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Abstract

This study explored if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development and if it impacts teachers and students. Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework served as the foundation for which to evaluate professional development. Adult learning theory served as the theoretical framework. The researcher used a mixed methods explanatory sequential design. A survey was completed by 83 AP World History: Modern high school teachers who had attended the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading. The survey provided data on teacher perceptions of the Reading as well as the perceived impacts on student learning. The researcher then conducted a focus group discussion with eight participants to study teacher perceptions and the impact on student learning in greater depth. Quantitative and qualitative results were integrated in order to gain a deeper understanding.

The researcher found that attending the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading is beneficial teacher professional development. The structure of the in-person Reading allows for collaboration, engages participants and is relevant to the attendees’ classroom practice. As a result of attending the Reading, teachers perceive increases in their knowledge and understanding of exam requirements, and they perceive increased levels of confidence in their abilities to instruct students and assess student learning. Teachers perceive that attending the AP World History: Modern Reading improved their students’ scores and contributed to growth in student learning.

Keywords: Advanced Placement World History, College Board, Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework, Adult Learning Theory, professional development, AP Reading
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This study explored if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development and if it impacts teachers and students. Chapter one provides background information about the College Board and the Advanced Placement program, discusses growth in enrollment in the AP World History: Modern course, and explains the AP Reading. In this chapter, the researcher describes the critical issue that the research addressed and details the purpose of the study, its research significance, and she communicates the research questions that she sought to answer. Additionally, the researcher shares limitations related to the study, discusses the conceptual and theoretical frameworks that guided the study, and includes definitions of terms.

College Board and the Advanced Placement Program

To understand the critical issues that this research addressed, this section provides background information about the College Board and the Advanced Placement program. The College Board is a not-for-profit organization created in 1900 to support secondary students’ acceptance into institutions of higher learning. This organization administers the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) and the Advanced Placement (AP) exams. In addition to assessments, the College Board develops curricula in the form of Advanced Placement courses. AP instructors teach these courses in high school at a college level, culminating in a standardized AP examination in May.

The AP Program emerged in the 1950s in the context of the Cold War. At that time, education was an important component in competing with the Soviet Union, and in 1951, the Ford Foundation created an independent foundation called the Fund for the Advancement of Education (FAE). The FAE researched and recommended introducing high school students to
college-level curricula to help bridge the gap between secondary and higher education (Rothschild, 1999). As a result:

In 1952, a pilot program was launched introducing advanced courses in 11 initial subjects. By the 1955-56 school year, the program was underway and the College Board was invited to step in and take over administration of the program, named the College Board Advanced Placement Program. (College Board, 2003, para. 4)

As of 2021, College Board offered 38 AP courses spanning multiple disciplines (College Board, n.d.-a). AP World History: Modern is one of the nine AP courses available in social studies. In 2020, 2,642,630 students took 4,751,957 AP exams. Of those, 302,942 students took the AP World History: Modern exam, most of whom were sophomores (245,139) (College Board, 2020c).

Expansive growth in the AP program began in the 1990s. Researchers Judson and Hobson (2015) studied the growth of the AP Program in American high schools and found that “From 1992 to 2012, the number of schools offering AP courses nearly doubled and the number of AP exams administered swelled more than 500 percent” (p. 59). As shown in Figure 1.1, the AP World History: Modern course has seen massive growth, from 20,955 exams administered in its inaugural year in 2002, to 313,317 exams administered in 2019 (College Board, 2020c). The only decline indicated was for the 2020 school year, directly correlated to the impact of school closures due to COVID-19.
Multiple reasons accounted for this growth. First, these courses allowed high school students the potential to earn university credit, as many colleges and universities awarded college credit with a score of 3 or higher on the exam. College credits earned while in high school amounted to significant monetary savings for students and their families, as the cost for the AP examination was $94 for the 2020 exam as opposed to what three credits at a university cost. The college credits earned may allow students entering institutions of higher learning to place out of some first-year requirements, graduate early, or take on a second major or minor (Princeton Review, 2022; Tetreault & Nimeshein, 2022).

Another reason that explained growth in AP enrollment was enhancing future students’ success in college. The rigorous coursework, along with the need for time management, and the
skills learned in these classes helped improve the high school/college transition. (College Board, 2008; McCauley, 2007; Scott et al., 2010). Thirdly, school districts concerned about increasing their overall reported rankings instituted policies that increased the number of students taking the exams. In 2021, *U.S. News and World Report* used a system for ranking high schools that factored in AP participation rates and applied a 25% weight to the number of students completing an AP exam, and a 75% weight to the number of students earning a score of 3 on at least one AP exam before or during their senior year (Morse & Brooks, 2021).

