders. Previous reading programs have students read the same story every day for a week and then take a test on Friday. This type of process keeps students in the shallow end of knowledge creation; whereas, Wonders provides students the opportunity through journals, portfolios, small group projects to truly integrate their knowledge by making it their own. With Wonders, the teacher merely 'activates'

the process by modeling the skill/strategy for the week and then the students work through the literature in a collaborative process.

In previous programs, teachers struggle to differentiate their instruction for two or three levels of learners. Programs were "one-size fits all" and mainly targeted the students in the middle. Wonders provides teachers with a data dashboard that levels every game, worksheet, and test to each student's individual needs. The data are targeted and actionable. This allows teachers a level of differentiation they have never had before this technology. Differentiating instruction to each individual student's need and ability is moving instruction from teacher-centered to student-centered.

Data Collection

Every six years the Oklahoma State Textbook Committee issues a 'Call for Bids' for a specific content area. The content area for the past school year (2016-2017) was reading. Publishers respond by announcing their intent to bid and by providing the State Textbook Committee with samples of their materials and correlations to the state's academic standards. The State Textbook Committee reviews the materials and votes to approve or not to approve them for the state-adopted list in late fall.

Once districts vote on their desired reading program and purchase the selected program, trainings are set up for teachers to learn the new program. Districts who voted for McGraw-Hill Education's reading program, *Wonders,* were selected to participate in this study. Data for this study came from 182 teachers representing 8 districts across the state of Oklahoma. Teachers volunteered to take the survey after their district-level professional development training for a newly adopted reading program. The professional development was a one-day training on the print and digital components of the reading program. Teachers taught kindergarten through sixth

grades. Teachers represented three types of districts: urban, suburban and rural. Teachers were given the opportunity during their lunch and/or planning period to complete the survey in an isolated room with district leadership approval.

Measures

Cynicism toward administration and cynicism toward the new reading curriculum were measured using adapted items from an organizational cynicism measure developed by Brandes et al (1999). This survey has been used in studies on cynicism in organizations within the business sector (Kim et al, 2009) and education (Polat, 2013, Ahmet, 2015, Polatcan & Titrek, 2013). The survey demonstrates good validity and reliability as evidenced by Kim, et al (2009) who reported Cronbach alphas of each cynicism component separately: cognitive (.82), affective (.95) and behavioral (.77) which suggests internal consistency reliability. Ahmet (2013) reported the Cronbach alpha reliability for the scale in general was (.94) and the coefficients for each dimension reported; (.88) for cognitive, (.88) for affective and (.86) for behavioral dimension. Similarly, Platcan and Titrek (2013) reported a Cronbach alpha value in general for the scale at (.92). Each sub-dimension reported, cognitive (.88), affective (.97) and behavioral at (.80). These data show that the cynicism scale has high reliability in their study. Researchers favor the cynicism scale developed by Brandes, et al (1999) because items include all three components of cynicism--cognitive, affective and behavioral (Dean et al, 1998; Kim et al, 2009).

Items for both measures were adapted by changing the referent from organizational behavior to school administration and changes in the reading program. The adapted measure consists of 14 items and utilized a six-point response format with strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (6) as endpoints. The items on the cynicism toward administration survey was adapted by changing the referent of each item to reflect actions and or responsibilities of school

administration. A few examples of adapted items are: *Policies, goals, and practices in my school seem to have little in common, When my school administration says it's going to do something, I wonder if it will really happen, When I think about the administrators at my school, I feel irritated, When visiting with others, I will often criticize my school's administrators.* Items for cynicism toward new reading program will be adapted by changing the referent of each item to reflect the new reading program and its components. A few examples of response items are: *The new reading program is confusing because it has too many components, I often experience anxiety when I think about the new reading program, I criticize the new reading program to others.*

Willingness to change was measured by a scale adopted from Dunham, Grube, Gardner, Cummings and Pierce (2011). Their measure served as a guide in the creation of questions since no exact survey exists for attitudes towards changing instructional practice. Questions were created in close alignment with Dunham et al (2011) in order to capture the teacher's intentions to change or to resist the change toward the new reading program. For example, Dunham et al's question reads, I look forward to changes at work. The question as adapted for this study reads, I look forward to using the new reading curriculum. Dunham et al (2011) in their original work with the measure reported coefficient alpha reliability estimates for the three 6 item scales (cognitive, affective, behavioral) were (.80), (.79) and (.73). The alpha for a single 18-item scale was (.90), suggesting the scale's reliability. Attitudes towards changes are divided into three dimensions, cognitive, affective and behavioral. The cognitive dimension's focus on the views of the advantages/disadvantages, benefits, requirements, knowledge needed to manage the changes. The affective dimension refers to feelings associated with dissatisfaction and concern

in making the change. The behavioral dimension is the action taken or to be taken in the future in the face of change or resistance to change (Nafei, 2013).

The measure was adapted by incorporating the 'new reading program' into each statement. The measure consisted of 9 statements. A Likert scale was used for judging levels of agreement or disagreement on six-point response format with strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (6) as endpoints. Some examples of items are: I look forward to using the new reading curriculum (affective). This reading program is what I have been looking for to help students learn (affective). I see value in using the new reading curriculum compared to the old one (cognitive). I believe I have the ability to effectively use the new reading program (cognitive) I am willing to use the Reading Writing Workshop book as my core program (behavioral). I am not willing to use the Close Reading Companion (behavioral).

Because all proposed measures were adapted from existing surveys, the psychometric properties of the surveys were evaluated though exploratory factor analysis and inter-item reliability. Evidence for validity and reliability comes from the number of factors extracted, factor loadings, and Cronbach alpha. Results are reported in Chapter 5.

Analysis

The hypotheses both required an analytical technique that estimated the relationships among a set of independent variables and the dependent variable. Multiple regression was used to test the hypotheses.

Four assumptions need to be considered when using multiple regression. The first assumption is that the relationship between the independent and dependent variables is linear (Vogt, 2007). It is also important to check for outliers since multiple linear regression is sensitive to outlier effects. The linearity assumption is often tested with scatter plots (Vogt,

2007). The second assumption of multiple regression is that the variables have normal distributions. There are several pieces of information that help researchers test this assumption: visual inspection of scatter plots, skew, kurtosis, P-P plots and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. These tests provide inferential statistics on normality (Osborne & Waters, 2002).

The third assumption is that there is little or no multicollinearity in the data. Multicollinearity occurs when the independent variables are not independent from each other (Vogt, 2007). The final assumption regarding multiple regression is that of homoscedasticity. Homoscedasticity means that the variance of errors is the same across all levels of the independent variable (Osborne & Waters, 2002). This assumption can be checked by visual examination of a plot of the standardized residuals by the regression standardized predicted value. SPSS was used in analyzing the survey data captured for this study and will consider all of these assumptions regarding multiple regression.

Study Limitations

Limitations exist in all research, and this study was no exception. Several limitations should be considered when thinking about the evidence and conclusions presented in this research. These limitations do not negate the findings, they are simply made clear so that claims can be made relative to features of the study design.

Internal Validity

According to Vogt (2007) internal validity deals with the accuracy and effectiveness of the research design. In other words, outcomes are produced by the independent variable as opposed to other factors. In experimental research, a cause-and-effect relationship can be determined because researchers can control and manipulate variables; however, non-experimental research designs rely on interpretation, observation or interactions to come to a conclusion. While non-

experimental research cannot determine a definitive cause-and-effect relationship, a non-experimental design can have high levels of external validity and under certain conditions can be generalized to a larger population. All the statistical data demonstrated valid research design measures and good reliability based on Cronbach alpha acceptability of .70 or greater. Each of the primary construct surveys administered scored met the acceptable reliability score of .70.

Steps were taken to control for alternative explanations for teacher's willingness to change instructional practice in the statistical models, but it remains that factors other than the variables of interest could be contributing to willingness to change.

External Validity

External validity refers to whether results can be generalized beyond the subjects studied (Vogt, 2007). In other words, to what degree does information about a sample also provide information about the population (Vogt, 2007). While the results of this study are not generalizable to all teachers in every situation, the study results could extend to teachers in similar school districts who are implementing a new curriculum.

Finally, the teachers surveyed were from one geographic location in the United States, were mainly from Title I schools and half were experienced teachers. The homogenous sample could affect variability and ultimately the estimated relationship.

Chapter 5: Results

This study set out to test the relationship between teacher cynicism and willingness to change instructional practices. The study was guided by the general question: What is the relationship between teacher cynicism and instructional change? Existing evidence about these concepts was used to advance two hypotheses: H1) Teacher cynicism toward building-level administration/leadership has an inverse relationship with a willingness to change instructional practices, and H2) Teacher cynicism toward a new reading curriculum has an inverse relationship with a willingness to change instructional practices. Results of the empirical tests are used to evaluate the hypotheses, but before getting to the evidence, descriptive statistics and exploratory factor results are presented.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive data are reported in Table 1. Participants reported on four demographic variables: years teaching (1-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-9 years or 10+ years), type of district they teach (urban, suburban or rural), if they teach in a Title I or a non-Title I school, and level of technology proficiency (very proficient, proficient or not proficient). Of the 182 teachers surveyed, 53% reported 10 plus years of teaching experience, 16% reported 7-9 years of teaching experience, 15% reported 4-6 years of teaching experience, and 15% reported 1-3 years of teaching experience. The majority of teachers worked in a rural school (60%) followed by suburban (28%) and urban (13%). Nearly 96% of the teachers taught at a Title I school. Teachers largely identified as being proficient (60%) or very proficient (33%) with technology, with only 7% identifying as no technology proficiency at all.

As for the primary constructs, the measures used a Likert response set ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree). The mean score for Cynicism Toward Administrators

was 1.72, with a standard deviation 0.81. The minimum score was 1.00 and the maximum was 6.00. On average, teachers did not report high cynicism toward their building-level administrators as average score for the sample fell in the disagree category.

The mean score for Cynicism Toward Reading Program reported was 2.49, with a standard deviation of 0.97. The minimum score was 1.00 and the maximum was 6.00. On average, teachers reported more cynicism toward the reading program than toward their administrators.

Finally, the mean score for Willingness To Change was 4.28, with a standard deviation 0.71. The minimum score was 1.00 and the maximum was 6.00. An average of 4.28 falls in the somewhat agree range, suggesting that teachers were ambivalent about their willingness to change.

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics

Variable	*n (%)*	*M*	*SD*	*Min*	*Max*
Years Teaching					
1-3 years	27(15)	--	--	--	--
4-6 years	28(15)	--	--	--	--
7-9 years	29(16)	--	--	--	--
10+ years	95(53)	--	--	--	--
District Type					
Urban	21(13)	--	--	--	--
Suburban	46(28)	--	--	--	--
Rural	100(60)	--	--	--	--
Title One					
Title One	174(96)	--	--	--	--
Not Title One	8(4)	--	--	--	--
Technology Proficiency					
Very proficient	60(33)	--	--	--	--
Proficient	110(60)	--	--	--	--
Not Proficient	12 (7)	--	--	--	--
CTA	--	1.72	0.81	1.00	6.00
CTRP	--	2.49	0.97	1.00	6.00
WTC	--	4.28	0.71	1.00	6.00

Note. n=8 districts, n=182 teachers. CTA=Cynicism Toward Administration. CTRP= Cynicism Toward Reading Program. WTC=Willingness To Change.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Results of the exploratory factor analysis for Cynicism Toward Administration appear in tables 2 and 3. Results showed that two factors could potentially be drawn from the set of questions. The two-factor solution accounted for 73% of the total variance for all items; however, the second factor only accounted for 13% of the total variance. Examination of the factor loadings suggest that a majority of the survey items loaded strongly on the first factor. Four survey items had loadings lower than .70 on the first factor and their loadings on the second factor were also not very strong.

Table 2.

Cumulative Variance for the Initial 2-Factor Solution for Cynicism Toward Administration

Source	*Factor 1*	*Factor 2*
Proportion of Variance	60.28	12.60
Cumulative Variance	60.28	72.88

Note. Numbers presented are percentages

Table 3.

Factor Loadings from Initial EFA for Cynicism Toward Administration (n = 180)

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2
CTA1	.79	-.11
CTA2	.81	-.02
CTA3	.81	-.17
CTA4	.74	-.09
CTA5	.83	-.20
CTA6	.90	-.13
CTA7	.93	-.13
CTA8	.87	-.20
CTA 9	.85	-.25
CTA10	.63	.49
CTA11	.53	.46
CTA12	.67	.59
CTA13	.32	.47

Given the results of the analysis of all nine items, a trimmed model was tested with the four items having the lowest factor loadings removed. As seen in table 4, a one-factor solution accounted for 75% of the total variance for all possible constructs. Factor loadings on the one factor were strong, ranging from .74 - .93 (table 5).

Table 4.

Cumulative Variance for the Final 1-Factor Solution for

Cynicism Toward Administration

Source	*Factor 1*
Proportion of Variance	75.36
Cumulative Variance	75.36

Note. Numbers presented are percentages.

Table 5.

Factor Loadings from Final EFA for Cynicism Toward Administration (n = 180)

Item	Factor 1
CTA1	.80
CTA2	.80
CTA3	.83
CTA4	.74
CTA5	.86
CTA6	.91
CTA7	.93
CTA8	.89
CTA9	.88

Results of the exploratory factor analysis for Cynicism Toward Reading Program appear in tables 6 and 7. Results showed that three factors could potentially be drawn from the set of questions. The three-factor solution accounted for 72% of the total variance for all items, with the first factor accounting for 53% and the second factor 10% and the third factor 8%. Examination of the factor loadings suggest that a majority of the survey items loaded strongly on the first factor with the exception of the items 3, 12, and13. These items had loadings below .60 on the first factor and even lower on factors two and three. Additionally, none of the items on

factors two or three reacted .60, suggesting that items do not cluster strongly around these factors.

Table 6.

Cumulative Variance for the Initial 3-Factor Solution for Cynicism Toward Reading Program

Source	*Factor 1*	*Factor 2*	*Factor 3*
Proportion of Variance	53.11	10.35	08.35
Cumulative Variance	53.11	63.46	71.81

Note. Numbers presented are percentages**.**

Table 7.

Factor Loadings from Initial EFA for Cynicism Factor Loadings from Initial EFA for Cynicism Toward Reading Program (n = 182)

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
CTRP1	.33	.52	.31
CTRP2	.73	-.06	.21
CTRP3	.46	.26	.34
CTRP4	.69	.13	.27
CTRP5	.85	-.27	.18
CTRP6	.92	-.26	.08
CTRP7	.89	-.27	-.02
CTRP8	.83	-.28	-.06
CTRP9	.84	.12	-.27
CTRP10	.63	.10	-.12
CTRP11	.85	.23	-.36
CTRP12	.54	.30	-.22
CTRP13	.37	.27	-.10

Given the results of the analysis of all thirteen items, a trimmed model was tested with the five items having the lowest factor loadings removed (tables 8 and 9). Results of the

trimmed model indicate that all eight items load strongly on one factor with the factor allowing for 72% of the variance (table 8). Factor loadings range from .66 - .96 (table 9).

Table 8.

Cumulative Variance for the Final 1-Factor Solution for

Cynicism Toward Reading Program

Source	Factor 1
Proportion of Variance	71.95
Cumulative Variance	71.95

Note. Numbers presented are percentages.

Table 9.

Factor Loadings from Final EFA for Cynicism Toward Reading

Program (n = 182)

Item	Factor 1
CTRP2	.73
CTRP4	.66
CTRP5	.88
CTRP6	.96
CTRP7	.92
CTRP8	.85
CTRP9	.81
CTRP11	.77

Results of the exploratory factor analysis for the construct Willingness to Change appear in tables 10 and 11. Eigenvalues over one were used to determine the optimal number of factors for the measure. Results showed that three factors could potentially be drawn from the set of questions The three-factor solution accounted for 68% of the total variance for all possible constructs; however, the second factor only accounted 13% of the total variance and the third

factor only accounted for 11% of the total variance. Examination of the factor loadings suggest that a majority of the survey items loaded strongly on the first factor.

Table 10.

Cumulative Variance for the Initial 3-Factor Solution for Willingness to Change

Source	*Factor 1*	*Factor 2*	*Factor 3*
Proportion of Variance	43.52	12.96	11.13
Cumulative Variance	43.52	52.48	67.61

Note. Numbers presented are percentages**.**

Table 11.