The growth also coincided with an “equity and access for all” initiative by the College Board which encouraged districts to “eliminate barriers that restrict access to AP for students from ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic groups that have been traditionally underserved” (College Board, 2002a, para. 6). Prior to this policy, evidence showed that access to AP courses disproportionately targeted affluent white students (Chatterji, 2021). Many school districts changed school policies to remove barriers to opportunities and to improve college readiness for all. For example, Roegman and Hatch (2016) reported “several districts adopted a key policy change around how students were recommended for AP courses. All districts found that entrance criteria, particularly teacher recommendations, excluded students who could succeed.” (p. 22). For example, the New Jersey City Public Schools, a large district, opened up sections of AP courses and increased the number of students who enrolled. They also changed antiquated entrance policy criteria that required teacher recommendations (Roegman & Hatch, 2016). As a result of more students enrolling in Advanced Placement courses and taking the examinations, the College Board needed more Readers to score students’ responses.

**AP Reading**
This section discusses the requirements to attend the Advanced Placement Reading and the proposed benefits of serving as a Reader from the point of view of the College Board. To grade the 2020 AP World History: Modern exams, College Board hired 1,769 Readers, an 80 percent increase from ten years prior, as in 2011, there were only 982 Readers (College Board, 2020a). In 2021, the College Board accepted Reader applications from high school teachers with at least two years’ experience teaching the course and from college faculty who taught a similar course in the past three years (College Board, 2021).

To entice applicants, the College Board highlighted the benefits of being a Reader on their website. They emphasized that a Reader could learn more about the exam and how to assess students, as well as gain the ability to collaborate and network with others in the field, earn professional development credit, and also receive compensation (College Board, 2021).

The College Board holds the AP Reading each June, with the disciplines allocated to one of four different reading locations. There are also options for Distributed Readers, who score components of the exams from their homes. The on-site Reading takes place over a seven-day period and Readers work for eight hours each day.

**Statement of the Problem**

According to the College Board, the AP Reading is purported to afford participants the opportunity to learn more about the exam and how to assess students. This researcher feels that instructors need training for the Advanced Placement World History: Modern course. To clarify, on the AP World History: Modern teacher Facebook page, the researcher sees questions where teachers seek clarification about specific elements of the course, ask for ideas and resources to aid them in the classroom, express their lack of confidence regarding how to apply the rubrics, and voice confusion about how the actual exam is structured. For example, a post on November
10, 2021 read, “Do we know if the SAQs [short answer questions] will be completely stimulus-based or not? Thanks for any guidance.” This led the researcher to feel that many educators assigned to teach this course have a background in social studies education, but did not receive specific training on the particular competencies involved in this college-level course. The course focuses on a study of the world from 1200 CE to the present. From experience, this researcher knows that high school students enrolled in this class learn content and specific skills, such as understanding historical context, analyzing primary and secondary sources, making connections, and developing and supporting arguments. Students must demonstrate their knowledge of both content and skills on an international examination administered each May.

Teachers of AP courses do not need a master’s in the content area of the AP course, unlike the requirements for dual credit courses (Sadler et al., 2010). In 2002, College Board implemented an AP teacher survey to gauge information regarding AP teacher training and experience. From data collected from 32,109 AP teachers, Milewski and Gillie (2002) found that many AP teachers participated in some form of professional development before teaching the course. The most common were one-day workshops and Advanced Placement Summer Institutes (APSIs) sponsored by the College Board. However, the percentage of teachers who attended those trainings was still low compared to other forms of indicated PD, such as reviewing released exams and AP course materials. In addition, only a small percentage participated in the AP Reading. Those who attended the Reading rated it an average of 3.6 out of 4 on Milewski and Gillie’s effectiveness scale. Of eight forms of PD activities related to the AP program, attending the Reading ranked second to APSIs in effectiveness. The researchers concluded that teachers underutilized many forms of PD and recommended more PD centered on test preparation.
These findings were consistent with Paek et al.’s (2005) study of 3,484 AP Coordinators who indicated the least common PD activities were APSIs and participating in the AP Reading. Through scoring student responses at the Reading, this researcher noted that many AP World History: Modern teachers seemed to use outdated instruction. For example, in their free-response question answers, students often spent time discussing the ‘missing voice’ not included in the documents that would better help them answer the question or attempted to write a piece of synthesis to make a connection to another discipline or time period. Both are elements that are no longer part of the course and demonstrated possible outdated and misguided instruction on the part of their AP World History: Modern teachers. Due to these observations, the researcher identified the problem and designed this study to investigate a potential means to address the issue.
Purpose of the Study

The researcher designed this study to evaluate if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development and if it impacts teachers and students. The study used a mixed-methods approach to uncover teacher perceptions about the structure of the AP World History: Modern Reading and to assess if participation in the Reading changed their teaching practices, knowledge, and beliefs. Furthermore, the study also investigated if teachers perceived any impact on student performance as a result of having attended the Reading.

Andragogy, or Adult Learning Theory (Knowles, 1973), was the theoretical framework that underpinned the study, while Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework (Desimone, 2009) was the conceptual framework that guided the study.

Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks

This researcher adopted Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework (2009) as a conceptual organizing principle to help determine if participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading changes teacher beliefs and practices and impacts student performance. Desimone claimed that there were core critical features of effective teacher professional development: a focus on content, active learning, coherence, duration, and collective participation. Furthermore, her framework integrated a theory of instruction and change, as she depicted how effective PD affected teacher practice and student learning. She also recognized that contextual factors, such as the character of students and teachers and the school environment, impacted studies. Her framework acknowledged the interrelatedness of these elements and the importance of contextualization in understanding teacher development. However, Desimone admitted that “it is clear there are several potentially important components not included in the base model…” (Desimone, 2009, p. 186).
Therefore, this study also incorporated best practices as noted in a review of the literature that posited the additional importance of the role of administration, the impact of trainers, and teacher input and attitudes toward PD.

Additionally, the researcher used the theory of andragogy, or adult learning theory, as a theoretical lens to better understand the impact of teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading. Knowles (1973) explained Adult Learning Theory as the art and science of helping adults learn. His theory focused on basic principles and six assumptions about adult learners. The theory of andragogy was that adult learning opportunities were more successful when they emphasized the following: communicating about why the learning was important, building on previous adult learner experience, allowing for the adults to feel responsible for their own learning, providing the opportunity to solve an immediate real-life problem, teaching specific knowledge and skills, and when the desire to participate was intrinsically motivated.
Research Questions

Based on the frameworks, the researcher designed the research questions to evaluate if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development, if teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading translates to changes in teacher
knowledge, practices, and beliefs, and if teachers perceive that attendance at the Reading impacts student learning. Darling-Hammond (2017) defined effective teacher professional development as structured professional learning that results in changes in teacher practices and improvements in student learning outcomes” (para. 3). Therefore, the research questions that guided this study are:

**RQ1.** In what ways, if at all, does participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading result in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development?

**RQ2.** In what ways, if at all, does teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impact teachers' perceived practices and beliefs?

**RQ3.** In what ways, if at all, do teachers perceive that participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts student performance?

**Research Significance**

These research questions support the significance of this study, as the study can fill a gap in the literature and benefit many stakeholders. The gap in the literature is that there are few studies evaluating the impact of attending the AP World History: Modern Reading and little in the field about the impact of teacher attendance at College Board Readings. The researcher only found a non-peer-reviewed case study (Black & Leonard, n.d.) which utilized focus group interviews of eleven AP World History Readers and found that as a result of participating in the AP World History Reading, the participants improved their content knowledge and teaching strategies. Similarly, a study about the impact of attending the AP Statistics Reading that used quantitative methods found that teachers gained knowledge of teaching strategies and content,
found value in collaborating with peers, and better understood student misconceptions as a result of attending the Reading (Jacobbe, et al., 2013).

Although only one study was found that addressed the AP World History: Modern Reading directly, there was much literature about what makes teacher professional development effective, such as studies that discussed the essential characteristics needed, as well as the obstacles that teachers faced in obtaining professional development (Belzer, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2017; Day et al., 2008; Desimone, 2009; Eroglu, 2020; Fischer et al., 2019, 2020; Firestone et al., 2020; Guskey, 2003, 2008, 2016; Hauge, 2019; Kennedy, 2016; Klein & Riordan, 2008; Klopfenstein, 2003; Kyndt et al., 2016; O’Brien et al., 2008; Sims & Wood, 2020; Small et al., 2020; Thomas-Brown et al., 2016; Tyagi & Misra, 2021; Varga-Atkins et al., 2009; Wayne et al., 2008; Yoon, 2007). Some studies also indicated the impact of teacher professional development on teacher and student learning (Akram, 2019; Belzer, 2004; Day et al., 2008; Desimone et al., 2002; Fischer et al., 2020; Firestone et al., 2020; Goss, 2004; Hauge, 2019; Holme et al., 2019; Institute of Educational Sciences, 2021; Kennedy, 2016; Klein & Riordan, 2008; Monte-Sano, 2008; O’Brien et al., 2008; Park & Wimmer, 2014; Scott & Sutton, 2008; Small et al., 2020; Spillane et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2013; Wayne et al., 2008). Some literature explicitly focused on the growth of the AP program, professional development for Advanced Placement teachers, and the experiences of AP students (Black & Leonard, n.d.; Chatterji, 2021; Fischer et al., 2020; Godfrey, 2009; Goss, 2004; Jacobbe et al., 2013; Judson & Hobson, 2015; Klopfenstein, 2003, 2004; Milewski & Gillie, 2002; Monte-Sano, 2008; Paek, 2005; Park & Wimmer, 2014; Roegman & Hatch, 2016; Rothschild, 1999; Sadler et al., 2010; Small et al., 2020; Suldo et al., 2018).
On September 10, 2021, this researcher contacted Jodi Eastberg, the Chief Reader for the AP World History: Modern exam, to inquire if she knew of studies related to the impact of the AP World History: Modern Reading. She replied that she did not and would investigate with fellow College Board personnel. On October 22, 2021, the researcher received an email from Cathy Brigham, College Board’s Senior Director of Academic Relations, Higher Education. She wrote that there was nothing aside from anecdotal examples of how the Reading impacted instruction.