Factor Loadings from Initial EFA for Willingness to Change (n = 182)

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
WTC1	.80	.23	-.35
WTC2	.69	.18	-.37
WTC3	.39	.08	.13
WTC4	.63	.12	-.17
WTC5	.65	-.39	.07
WTC6	.69	-.69	.11
WTC7	.77	.07	.16
WTC8	.60	.47	.53
WTC9	-.28	.06	-.10

Similar to the cynicism measures, items with low factor loadings were removed and a trimmed model was tested. One factor accounted for 56% of the variance with factor loadings ranging from .68-.81. Examination of the factor loadings suggest that a majority of the survey items were strongly correlated on two overall constructs. Three survey items did not have strong

factor loadings on the first construct and were subsequently removed when examining the reliability of the scale. Based on these results, a trimmed model was tested with the three lowest factor loadings removed (Table 13). The two-factor solution accounted for 75% of the total variance for all possible constructs (Table 12).

Table 12.

Cumulative Variance for the Final 2-Factor Solution for

Willingness to Change

Source	*Factor 1*
Proportion of Variance	56.52
Cumulative Variance	56.52

Note. Numbers presented are percentages.

Table 13.

Factor Loadings from Final EFA for Willingness to Change

(n = 182)

Item	Factor 1
WTC1	.81
WTC2	.71
WTC4	.64
WTC5	.72
WTC6	.68
WTC7	.71

With structural validity evidence established, it is important to test the reliability of the measures. The following alpha values report inter-item consistency. Alpha values greater than .80 suggest excellent reliability, between .80-.89 is good, between .70-.79 is acceptable,

below .70 is questionable, between .60 and .50 is poor and below .50 is unacceptable. As seen in Table 14, all show excellent to good reliability according to guidelines suggested by George & Mallery (2016).

Table 14.

Cronbach's Alpha for Scales

Source	*Total Number of Items*	*α*
Cynicism toward administration	9	.96
Cynicism toward reading program	8	.94
Willingness to change	6	.85

All statistical data demonstrate valid research design measures (Vogt, 2007) and good reliability (Kim, et al, 2009) based on Cronbach alpha acceptability of .70 or greater. Each primary construct survey used in this study scored at the good or excellent range. All three of these scores meet the acceptable reliability score of .70.

Correlational Analysis

The first step in testing the hypotheses was to examine the bivariate correlations between the variables of interest and the control variables in the study. Results in table 15 show a strong negative relationship between Cynicism Toward Reading Program and Willingness to Change ($r = -.56$, $p < .001$). No statistically significant relationship was found between Cynicism Toward Administration and Willingness to Change ($r = -.03$, $p < .001$). The only other statistically significant relationship with Willingness to Change was teachers who reported no technology proficiency ($r = -.19$, $p < .001$).

It is interesting to note that urban teachers had higher Cynicism Toward Administration than non-urban teachers ($r = .21$, $p < .001$), but not Cynicism Toward Reading Program. Rural teachers had lower Cynicism Toward Administration ($r = -.20$, $p < .001$) and lower Cynicism Toward Reading Program ($r = -.17$, $p < .001$). There was a small relationship between teachers with no technology proficiency and Willing to Change ($r = -.19$, $p < .001$) and Cynicism Toward Reading Program ($r = -.23$, $p < 001$).

Table 15

Correlation Coefficients for Continuous Study Variables (n = 182)

	WTC	CTA	CTRP	Urban	Sub	Rural	Prof	Avg	None	Novice	MidCar	Exp
WTC	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CTA	-0.03	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CTRP	-.56**	0.11	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Urban	0.04	.21**	-0.05	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suburban	0.12	0.06	-0.15	-.23**	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural	-0.13	-.20**	-.17*	-.46**	-.75**	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Proficient	-0.03	0.03	0.11	-0.05	0.06	-0.02	1	-	-	-	-	-
Avg Prof.	-0.07	0.03	0.01	0.09	-0.07	0	-.87**	1	-	-	-	-
No Prof.	-.19*	-0.12	-.23**	-0.09	0.03	0.03	-.19*	-.33**	1	-	-	-
Novice	-0.09	-0.07	0.04	-0.11	0.05	0.03	-.17*	-0.11	-0.11	1	-	-
MidCareer	0.08	0.06	-0.1	0.14	0.05	-0.14	0.12	-0.09	-0.05	-.18*	1	-
Experienced	0.01	0.01	0.04	-0.02	-0.08	0.09	-.23**	.15*	0.13	-.63**	-.65**	1

Note: ** p < .01. * p < .05. Note=control variables were dummy coded.
WTC=Willingness to Change. CTA=Cynicism Toward Administration.
CTRP=Cynicism Toward Reading Program.

Multiple Linear Regression Results

A multiple linear regression (Table 16) was conducted to examine the relationship between Cynicism Toward Reading Program, rural teachers, teachers with no technology experience, and teacher's Willingness to Change due to their significance. Results of the overall model were statistically significant, $F(3, 163) = 28.79$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .346$. The R^2 value, or coefficient of determination, indicates that 34.6% of the variance in willingness to change can be explained by the set of predictor variables. Upon further examination of the predictor variables, only Cynicism Toward Reading Program had a statistically significant relationship ($B = -.56$, $p < .001$) with Willingness to Change. The relationship was negative, meaning that for every one standard deviation increase in Cynicism Toward Reading Program, Willingness to Change scores decreased by 0.54 standard deviations. Cynicism Toward the Reading Program uniquely explained approximately 31% of the variance, a large effect by Cohen (1988) standards.

Table 16.

Multiple Linear Regression between Cynicism Toward Reading Program, Rural, Technology and Willingness to Change

Source	*b*	*SE*	*β*	*t*	*p*
ReadCync	*-0.44*	*0.05*	*-.56*	*-8.50*	*<.001*
Rural	*-0.07*	*0.12*	*-.04*	*-0.61*	*.544*
None	*0.36*	*0.25*	*.09*	*1.42*	*.157*

Note: Overall Model: *$F(3, 163) = 28.79$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .346$.* ReadCync= Cynicism Toward Reading Program. Rural=teachers in rural districts. None=no technology proficiency.

Chapter 6: Discussion

This study sought to address the gap in the literature by testing the relationship between teacher cynicism and willingness to change instructional practices. Informed by Lewin's change theory and literature on cynicism, the study proposed that teacher cynicism toward building-level administration and teacher cynicism toward a new reading program would have an inverse relationship with a willingness to change instructional practices. While there was only support for the second hypothesis, the evidence offers valuable insight into the relationship between teacher cynicism and willingness to change. The results are now considered through the lenses of change theory and the cynicism literature before presenting implications for leadership.

Cynicism and Instructional Change

To explain the function of cynicism in instructional change, it is necessary to return to Lewin's Change Theory and cynicism literature. Lewin's theory is comprised of field theory, group dynamics, action research and the 3-step model of change as a unified explanation for planned change (Burnes, 2004). Three of these elements contribute to the explanation of findings in this study along with the literature on cynicism.

Field Theory

Field Theory is the idea that a person occupies a field and/or space in which psychological forces affect their behavior or choices. We can begin to understand and even predict a person's behavior if we know all the psychological forces at play (Burnes, 2004). Lewin believed that behavior comes from the psychological forces in a person's life space and that behavioral change occurs when there are changes to those forces (Burnes & Cooke, 2013). So, if you want to understand, predict and begin to change a person's behavior, it would be necessary to consider all the psychological forces at work in a person's life space (Burnes &

Cooke, 2013). Lewin believed that it was not enough to identify one or two of the forces that impinge on the individual, but that all the forces and how they relate to and interact with each other, must be taken into account (Burnes, 2004). Psychological forces are behaviors, goals, needs, desires, intentions, tensions and cognitive processes that are comprised within the psychological footprint of a person's life space. (Burnes & Cooke, 2013). To begin to understand how cynicism would affect a teacher's willingness to change his/her instructional practice, it is important to situate the beliefs and behaviors with one's social context.

Cynicism does not account for the totality of the psychological forces at play when individuals evaluate a change like a new reading program, but cynicism does reflect an attitude that could seemingly prevent a teacher from automatically embracing another instructional resource. In other words, cynicism could function as a psychological force affecting a teacher's willingness to change. The results of this study support this claim. Results suggest a strong negative relationship between Cynicism Toward Reading Program and Willingness to change did exist, ($r = -.56$, $p < .001$). Therefore, cynicism did act as an imposing force on some teacher's willingness to change.

For teachers in this study, attitudes toward the reading program influenced their intentions to use the new resources. The more cynical the teachers were toward the new reading program, the less willing some were to change instructional practice. Cynicism toward administration, on the other hand, seemed to be unrelated to teacher's willingness to change, ($r = -.03$, $p < .001$). No statistically significant relationship was found between Cynicism Toward Administration and Willingness to Change; therefore, cynicism toward administration did not act as am imposing force on teacher's willingness to change.