Due to this gap in research, this study contributed much to the field and has the potential to benefit many stakeholders. First and foremost, if the researcher finds that the Reading is effective professional development, future AP World History: Modern students may benefit if more teachers attend. AP World History: Modern teachers may also gain increased knowledge, practice, and confidence in their craft (Desimone, 2009). High school institutions may also benefit, as it could increase their rankings if student scores increase as a result of teachers’ attendance. School districts may also increase support for their teachers to attend. Furthermore, the College Board might benefit from this study, as research that substantiates the value of their offering may generate more interested Reader applicants.

Limitations

As this study is so significant, it is especially important to be aware of its limitations. The researcher acknowledged that her involvement with the AP World History: Modern course was a limitation for this study. Over the past eight years, she has served as a Reader, a Table Leader (training and monitoring eight Readers), and, in 2021, worked as an Early Table Leader for the scoring of the exams, which involved helping to set the working rubric and annotating essay examples. In 2018, she also became a consultant for the College Board, leading workshops and
teaching Advanced Placement Summer Institutes (APSIs). Based on this researcher’s experiences, she brought assumptions to the topic, yet she strived to be completely objective.

The researcher conducted an in-depth study of the Reading experience and investigated if the Reading is effective teacher professional development, if it yields changes in the knowledge, practices and beliefs of teacher participants, and what perceived impact, if any, it has on student achievement. Kivunja and Kuyini (2017) discussed the “morality criterion,” (p. 28) meaning the importance of truthfulness on the part of the researcher in interpreting the data. The researcher upheld that criterion and objectively analyzed the data collected.

**Definition of Key Terms**

To make sure that the terminology did not lead to a limitation based on someone’s perception of a term, the researcher used the following definitions:

**Advanced Placement (AP) Program or Course:** A high school course taught at a college level and aligned with the curricula designed by the College Board. It culminates in a standardized assessment given each May in which students have the potential to earn college or university credit with the achievement of certain scores. The College Board currently offers 38 Advanced Placement courses in a variety of disciplines (College Board, n.d.-a).

**Advanced Placement Reading:** The Advanced Placement Reading (the Reading) refers to the evaluating and scoring of AP students' answers to free-response questions on the examination. High school teachers and college faculty gather in specific locations in June to receive training and score the exams. There are also some distributed reading (scoring off-site) options for certain examinations.

**Advanced Placement World History: Modern (APWH):** A specific Advanced Placement course offered by the College Board in the History and Social Studies discipline. The course
focuses on a study of the world from 1200 CE to the present. High school students enrolled in this class learn content and specific skills, such as understanding historical context, analyzing primary and secondary sources, making connections, and developing and supporting arguments.

**Advanced Placement Summer Institute (APSI):** Advanced Placement Summer Institutes are 30-hour professional learning courses for new and experienced Advanced Placement teachers, offered at host institutions recognized by the College Board and taught by College Board-endorsed consultants.

**Belief:** A belief is a type of knowledge that is subjective and based on experience (Kaasila, et al., 2004). Teacher’s professional knowledge can be referred to as beliefs (Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2017). “Teacher beliefs are implicit and explicit suppositions held by educators which have relevance for their professional and instructional practices, interactions with students, and learning processes. They may include beliefs about students, self, learning, knowledge, and knowing” (Ferguson & Brownlee, 2021).

**College Board (CB):** A not-for-profit organization founded in 1900 to expand access to higher education. College Board is the parent company of the Advanced Placement Program.

**Chief Reader (CR):** The Chief Reader is responsible for overseeing the scoring of the Advanced Placement exam in their subject area. “The Chief Reader for each exam develops scoring rubrics for free-response questions, oversees day-to-day scoring activities, and selects Readers and Reading leadership” (College Board, n.d.-b). They are college or university faculty who are experts in their field.