Group Dynamics

This study found a strong negative relationship between teacher cynicism and teacher willingness to change to the new reading program. Literature on change within the institution of education and change among teachers suggests change is incremental at best (Cuban, 1984; Fullan, 2013, McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007). Understanding the dynamics of teachers functioning as a group and functioning within the conservative institution of education offers worthy explanations to our findings.

Group Dynamics is the idea that when considering change, the emphasis should be on the group and the power the group has on the individual; in other words, if you want to change an individual's behavior, you need to change the behavior of the group. Kippenberger (1998) notes that Lewin was addressing two questions with his focus on group dynamics: What is it about the nature and characteristics of a group that causes it to respond (behave) as it does to the forces which impinge on it? How can these forces be changed in order to elicit a more desirable form of behavior? Group Dynamics stressed that group behavior, rather than that of individuals should be the focus of change (Bernstein, 1968). Lewin (1947) maintained that it is fruitless to concentrate on changing the behavior of individuals because the individual in isolation is constrained by group pressures to conform. Therefore, Lewin saw successful change as a group activity because unless group norms and routines are also transformed, changes to individual behavior will not be sustained (Cummings & Huse, 1989).

This element of Lewin's Change Theory suggests that if one wishes to change the instructional practice of teachers, he/she must address change as a group (Cummings & Huse, 1989). Recalling literature of why teachers enter the profession of teaching might help explain why teachers in this study who were cynical toward the reading program were less willing to

change instructional practice. As Cuban argues, "…teaching breeds conservatism and resistance to change…" (Cuban, 1984, p. 256). People attracted to teaching are those who are seeking to work with children and value a flexible work schedule because the school calendar is compatible with family obligations and vacations; therefore, people join the profession because of their personal alignment with it; they generally do not enter the profession for the purpose of seeking to challenge and/or change it (Fullan 2013, McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007). Teachers are also informally socialized for the 12-13 years they sit in classrooms as students. This socialization also breeds conformity to the norms. Teachers are typically people who value the school system; the system worked for them and they join the institution already socialized to it and help to maintain and promote it, not change it (Cuban, 1984: Felder & Brent, 1996).

This conformity of teachers as a group provides an explanation as to why teachers might be cynical toward changing a system that worked for them. Specifically, regarding the reading program, teachers might have a cynical attitude toward the new reading program because it pushes against the conservative and resistant to change nature of the system in which they exist. Any type of change would be resisted due to the conservative nature of the institution. It is less about the requested change and more about the tenants of the institution. When we begin to consider the research about the institution of education (Cuban, 1984: Felder & Brent, 1996) and the teachers who work to maintain its tenants (Fullan, 2013, McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007), it is interesting to think that districts seek to make changes at all. It might serve districts well to initiate change in a manner more reflective of its own conservative composition: slowly, over long periods of time and incrementally.

To further carry out this line of thinking, the reading program adopted, Wonders, was not only a new curriculum, but a departure from existing teaching techniques. So, this adds another

layer of possible resistance to the change; in that, the teachers are not only being asked to change curriculum but change their methodology as well. Wonders is not the typical reading program where there is a story of the week that the students read every day and then take a test over the story on Friday. Wonders requires short reads throughout the week allowing students to wrestle with more complex texts. Using journals, portfolios, and small group projects students can integrate their knowledge by making it their own. Wonders provides students daily with opportunities to participate in collaborative conversations about the skills/strategies they are learning that week. This change in practice would be a possible added frustration to teachers who are used to a prescribed daily schedule using one story. Wonders would require teachers to develop creative ways for students to interact with the text/story. It is also likely that teachers using this reading and writing methodology learned to read and write in the same way which might cause frustration when being asked to teach in a new way. Teachers work to maintain the routines/tradition of the institution (Cuban, 1984; Shein, 1988). They become teachers to work in an environment that worked for them and they return to it to maintain it, not change it and understanding the group dynamics provides explanation for their resistance to change.

Another change required with the new reading program is how reading is taught comprehensively instead of compartmentally (Shanahan et al, 2016). In the past, spelling, grammar, writing, reading was all taught in isolation. Reading programs even had a different workbook for each subject. Wonders, however, proposed that reading and writing should be taught together. Spelling and grammar were embedded in the reading and writing assignments. If you were studying adverbs, you read a passage where adverbs were used, your spelling list consisted of adverbs, etc. In the past, each component of reading was taught in isolation and sometimes by a different teacher. Some districts are still set up where students have a reading

teacher and a writing teacher. If teachers, learned to read and write in a system where each subject was taught independent of the other, embracing a new system where they were embedded might create some resistance or cynical attitude toward a new process because they are used to maintaining a system, not changing it (Cuban, 1984; Fullan, 2013, McCombs, 2001; McCombs & Miller, 2007).

3-Step Model of Change

Change is a process (Burnes, 2004; Lewin, 1947; Schein, 1996). Asking teachers to change their instructional practices is a process as well. Since study results demonstrated that teacher cynicism appears negatively to affect their willingness to change ($r = -.56$, $p < .001$), it is necessary to consider what steps might have been missed in the change process outlined by Lewin's 3-Step Model of Change.

The 3-Step model is a process where an individual unfreezes a behavior, learns a new behavior and then refreezes the new behavior. This process provides the primary theoretical explanation for the postulated link between cynicism and instructional change. Successful change, Lewin (1947) argued, involved three steps: unfreezing, moving and refreezing.

Step one is unfreezing. Recall from field theory that Lewin believed human behavior was based on a quasi-stationary equilibrium supported by a complex field of driving and restraining forces. He argued that for an individual to change in authentic and meaningful ways the equilibrium needs to be destabilized (unfrozen). Destabilization creates the cognitive space for old behavior to be discounted (unlearned) and new behavior successfully adopted.

Step two is moving. As Schein (1996) notes, unfreezing is not an end in itself; it creates motivation to learn but does not necessarily control or predict the direction in which new behavior will follow. Moving is the stage in the cognitive process whereby an individual

experiment with the new behavior in order to discern its value and future worth (Lewin, 1947). Group dynamics are instrumental in the moving process. Group norms, interactions, and member roles shape the degree to which individuals will experiment with new practices and learn from their actions (Lewin, 1947). However, Lewin (1947) recognized that without reinforcement, change could be short-lived.

Step three is refreezing. This is the final step in the 3-Step model. Refreezing seeks to stabilize the group at a new quasi-stationary equilibrium in order to ensure that the new behaviors are relatively safe from regression. The main point about refreezing is that new behavior must be, to some degree, congruent with the rest of the behavior, personality and environment of the learner or it will simply lead to a new round of disconfirmation (Schein, 1996).

Again, in this study, the second hypothesis was supported; as teacher cynicism toward the new reading program increased, their willingness to change decreased. Because some teachers were unwilling to change, it is likely that the 3-step process of change never started. Based on the explanation of Lewin's 3-Step Model of Change, for the destabilization process to begin teachers would require a need for the change. An example of a need might be that a district's reading scores plummeted. This would provide a possible catalyst for teachers to see a need for the change in reading curriculum. This need would start the unfreezing process. Since some of the teachers in the study were unwilling to change, they likely never started the unfreezing process. Their cynicism toward the reading program possibly hindered them from acknowledging a need to change, acting as a barrier to change. Perhaps some teachers did see a need for change, but their cynical attitudes toward the selected reading program possibly prevented them from unfreezing their held beliefs that would allow the change to occur. Because

of the possible barrier created by teacher cynicism toward the reading program, some teachers never started the 3-step change process. Teacher cynicism toward the reading program acted as a possible barrier or imposing force which prohibited the unfreezing process to start.

Other Interesting Findings

This study also produced other interesting relationships worthy of noting and examining. First, there was a small statistically significant relationship between Willingness to Change and teachers who reported No Technology Proficiency ($r = .19$, $p < .001$), but not Cynicism Toward the Reading Program. Teachers who reported no technology proficiency were less likely than those who reported average proficiency or very proficient technology skills to be cynical toward the new reading program and more willing to change. Second, urban teachers had higher Cynicism Toward Administration than Non-Urban Teachers ($r = .21$, $p < .001$), but not Cynicism Toward the Reading Program, and third, Rural Teachers had lower Cynicism Toward Administration ($r = -.20$, $p < .001$) and lower Cynicism Toward Reading Program ($r = -17$. $P < .001$). These findings pose questions for areas of further study and consideration.