**Distributed Reader:** A Reader who scores from home rather than on-site for the exam. All Readers scored from home for the 2020 and 2021 exams due to COVID-19.
**Document-Based Question (DBQ):** A document-based question is an essay question that requires students to use historical documents to respond to a prompt. The DBQ for the AP World History: Modern exam contains seven documents and requires students to craft a historically defensible thesis statement, describe the broader historical context that relates to the prompt, incorporate evidence beyond the documents, source at least three documents for purpose, historical situation, point of view, or audience, and demonstrate a complex understanding of the focus of the prompt (College Board, 2020b, p. 197).

**Early Table Leader (ETL):** An experienced Table Leader who joins the leadership team at the Reading earlier than the Table Leaders and Readers to participate in the sample selection process. ETLs identify student responses to be used as examples for the differing scores and provide annotations that will teach Readers why the essay scored the specific points. ETLs also earmark essays for calibration training purposes. Once the Reading period begins, the ETL then serves as a TL.

**Educational Testing Services (ETS):** Founded in 1947 and based in New Jersey, ETS is the world's largest private non-profit educational testing and assessment organization. ETS administers the College Board exams.

**Facebook (FB):** A social media application. There is an AP World History: Modern teachers’ private group on Facebook.

**Free-Response Question (FRQ):** The free-response portions of the exam require written responses from students, in contrast to the multiple-choice component. The free-response questions on the AP World History: Modern exam are the short answer questions, the document-based question, and the long essay question.
**Historical Thinking Skills (HTS):** The AP historical thinking skills are what students should do with the content learned. Students “develop and use the same skills and methods employed by historians” to analyze primary and secondary sources; develop historical arguments; make historical connections; and utilize reasoning about comparison, causation, and continuity and change (College Board, 2017, para. 3). These skills are noted in the FRQ rubrics.

**Long Essay Question (LEQ):** An essay question that requires students to use historical evidence to respond to a prompt. Per the rubric used during the Reading, the LEQ for the AP World History: Modern exam requires students to craft a historically defensible thesis statement, describe the broader historical context that relates to the prompt, use specific evidence to support the claim, and demonstrate a complex understanding of the focus of the prompt (College Board, 2020b, p. 198).

**Question Leader (QL):** The Question Leaders work with a specific free-response question. It is their task to make an initial presentation to the Table Leaders and Readers, oversee specific problems related to their question, and write reports about any issues that arise.

**Short Answer Question (SAQ):** A component of the AP World History: Modern examination that requires students to answer questions in written form. The examination contains three sets of SAQs, one based on a secondary source, one on a primary source, and one with no stimulus. Each set contains three tasks, or three questions, for the students to answer.

**Table Leader (TL):** An experienced AP Reader tasked with leading a group of AP Readers in the scoring process. The Table Leader facilitates Reader training to ensure all correctly internalize and apply the rubric and the TL examines scores applied to papers to monitor if Readers are on standard.

**Teacher Professional Development (TPD):** Continuing education for educators.
Chapter Summary

As designed by the College Board, the AP World History: Modern course is a challenging college-level course predominantly taught to sophomore high school students. The examination administered each May assesses students’ content knowledge and proficiency with specific skills, such as, understanding historical context, analyzing primary and secondary sources, making connections, and developing and supporting arguments. The examination consists of stimulus-based multiple-choice questions, short-answer questions, a document-based essay, and a long essay question.

The researcher feels that many Social Studies teachers seem to need specific training on the particular competencies involved in this college-level course. Some educators may lack confidence in their abilities to prepare students for success on this examination. Others believe that they are aligning their teaching to match the expectations of the assessment, but each year student examinations demonstrate outdated or misguided instruction.

Professional development opportunities are offered by the College Board to better prepare teachers. One such offering is to attend the AP Reading. The Reading is held each June in one of four locations and provides training on how to assess and score the free-response components of the AP examination.