Implications for School Leadership

While this study begins to fill a void in the literature regarding the relationship between teacher cynicism and willingness to change instructional practices, it also offers insight for building-level administrators and curriculum providers. Understanding the complexities of the change process and knowing the attitudes of those being asked to implement the change is imperative for building-level administrators. The following implications emerge from theory and evidence.

First, building-level administrators need to set realistic expectations for instructional change efforts. Evidence suggests that institutions like education are highly resistant to change

(Zucker, 1987) and teachers have consistently maintained the role of gatekeeper of the classroom by resisting classroom reforms (Fullan, 2013, 2015; Hatti 2012). Teacher cynical attitudes toward the reading program can prohibit them from changing their instructional practices as evidenced by a strong negative relationship between cynicism toward the reading program and willingness to change, ($r = -.56$, $p < .001$). Their attitudes likely preempted a school led change in reading instruction. Classrooms have made incremental changes with the increased use of technology, new instructional materials and advancements made in assessments, but instructional change has largely consisted of adopting new tools of the craft, but not adjusting the paradigm used to guide how learning is activated (Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2003; Ertmer, 1999, 2005; Ertmer el al, 2012; Fullan 2015). This notion provides valuable information for building-level administrators and implementers of new curriculum; they need realistic expectations for the level of change likely to occur and understand the resistance teachers possibly maintain toward the change (Fullan 2013, 2015).

Second, building-level administrators need to acknowledge and address current attitudes of contempt, frustration, hopelessness, disillusionment and distrust toward objects in their teacher's environments (Abraham, 2000; Reichers, Wanous & Austin, 1997; Anderson & Bateman, 1997; Choi, 2011). Cynicism has become an inherent characteristic of many Americans. Forty-three percent of the workforce is cynical, and this includes the teaching workforce (Akin, 2015; Aslan & Yilmaz, 2013; Eisinger, 2000; Mirvis & Kanter, 1989). The current study adds to this body of research; in that, teacher cynicism acted as a possible barrier toward embracing the implementation of the new reading program. Building-level administrators need to understand the barrier to change cynical attitudes can impose prior to spending funds on new curricula, professional development and human capital on instructional

reform efforts. This is not to suggest schools stop attempting to make instructional changes, but to understand that pre-existing attitudes held by their teachers might impede their change goals. As previously stated, Lewin believed that it was not enough to identify one or two of the forces that impinge on the individual, but to consider all the forces and how they relate to and interact with each other, have to be taken into account (Burnes, 2004). Building-level administrators need to take stock of their teacher's attitudes prior to initiating district instructional reform efforts.

Conclusion

A significant takeaway from this research is that it begins to fill in the gap of missing literature between teacher cynicism and willingness to change instructional practice. The data presented within this study support the theoretical connections within the literature that teacher cynicism can act as a barrier to their willingness to change instructional practices. If teacher cynicism toward any referent can impede instructional change it is worthy of study and the attention of educators at all levels to consider.

Districts spend considerable funds, time, and human capital implementing new instructional programs. It would behoove educators, policy makers, district leadership, and building-level administrators to be mindful of the cynical attitudes held by their teachers. These cynical attitudes can stymie the implementation process before it begins. While this study did not prove that cynical attitudes toward building-level administrators acted as a barrier to teacher's willingness to change instructional practices, it did provide evidence that certain referents of cynical attitudes can possibly affect change. Because of this connection, further research into this relationship is warranted.

Future research could examine the relationship between administrator and teacher to determine how the relationship can mediate the negative effects of cynicism regardless of the referent: Are teachers who have more trust in their administrators, less cynical? Can administrators who have their teacher's trust mediate cynical attitudes toward new curriculum or other needed instructional changes? To what extent can trusting relationships mediate cynical attitudes? Further research could also analyze the relationship between years of teaching, cynical attitudes and willingness to change. Most educators support the notion of being a life-long learner. Further research could uncover if teachers are providing lip service to this philosophy or simply espousing it for their students and not the instructional practices within the classroom.

Teachers face all types of challenges when it comes to keeping their instructional practices current. Activating deeper thinking and understanding for each individual student is no small task; however, teachers are, in fact, the gatekeeper of their classrooms and the instructional practices that take place within them. It is logical then to conclude that the attitudes held by teachers will affect their daily instruction and should be heavily considered when asking teachers to change instructional practice or implement new curriculum.

Bibliography

Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational cynicism: Bases and consequences. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs, 126*(3), 269-292.

Ahmet, A. (2015). An analysis of the relationship between organizational communication and organizational cynicism according to teacher's perceptions in Turkey. *Educational Research and Reviews, 10*(5), 547-555.

Akin, U. (2015). The relationship between organizational cynicism and trust in schools: A research on teachers. *Egitim ve Bilim, 40*(181).

Allport, G. W. (1947). The genius of Kurt Lewin. *Journal of Personality, 16*(1), 1-10

An, Y. J., & Reigeluth, C. (2011). Creating technology-enhanced, learner-centered classrooms: K–12 teachers' beliefs, perceptions, barriers, and support needs. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education, 28*(2), 54-62.

Andersson, L. M. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations, 49*(11), 1395-1418

Andersson, L., & Bateman, T. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace and effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 449-469.

Armenakis, A. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (1999). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management, 25*(3), 293-315.

Aslan, H., & Yilmaz, E. (2013). The study of teachers' general cynicism inclinations in terms of life satisfaction and other variables. *Creative Education, 4*(09), 588.

Back, K. W. (1992). This business of topology. *Journal of Social Issues, 48*(2), 51-66.

Baier, A. (1986). Trust and antitrust. *Ethics, 96*(2), 231-260.

Baron, A. E., Kemker, K., Harmes, C., & Kalaydjian**,** K. (2003). Large-scale research study on technology in K-12 schools: Technology integration as it relates to the national technology standards. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 35*(4), 489-507.

Barron, B., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Teaching for Meaningful Learning: A Review of Research on Inquiry-Based and Cooperative Learning. Book Excerpt. George Lucas Educational Foundation.

Becker, H. J. (1994). How exemplary computer-using teachers differ from other teachers: Implications for realizing the potential of computers in schools. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 26*(3), 291-321.

Becker, H. J., & Riel, M. M. (1999). Teacher professionalism and the emergence of constructivist-compatible pedagogies. *Retrieved September, 9, 2010.*

Bedeian, A. G. (2007). Even if the Tower Is "Ivory," It Isn't "White:" Understanding the Consequences of Faculty Cynicism. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 6*(1), 9-32.

Bellanca, J. A. (Ed.). (2010). *21st century skills: Rethinking how students learn.* Solution Tree Press.

Benford, R., & Lawson, A. E. (2001). Relationships between Effective Inquiry Use and the Development of Scientific Reasoning Skills in College Biology Labs.

Bernstein, L. (1968). Management development. Random House Business.

Boardman, A., & Woodruff, A. (2004). Teacher change and "high-stakes" assessment: What happens to professional development? *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 545-557.

Boote, D. N. (2006). Teachers' professional discretion and the curricula. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and practice,* 12*(4), 461-478.*

Bouckenooghe, D. (2012). The role of organizational politics, contextual resources, and formal communication on change recipients' commitment to change: A multilevel study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 21(*4), 575-602.

Boukes, M., & Boomgaarden, H. G. (2015). Soft news with hard consequences? Introducing a nuanced measure of soft versus hard news exposure and its relationship with political cynicism. *Communication Research, 42(5),* 701-731.

Brandes, P., Castro, S. L., James, M. S., Martinez, A. D., Matherly, T. A., Ferris, G. R., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2007). The interactive effects of job insecurity and organizational cynicism on work effort following a layoff. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies.*

Brickner, D. (1995). The effects of first and second order barriers to change on the degree and nature of computer usage of secondary mathematics teachers: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Bridwell-Mitchell, E. (2015). Theorizing teacher agency and reform: How institutionalized instructional practices change and persist. *Sociology of Education, 88(2),* 140-159.

Brown, M., & Cregan, C. (2008). Organizational change cynicism: The role of employee involvement. *Human Resource Management, 47*(4), 667-686.

Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: a re-appraisal. *Journal of Management studies, 41*(6), 977-1002.

Burnes, B., & Cooke, B. (2013). Kurt Lewin's Field Theory: A Review and Re-evaluation. *International journal of management reviews, 15*(4), 408-425.

Byrne, Z. S., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2008). Perceived organizational support and performance: Relationships across levels of organizational cynicism. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*(1), 54-72.