This study investigated if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development and if it impacts teachers and students. Chapter two will provide a literature review of studies related to elements of teacher professional development, the impact of teacher professional development on teachers and students, and barriers to teacher professional development. In chapter three, the researcher will explain the methodological
approach and study design, consisting of quantitative data collected through a survey and qualitative data collected in the form of a focus group. Chapter four will analyze the results and findings of the two strands of data, and chapter five will contain a summary of the findings, implications, and limitations, along with suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This study analyzed if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development and if participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts teacher practices, knowledge and beliefs, as well as if there are any perceived impacts on student performance. The bodies of work that informed this literature review focused on Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework, which highlighted the importance of teacher professional development (TPD) that was content-related, allowed for collective participation, was of a sustained duration, allowed for active learning, and demonstrated coherence. The researcher also reviewed other existing literature that explored additional characteristics associated with effective professional development, such as, the role of administration, teacher attitudes and input, and the impact of trainers. The researcher also reviewed literature that explored the impact of professional development on teachers and students, and some common barriers to teacher professional development related to adult learning theory.
The researcher used Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework and Knowles’ theory of andragogy as the conceptual and theoretical frameworks for this study. This researcher believes in a constructivist epistemology and that each teacher will have different circumstances that will impact their perceptions of the AP World History: Modern Reading experience. Much of the research that informed this literature review focused on the characteristics that researchers deem make professional development effective and the authors had differing philosophical stances. For example, Desimone (2002, 2009) wrote about her core characteristics of effective PD. Many other researchers (Darling-Hammond, 2017; Fischer et al., 2019a, 2019b; Small et al., 2020;
Thomas-Brown et al., 2016) used her studies and deductions, and claimed that knowledge can be standardized and controlled. While this seemed like a positivist view, Desimone (2002) acknowledged that contextual factors influenced the effects of professional development, but believed that her framework offered “a common base to allow our building on knowledge from both [positivist and constructivist] perspectives” (p. 187). While there was much to be gleaned from her findings, others (Day et al., 2008; Firestone et al., 2020; Guskey, 2008; Kennedy, 2016; Martin et al., 2019; Sims & Fletcher-Wood, 2020; Suldo et al., 2018; Wayne et al., 2008) questioned the definitive nature of her results. Guskey (2008) believed that “…truly effective professional development may stem not from a single list of “best practices,” but instead from a collection of core elements that must be adapted to the unique contextual characteristics of a particular school” (p. 231). He used a constructivist research paradigm and believed that contextual elements impacted the effectiveness of PD. This researcher chose to align her study with Desimone’s conceptual framework as she agreed that having a common foundation, while also acknowledging contextual factors, was beneficial to understanding the impact of professional development.

The researcher used the theory of andragogy, or adult learning theory, as a theoretical lens to better understand the impact of teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading. Knowles (1973) explained that Adult Learning Theory is the art and science of helping adults learn. He focused on basic principles and six assumptions about adult learners. Knowles’ explanation of andragogy was that adult learning opportunities were more successful when they emphasized the following: communication about why the learning was important, previous adult learner experience, being responsible for one’s learning, the opportunity to solve an immediate real-life problem, specific knowledge and skills, and intrinsically motivated participation.
Types of Studies Reviewed

The following studies were in accordance with the theoretical and conceptual frameworks that guided this research. The types of studies reviewed aligned with the focus on the nature of acquired knowledge, and were consistent with the researcher’s belief in a constructivist epistemology. The literature reviewed consisted of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods studies. The researcher read informative quantitative studies (Akram, 2019; Desimone et al., 2002; Fischer et al., 2019b; Garet et al., 2001; Institute of Educational Sciences, 2021; Jacobbe et al., 2013; Kara et al., 2019; Klopfenstein, 2004; Small et al. 2020; Sun et al., 2013; Tyagi & Misra, 2021; Yoon, 2007) that evaluated teacher professional development.

Many studies that utilized qualitative methods also provided information for this review (Baharudin et al., 2013; Belzer, 2004; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Eroglu & Kaya, 2020;
Firestone et al., 2020; Kennedy, 2016; Klein & Riordan, 2008; Park & Wimmer, 2014; Sims & Fletcher-Wood, 2020; Suldo et al., 2018).

Additionally, the researcher included mixed-methods studies in this literature review (Day et al., 2008, Fischer et al. 2019a; Kyndt et al., 2016; Monte-Sano, 2008; O’Brien et al., 2008; Rutherford, 2010; Scott & Sutton, 2008; Spillane et al., 2018; Thomas-Brown et al., 2016; Varga-Atkins et al., 2009; Wehbe, 2018) as some researchers believed they yielded new insights as the methodology allowed for a greater range of data, increased interconnection between the data, and generated more authentic and nuanced findings. For example, Scott and Sutton (2008) studied 50 elementary school teachers and analyzed their emotions during PD about the writing process. Quantitative results showed no relationship between emotions and change in practice, whereas qualitative interviews found mixed emotions. The voices of the participants yielded new insight and the researchers stated that “the findings were much broader and deeper than a typical study using interview data alone” (p. 153). Despite their choice of methodology, multiple researchers investigated the various elements of effective teacher professional development.