Caplan, J. (2003). Police cynicism: police survival tool. *The Police Journal, 76*(4), 304-313.

Cartwright, D. (1951). Achieving change in people: some applications of group dynamics theory. *Human Relations*, *4*(4), 381-392.

Cartwright, S., & Holmes, N. (2006). The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*(2), 199-208.

Chang, M. (2009). An Appraisal Perspective of Teacher Burnout: Examining the Emotional Work of Teachers. *Educational Psychology Review Educ Psychol Rev,* 193-218.

Choi, M. (2011). Employees' attitudes toward Choi, M. (2011). Employees' attitudes toward organizational change: A literature review. *Human Resource Management, 50*(4), 479-500.

Chiaburu, D. S., Peng, A. C., Oh, I. S., Banks, G. C., & Lomeli, L. C. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee organizational cynicism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 83*(2), 181-197.

Cohen, D. K. (1988). Teaching Practice: Plus Ca Change... Issue Paper 88-3.

Cohen, D. K., & Ball, D. L. (1990). Relations between policy and practice: A commentary. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12*(3), 331-338.

Cook, W. W., & Medley, D. M. (1954). Proposed hostility and pharisaic-virtue scales for the MMPI. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 38*(6), 414.

Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (Eds.). (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance.* Lexington Books.

Crocco, M. S., & Costigan, A. T. (2007). The narrowing of curriculum and pedagogy in the age of accountability urban educators speak out. *Urban Education*, 42(6), 512-535.

Cuban, L. (1982). Persistence of the Inevitable: The Teacher-Centered Classroom. *Education and Urban Society*,*15*(1), 26-41.

Cuban, L. (1984). How Teachers Taught: *Constancy and Change in American Classrooms,* 1890-1980. *Research on Teaching Monograph Series Classrooms, 1890-1990*. Teachers College Press.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher, 19*(1), 3-13.

Cuban, L. (1988). Why Do Some Reforms Persist? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 24*(3), 329-35.

Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in America Classrooms, 1890-1990.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cummings, T. G., & Huse, E. F. (1989). Organizational Development and Change.

Dancey, L. (2012). The consequences of political cynicism: How cynicism shapes citizens' reactions to political scandals. *Political Behavior, 34*(3), 411-423.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Conley, D. T. (2012). Assessment Systems for Deeper Learning. In *Deeper Learning: Beyond 21st Century Skills* (pp. 235-271). Bloomington, IN : Solution Tree Press.

Dean, J., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational Cynicism. *The Academy of Management Review*, 341-341.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1975). *Intrinsic Motivation*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macro theory of human motivation, development, health. Canadian Psychology, *49*(3), 182.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The" what" and" why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268.

Demko, M. (2010). Teachers become zombies: The ugly side of scripted reading curriculum. *Voices from the Middle*, 17(3), 62.

Dent, E. B., & Goldberg, S. G. (2013). Challenging "Resistance to Change. SSRN Electronic Journal. Doi:10.2139/ssrn.2326329

DeMers, J. (2017, February). Do you have shiny object syndrome: what it Is and how to beat it. Entrepreneur Magazine, 9, 5-10.

De Vreese, C. H. (2005). The spiral of cynicism reconsidered. *European Journal of Communication, 20*(3), 283-301.

Dexter, S. L., Anderson, R. E., & Becker, H. J. (1999). Teachers' views of computers as catalysts for changes in their teaching practice. *Journal of research on computing in education, 31*(3), 221-239.

Dudley, D. (1937). *A history of cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th century A.D.,* London: Methuen.

Duffy, G., & Roebler, L. (1986). Constraints on teacher change. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 55-5

DuFour, R., & DuFour, R. (2015). Deeper Learning for Students Requires Deeper Learning for Educators. In Deeper Learning Beyond 21st Century Skills (pp. 21-52). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., Gardner, D. G., Cummings, L. L., & Pierce, J. L. (2011, October). The development of an attitude toward change instrument. In *Academy of Management annual meeting, Washington, DC.*

Eisinger, R. M. (2000). Questioning cynicism. *Society*, 37(5), 55-60.

Elmore, R. F. (2004). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice, and performance.* Harvard Education Press. 8 Story Street First Floor, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Elmore, R. F., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1988). *Steady Work. Policy, Practice, and the Reform of American Education.* The RAND Corporation-Publications Department, 1700 Main St., PO Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90406-2138.

English, B., & Chalon, C. (2011). Strengthening affective organizational commitment: The influence of fairness perceptions of management practices and underlying employee cynicism. *The health care manager*, 30(1), 29-35.

Ertmer, P. A. (1999). Addressing first-and second-order barriers to change: Strategies for technology integration., *Educational Technology Research and Development, 47*(4), 47-61.

Ertmer, P. A. (2005). Teacher pedagogical beliefs: The final frontier in our quest for technology integration? *Educational technology research and development, 53*(4), 25-39.

Ertmer, P. A., Bai, H., Dong, C., Khalil, M., Hee Park, S., & Wang, L. (2002). Online professional development: Building administrators' capacity for technology leadership. *Journal of Computing in teacher Education, 19*(1), 5-11.

Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T. (2010). Teacher technology change: How knowledge, confidence, beliefs, and culture intersect. *Journal of research on Technology in Education, 42*(3), 255-284.

Ertmer, P. A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Sadik, O., Sendurur, E., & Sendurur, P. (2012). Teacher beliefs and technology integration practices: A critical relationship. *Computers & Education, 59*(2), 423-435.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research, 38*(1), 47-65.

Farber, B. A. (1991). Crisis in education: *Stress and burnout in the American teacher*. Jossey-Bass.

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (1996). Navigating the bumpy road to student-centered instruction. *College teaching*, *44*(2), 43-47.

Forsyth, P. B., Adams, C. M., & Hoy, W. K. (2011). *Collective Trust: Why Schools Can't Improve without It.* Teachers College Press. 1234 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, NY 10027.

Fullan, M. G., & Miles, M. B. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi delta kappa, 73*(10), 745-752.

Fullan, M. (2013). The new pedagogy: Students and teachers as learning partners. *Learning Landscapes*, *6*(2), 23-29.

Fullan, M. (2013). *Stratosphere: Integrating technology, pedagogy, and change knowledge.* Pearson Canada.

Fullan, M. (2015). Breakthrough Learning. *In Deeper Learning: Beyond 21st Century Skills* (pp. 275-284). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Fullan, M. (2000). The return of large-scale reform. *Journal of educational Change, 1*(1), 5-27.

Fullan, M. G. (1993). Why teachers must become change agents. *Educational leadership, 50*, 12-12.

Fullan, M., & Langworthy, M. (2013). Towards a new end: New pedagogies for deep learning. *Seattle, Washington: Collaborative Impact.*

Fullan, M. S., & Stiegelbauer, S. S.(1991): *The New Meaning of Educational Change.* London: Cassell.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2016). IBM SPSS statistics 23 step by step: A simple guide and reference. Routledge.

Goldfarb, J. C. (1991). *The cynical society: The culture of politics and the politics of culture in American life.* University of Chicago Press.

Golembiewski, R. T., & McConkie, M. (1975). The centrality of interpersonal trust in group processes. *Theories of group processes*, 131, 185.

Guskey, T. (2002). Professional Development and Teacher Change. *Teachers and Teaching*, 381-391.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational researcher, 15*(5), 5-12.

Hargreaves, A. (2006). Educational Change Over Time? The Sustainability and Non-sustainability of Three Decades of Secondary School Change and Continuity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 3-41.

Hattie, J. (2015). The applicability of Visible Learning to higher education. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology,1*(1), 79-91.

Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement.* Routledge.

Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge

Hendry, C. (1996). Understanding and creating whole organizational change through learning theory. *Human relations*, 49(5), 621-641.

Hickman, M. J. (2008). On the context of police cynicism and problem behavior. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, *4*(1).

Hochwarter, W. A., James, M., Johnson, D., & Ferris, G. R. (2004). The interactive effects of politics perceptions and trait cynicism on work outcomes. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *10*(4), 44-57.

Holliday, W. G. (2001). Critically considering inquiry teaching. *Science Scope*, 24(7), 54.

Hoy, W. K., & Kupersmith, W. J. (1985). The meaning and measure of faculty trust. *Educational and psychological research*, *5*(1), 1-10.

James, M. S., Ferris, G. R., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2005*). Antecedents and consequences of cynicism in organizations: An examination of the potential positive and negative effects on school systems.*

James, T., & Tyack, D. (1983). Learning from Past Efforts to Reform the High School. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *64*(6), 400-6.

Janicki-Deverts, D., Cohen, S., & Doyle, W. J. (2010). Cynical hostility and stimulated Th1 and Th2 cytokine production. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*, *24*(1), 58-63.

Jebril, N., Albæk, E., & De Vreese, C. H. (2013). Infotainment, cynicism and democracy: The effects of privatization vs personalization in the news. European *Journal of Communication, 28*(2), 105-121.

Johnson, J. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, Johnson, J. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2003). The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism: Not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* English, B., & Chalon, C. (2011). Strengthening affective organizational commitment: The influence of fairness perceptions of management practices and underlying employee cynicism. *The health care manager, 30*(1), 29-35., 24(5), 627-647.

Kääriäinen, J., & Siren (2012) Do the police trust in citizens? European comparisons. *European Journal of Criminology, 9*(3), 276-289.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implication of research on teacher belief. *Educational psychologist, 27*(1), 65-90.

Kim, T. Y., Bateman, T. S., Gilbreath, B., & Andersson, L. M. (2009). Top management credibility and employee cynicism: A comprehensive model. *Human Relations, 62*(10), 1435-1458.

Kim, C., Kim, M. K., Lee, C., Spector, J. M., & DeMeester, K. (2013). Teacher beliefs and technology integration. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 29, 76-85.*

Kippenberger, T. (1998). Planned change: Kurt Lewin's legacy. *The Antidote, 3*(4), 10-12.

Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 75-86.

Leung, K., Ip, O. K., & Leung, K. K. (2010). Social cynicism and job satisfaction: A longitudinal analysis. *Applied Psychology, 59*(2), 318-338.

Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of social issues, 2*(4), *3*4-46.

Lewin, K. (1947). Group decision and social change. *Readings in social psychology, 3*, 197-211.

Lewin, K., & Lorsch, K. (1939). Mathematical constructs in psychology and Sociology. *Journal of Unified Science*, 9, 397-403.

Locke, E. A. (1969) What is job satisfaction? Organizational behavior and human performance, 4(4), 309-336.

McCombs, B. L. (2001). What do we know about learners and learning? The learner-centered framework: Bringing the educational system into balance. *Educational Horizons,* 182-193.

McCombs, B. L., & Miller, L. (2007). *Learner-centered classroom practices and assessments: Maximizing student motivation, learning, and achievement.* Corwin Press.

Milner IV, H. R. (2013). Scripted and narrowed curriculum reform in urban schools.

Mirvis, P. H., & Kanter, D. L. (1989). Combatting cynicism in the workplace. *National Productivity Review, 8*(4), 377-394.

Mumtaz, S. (2000). Factors affecting teachers' use of information and communication technology: a review of the literature. *Journal of information technology for teacher education, 9*(3), 319-342.

Nafei, W. A. (2013). Examining the relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational change: A study from Egyptian context. *Journal of Business Administration Research, 2*(2), p1.

Neves, P. (2012). Organizational cynicism: Spillover effects on supervisor- subordinate relationships and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*(5), 965-976.

Niederhoffer, A. (1967). *Behind the shield: The police in urban society* (pp. 103-51). Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

O'Connell, B. J., Holzman, H., & Armandi, B. R. (1986). Police cynicism and the modes of adaptation. *Journal of Police Science & Administration*.

Osborne, J., & Waters, E. (2002). Four assumptions of multiple regression researchers should always test. *Practical assessment, research & evaluation, 8*(2),1-9.

Pardo del Val, M., & Martínez Fuentes, C. (2003). Resistance to change: a literature review and empirical study. *Management decision,* 41(2), 148-155.

Payne, C. M. (2008). *So much reform, so little change: The persistence of Failure in urban schools.* Harvard Education Press. 8 Story Street First Floor, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Educational research quarterly,* 29*(1), 38-54.*

Pedersen, R. T. (2012). The game frame and political efficacy: Beyond the spiral of cynicism. *European Journal of Communication, 27*(3), 225-240.

Pellegrino, J. W., & Hilton, M. L. (2012). *Education for life and work: developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.

Peters, E. E. (2010). Shifting to a student-centered science classroom: An exploration of teacher and student changes in perceptions and practices. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21(3), 329-349.

Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of management review,* 25*(4), 783-794.*

Pietarinen, J., Pyhältö, K., Soini, T., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2013). Reducing teacher burnout: A socio-contextual approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 35*, 62-72.

Pintrich, P. R., Marx, R. W., & Boyle, R. A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. *Review of Educational Research, 63*(2), 167-199.

Polat, S. (2013). The impact of teachers' organizational trust perceptions on organizational cynicism perception. *Educational Research and Reviews, 8*(16), 1483.

Polatcan, M., & Titrek, O. (2013). The Relationship between Leadership Behaviors of School Principals and their Organizational Cynicism Attitudes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 1291-1303.

Price, V., & Stroud, N. J. (2005). Public attitudes toward polls: Evidence from the 2000 US presidential election. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 18(4), 393-421.

Pugh, S. D., Skarlicki, D. P., & Passell, B. S. (2003). After the fall: Layoff victims' trust and cynicism in re-employment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*(2), 201-212.

Pyhältö, K., Pietarinen, J., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2011). Teacher–working-environment fit as a framework for burnout experienced by Finnish teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(7), 1101-1110.

Qian, Y., & Daniels, T. D. (2008). A communication model of employee cynicism toward organizational change. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 13*(3),319-332.

Quinn, J. B. (1980). Strategies for change: Logical incrementalism. Irwin Professional Publishing.

Quinn, J. B. (1989). Managing strategic change. *Readings in Strategic Management*, 19-42.

Raphael, T., Gavelek, J., Hynd, C., Teale, W., & Shanahan, T. (2002). Christmas trees are great, but not as models for instructional coherence. *Illinois Reading Council Journal, 30(2), 5-7.*

Raven, B. H. (1992). A power/interaction model of interpersonal influence: French and Rave thirty years later. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality.*

Ravitz, J., Hixson, N., English, M., & Mergendoller, J. (2012, April). Using project based learning to teach 21st century skills: Findings from a statewide initiative. In *Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association Vancouver, BC. Retrievedhttp://www.bie.org/research/study/PBL_21CS_WV.*

Regoli, R. M. (1976). The effects of college education on the maintenance of police cynicism. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 4*(3), 340-345.

Reichers, A., Wanous, J., & Austin, J. (1997). Understanding and managing cynicism about organizational change. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 48-59.*

Resnick, D. P., & Resnick, L. B. (1985). Standards, curriculum, and performance: A historical and comparative perspective. *Educational Researcher, 14*(4), 5-20.

Richards, J., & Kosmala, K. (2013). 'In the end, you can only slag people off for so long': employee cynicism through work blogging. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 28*(1), 66-77.

Richardsen, A. M., Burke, R. J., & Martinussen, M. (2006). Work and health outcomes among police officers: The mediating role of police cynicism and engagement. *International Journal of Stress Management, 13*(4), 555.

Richardson, V. (1990). Significant and worthwhile change in teaching practice. *Educational researcher, 19*(7), 10-18.

Rotter, J. B. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of personality, 35*(4), 651-665.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American psychologist, 55*(1), 68.

Ryan, A. M., & Patrick, H. (2001). The classroom social environment and changes in adolescents' motivation and engagement during middle school. American Educational Research Journal, 38(2), 437-460.

Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction *Human resource management, 43*(4), 395-407.

Sağır, T., & Oğuz, E. (2012). Developing of organizational cynicism scala for teachers. *Journal of Human Sciences, 9*(2), 1094-1106.

Saha, L. J., & Dworkin, A. G. (2009). Teachers and Teaching in an Era of Heightened School Accountability: A Forward Look. *In International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching* (pp. 1177-1185). Springer US.

Sarason, S. B. (1997). Revisiting *"The culture of the school and the problem of change"*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. Schein, E. H. (2002). Kurt Lewin's Change Theory.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Systems practice*, 9(1), 27-47.

Schuck, A. R., Boomgaarden, H. G., & de Vreese, C. H. (2013). Cynics all around? The impact of election news on political cynicism in comparative perspective. *Journal of Communication, 63*(2), 287-311.

Schunk, D. H., & Ertmer, P. A. (2000). Self-regulation and academic learning: Self-efficacy enhancing interventions.

Shanahan, T. (2006). Does he really think kids shouldn't read? *Reading Today*, 23(6), 12.