**Characteristics of Effective Teacher Professional Development**

Many researchers (Desimone, 2002, 2009; Fischer et al., 2019a; Klein & Riordan, 2008; Small et al., 2020; Thomas-Brown et al., 2016) concluded that there were essential features of professional development that rendered it effective. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) defined effective teacher professional development as structured professional learning that resulted in changes in teacher practices and improvements in student learning outcomes” (para. 3). Desimone (2002) cited that the common elements were a focus on content, some form of collaboration or collective participation, sustained duration, opportunities for teacher engagement, and relevance and coherence for the teacher participants.
Darling-Hammond (2017), Firestone (2020), Hauge (2019), Kennedy (2016), O’Brien et al. (2008), Sims and Fletcher-Wood (2020), and Varga-Atkins et al. (2009) added to the list of characteristics of effective teacher professional development the importance of coaching or expert support, opportunities for teacher reflection and feedback, a focus on teacher input, teacher motivation, and the role of school district administration. These characteristics of effective professional development were further discussed in the following sections.

**Content-Related Professional Development**

Professional development that emphasized content-related curriculum positively impacted student learning (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone, 2002; Klopfenstein, 2003, Thomas-Brown, 2006; Varga-Atkins et al., 2009). Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) reviewed 35
studies that featured a positive connection between teacher professional development and improved student outcomes. The researchers found that professional development that emphasized discipline-specific curriculum improved student learning because the focus on content correlated with the relevance of the PD for teacher participants. Thomas-Brown et al. (2006) conducted a mixed-methods study and examined the impact of a specific teacher professional development program, the Wayne Schools Global Geography Project, which focused on improving teacher effectiveness through PD and classroom observations of social studies teachers. After the researchers collected and analyzed data from surveys, observations, pre- and post-tests, and focus groups, the researchers found that a focus on content-specific PD increased the likelihood that teachers implemented what they learned, as an increase in content knowledge translated to an increase in teacher competency and confidence. Additionally, in a longitudinal study by Desimone (2002) which utilized quantitative methods to evaluate the effect of teacher professional development on changing teachers’ practices in math and science, Desimone correlated content-focused PD with teacher implementation of learned knowledge in the classroom. She found that content-focused PD increased teacher implementation.

While dual-credit courses required instructors to have a major in the subject they teach, AP courses never did. That was one of the reasons why the College Board provided subject-specific training programs. The Institute of Educational Services (2021) evaluated student AP scores in the District of Columbia public school system and investigated the impact of AP instructors who did not have a major in the subject. The study showed a link between higher student AP scores and teachers who had a major aligned to the subject taught. This study indicated that teachers with more content knowledge generated higher student performance. Additionally, Klopfenstein (2003) researched professional development in connection with the
AP Program and recommended ways to maintain quality AP programming. She noted that “it is critical that AP teachers have a deep conceptual understanding of their subject” (p. 41). Small et al. (2020) designed a study using quantitative methods and evaluated the impact of Advanced Placement Summer Institutes (APSIs), one form of PD offered by the College Board. She investigated if APSIs were beneficial for teacher learning and showed that attendees perceived those which emphasized content as very helpful. Similarly, Jacobbe et al. (2013) studied another form of PD offered by the College Board, participating in the scoring of exams. The researchers surveyed 183 high school readers and 193 college instructors at the 2008 AP Statistics Reading. They investigated the motivation for and the benefits of attending the AP Statistics Reading and reported that improved teacher content knowledge was a motivating factor for high school teachers to attend the professional development offering.

**Collective Participation**

In addition to a focus on content, many researchers espoused the importance of collaboration in teacher professional development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone, 2002; O’Brien et al., 2008; Varga-Atkins, 2009). Desimone (2002, 2009) placed collective participation as one of her core features of effective professional development and claimed that teachers benefitted from working in groups and developing skills together. Through a mixed-methods study that used interviews, observations, action research projects, and a questionnaire, O’Brien et al. (2008) explored the perceptions of educators involved in a learning networks project introduced in the Liverpool, England schools. They found that learning networks, or collaborative practices, generated new ideas that improved teacher and student learning. A similar study that evaluated the impact of professional development within schools and the collaborations between schools involved in the Liverpool Learning Networks research project
found that there were benefits to having colleagues in the same school participate in the same learning experiences (Varga-Atkins et al., 2009).

Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) qualitatively coded 35 studies for program features and characteristics that demonstrated a positive link between teacher professional development, teaching practices, and student outcomes. They concluded that PD that was collaborative aided in positive results as “teachers create a collective force for improved instruction and serve as support groups for each other’s work on their practice” (p. 10). Furthermore, they stated that “when PD utilizes effective collaborative structures for teachers to problem-solve and learn together, it can positively contribute to student achievement” (p. 10).