Shanahan, T., Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2016). The challenge of challenging text. On Developing Readers: Readings from Educational Leadership (EL Essentials), 100.

Shehata, A. (2014). Game frames, issue frames, and mobilization: Disentangling the effects of frame exposure and motivated news attention on political cynicism and engagement. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 26*(2), 157-177.

Simbula, S., & Guglielmi, D. (2010). Depersonalization or cynicism, efficacy or inefficacy: what are the dimensions of teacher burnout? *European journal of psychology of education, 25*(3), 301-314.

Smith, T. W., & Pope, M. K. (1990). Cynical hostility as a health risk: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 5*(1), 77.

Smith, T. W., Pope, M. K., Sanders, J. D., Allred, K. D., & O'Keeffe, J. L. (1988). Cynical hostility at home and work: Psychosocial vulnerability across domains. *Journal of Research in Personality, 22*(4), 525-548.

Spillane, J. P. (1999). External reform initiatives and teachers' efforts to reconstruct their practice: The mediating role of teachers' zones of enactment. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31*(2), 143-175.

Spillane, J., Reiser, B., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy Implementation and Cognition: Reframing and Refocusing Implementation Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 387-431.

Stanley, D. J., Meyer, J. P., & Topolnytsky, L. (2005). Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19*(4), 429-459.Tynjälä, P. (1999).

Tindle, H. A., Chang, Y. F., Kuller, L. H., Manson, J. E., Robinson, J. G., Rosal, M. C., & Matthews, K. A. (2009). Optimism, cynical hostility, and incident coronary heart disease and mortality in the Women's Health Initiative. *Circulation, 120*(8), 656-662.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2014). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. John Wiley & Sons.

Tynjälä, P. (1999). Towards expert knowledge? A comparison between a constructivist and a traditional learning environment in the university. *International journal of educational research, 31*(5), 357-442.

Tsai, C. C., & Chai, C. S. (2012). The" third"-order barrier for technology-integration instruction: Implications for teacher education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 28*(6).

Tucker, C. R., Wycoff, T., & Green, J. T. (2016). Blended learning in action: A practical guide toward sustainable change. Corwin Press.

Vance, R. J., Brooks, S. M., & Tesluk, P. E. (1996). Organizational cynicism, cynical cultures, and organizational change. *Unpublished manuscript, Center for Applied Behavioral Sciences, Pennsylvania State University.*

VanderArk, T., & Schneider, C. (2012). *How digital learning contributes to deeper learning. Getting Smart. December.*

Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and teacher education, 24*(1), 80-91.

Vogt, W. P. (2007). *Quantitative research methods for professionals*. Allyn & Bacon.

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Austin, J. T. (2000). Cynicism about organizational change measurement, antecedents, and correlates. *Group & Organization Management, 25*(2), 132-153.

Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). Balanced Leadership: What 30 Years of Research Tells Us about the Effect of Leadership on Student Achievement. A Working Paper.

Watt, J. D., & Piotrowski, C. (2008). Organizational change cynicism: A review of the literature and intervention strategies. *Organization Development Journal, 26*(3), 23.

Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human resource management review, 12*(2), 173-194.

Webb, N. L. (2002). Depth-of-knowledge levels for four content areas. *Language Arts.*

Webb, N. L. (2007). Issues related to judging the alignment of curriculum standards and assessments. *Applied Measurement in Education, 20*(1), 7-25.

Wilkerson, J. M., Evans, W. R., & Davis, W. D. (2008). A test of coworkers' influence on organizational cynicism, badmouthing, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(9), 2273-2292.

Wu, H. K., & Huang, Y. L. (2007). Ninth-grade student engagement in teacher-centered and student-centered technology-enhanced learning environments. *Science Education*, 91(5), 727-749.

Zucker, L. G. (1987). Institutional theories of organization. *Annual review of sociology, 13*(1),443-464.

Appendix A

Cynicism Survey Toward School Administration

The following are statements reflecting beliefs that you might have about the administrators (principals, assistant principals and/or deans) who served in the building where you taught last year. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement as it pertains to your general perceptions of your site leadership team. Please be as candid as possible.

Place the appropriate number to the left of each statement:

1=Strongly Disagree
2= Disagree
3=Somewhat Disagree
4=Somewhat Agree
5=Agree
6=Strongly Agree

---

1. Administrators at my school say one thing and do another.
2. Policies, goals, and practices in my school seem to have little in common.
3. When my school administration says it's going to do something, I wonder if it will really happen.
4 My school administration expects one thing of its employees, but reward another.
5 There seems to be little similarity between what my school administration says it will do and what it actually does.

6 When I think about the administrators at my school, I often feel irritated.
7. When I think about the administrators at my school, I often feel aggravated.
8. I often experience tension when I think about my school administrators.
9. I often experience anxiety when I think about my school administrators.
10. I complain about how things happen in my school to friends outside the organization.
11 I exchange "knowing" glances with my coworkers.
12. I often talk to others about the ways things are run in my school.
13. I criticize my school administrator's practices and policies with others.
14. I find myself mocking my school administration's slogans and initiatives.

Appendix B

Cynicism Survey Toward Reading Curriculum

The following are statements reflecting beliefs that you might have about the reading curriculum selected by your district. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement as it pertains to your general perceptions of the reading curriculum selected by your district. Please be as candid as possible.

Place the appropriate number to the left of each statement:

1=Strongly Disagree

2= Disagree

3=Somewhat Disagree

4=Somewhat Agree

5=Agree

6=Strongly Agree

---

1. The new reading curriculum claims to be new and approved, but reading programs are basically all the same.
2. The new reading curriculum is confusing and has too many components.
3. Every six years we select a new reading curriculum, but the new curriculum won't change my instructional practice.
4. The new reading curriculum is supposed to help students meet the new state standards, but I doubt that happens.
5. When I think about the new reading curriculum, I feel irritated.
6. When I think about the new reading curriculum, I feel aggravated.
7. I often experience anxiety when I think about the new reading curriculum.
8. I often experience tension when I think about the new reading curriculum.
9. I complain to my friends outside of school about the new reading curriculum.
10. I often talk to others about my issues with the new reading curriculum.
11. I criticize the new reading program to others.
12. I find myself mocking the new reading program's themes and ideas.
13. I exchange "knowing" glances with my co-workers about the new reading program.
14. Teachers will be expected to use the new reading program, but n***o*** one will monitor the usage of it.

Appendix C

Willingness to Change Survey

The following are statements reflecting attitudes that you might have about change. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement as it pertains to your general attitudes about change and your willingness to change. Please be as candid as possible.
Place the appropriate number to the left of each statement:

1=Strongly Disagree

2= Disagree

3=Somewhat Disagree

4=Somewhat Agree

5=Agree

6=Strongly Agree

---

1. I look forward to using the new reading curriculum (affective).
2. This reading program is what I have been looking for to help students learn (affective).
3. Changing reading curriculum will frustrate me (affective).
4. I see value in using the new reading program compared to the old one (cognitive).
5. I believe I have the ability to effectively use the new reading program (cognitive).
6. I believe I understand how to use the new reading program (cognitive).
7. I am willing to use the Reading Writing Workshop book as my core program (behavioral).
8. I am not willing to use the Close Reading Companion (behavioral).
9. I am willing to use the data dashboard (behavioral).

Appendix D

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Approval of Initial Submission – Exempt from IRB Review – AP01

Date: ***December 05, 2016*** ***IRB#:*** ***7180***

Principal Investigator: ***Vicki L Beard*** ***Approval Date: 12/05/2016***

Exempt Category: 2

Study Title: ***Examining the Relationship between Cynicism and Instructional Change***

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed the above-referenced research study and determined that it meets the criteria for exemption from IRB review. To view the documents approved for this submission, open this study from the My Studies option, go to Submission History, go to Completed Submissions tab and then click the Details icon.

As principal investigator of this research study, you are responsible to:

- ***Conduct the research study in a manner consistent with the requirements of the IRB and federal regulations 45 CFR 46.***
- ***Request approval from the IRB prior to implementing any/all modifications as changes could affect the exempt status determination.***
- ***Maintain accurate and complete study records for evaluation by the HRPP Quality Improvement Program and, if applicable, inspection by regulatory agencies and/or the study sponsor.***
- ***Notify the IRB at the completion of the project.***

If you have questions about this notification or using iRIS, contact the IRB @ 405-325-8110

or irb@ou.edu. Cordially,

Lara Mayeux

Lara Mayeux, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board