While Desimone (2002, 2009), Darling-Hammond et al. (2017), O’Brien et al. (2008), and Varga-Atkins et al. (2009) argued that collective participation was a desirable feature of PD, Guskey (2008), Kennedy (2016), and Sims and Wood (2020) claimed that there was not enough evidence to support that collaboration was a necessary component. For example, Kennedy (2016) reviewed 28 studies of TPD that included evidence of student achievement, used mandatory assignments to groups, and followed teachers over time for at least one year. As a result, they reported that just having a professional learning community was not enough to warrant the PD effective, but that the content and context of those groups mattered more. Likewise, Guskey (2008) argued that contextual characteristics influenced professional development elements and claimed that collaboration blocked change if it was not structured and purposeful. He discussed that participants who held different professional beliefs inhibited collaborative efforts. Finally, Sims and Fletcher-Wood (2020) performed a methodological review of literature about effective PD and stated that the consensus of some that collaboration was necessary “currently lack[ed]
evidential warrant” and that “collaboration may be causally redundant, rather than an active ingredient” (pp. 14-15).

Newer studies like Fischer et al.’s (2019a) and Holme et al.’s (2019) looked at more informal and grassroots teacher professional development and found that collaboration was meaningful when it was teacher-initiated and purposeful. For example, the structure of EdCamps, BrewEds, and TeachMeets, where teacher collaboration occurred from the ‘bottom up’ without a sponsor, provided opportunities for greater and more meaningful collaboration (Holme et al., 2019). Similarly, Fischer et al. (2019a) conducted a mixed-methods study that analyzed AP Biology teachers’ engagement on Twitter, and Rutherford (2010) performed a qualitative and quantitative examination of discussion topics on an Ontario teachers’ Facebook page to evaluate Facebook teacher groups as an online learning community. Both reported that with the absence of hierarchical leadership and the ability for teachers to select their individual learning contexts, these platforms emerged as ways to fulfill the collective participation element of high-quality PD. Spillane et al. (2018) conducted a longitudinal mixed-methods study that examined the relationship between teacher performance and teachers’ collaboration with their peers which demonstrated that higher-performing teachers were more likely to seek out others for advice and collaboration. These studies supported the notion that collaboration was beneficial, and that teacher-initiated and informal collaboration were successful.

Interaction and discussion with others were informal learning activities that aided teacher learning. Kyndt et al. (2016) analyzed 74 studies about teachers’ informal learning and found that a common space that facilitated interactions generated collaboration. In assessing the motivation for teachers to attend the AP Statistics Reading, both new and experienced high
school teacher participants indicated that meeting fellow teachers was a reason for attendance (Jacobbe et al., 2013).

**Sustained Duration**

Another characteristic thought to be an indicator of effective professional development was sustained duration. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) said that “professional development that is sustained, offering multiple opportunities for teachers to engage in learning around a single set of concepts or practices, has a greater chance of transforming teaching practices” (p. 15). Sun et al. (2013) studied writing professional development in 39 schools and found that professional development encouraged the dissemination of effective teaching strategies among teachers through collaboration and reported that teachers who participated in PD of longer duration were more likely to help others. However, researchers disagreed on the threshold for what duration translated to meaningful learning. Yoon (2007) studied how teacher professional development affected student achievement and deduced that 14 hours or more resulted in a positive outcome for student performance. Desimone (2009) demonstrated that the minimum should be 20 hours. While there was not unanimity about the specific duration, many agreed that professional learning that translated to changes in practice did not result from one-off workshops (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone, 2009; Yoon, 2007). The AP World History: Modern Reading always took place over a seven-day period where Readers worked eight hours daily. There were also optional professional development sessions in the evening.

Yet others (Firestone, 2020; Guskey, 2003, 2008; Kennedy, 2016) questioned the inclusion of this characteristic as a definitive measure of effective PD. They said that the length of the session was not what mattered, but that the PD’s nature, and whether or not it was purposeful and relevant, made the difference. Fischer et al. (2019) and Rutherford (2010)
supported that claim and reported that online social media platforms provided a means of teacher professional development. Their studies showed that duration must be re-envisioned, as sites, such as Twitter and Facebook, provided for temporal engagement, and most interactions were brief. Yet, the teachers remained part of the online community for extended times and, therefore, when totaled, the duration met the minimums cited.

**Active Learning / Teacher Engagement**

While duration was important, researchers found that active learning during the time spent in professional development also led to increased benefits for participants. Active learning in professional development referred to opportunities for participant engagement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Desimone, 2002). Teacher engagement was one of the principles of Knowles’ adult learning theory, which was that teachers were more successful when they were active participants in their learning. Studies of professional development programs found that lecture-based PD was less likely to translate into improved teacher knowledge (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Garet et al., 2001). A study of writing professional development in 39 schools found that “teachers who participated in professional development programs with more active learning strategies had a higher likelihood of improving their writing instruction” (Sun et al., 2013, p. 358). In Jacobbe et al.’s (2013) study about motivation for and the benefits of attending the AP Statistics Reading, the researchers cited Rogoff’s (1997) concept of peripheral participation and discussed the theory of “transformation through participation” (p. 33). Rogoff's socio-cultural theory posited that cognition increased through human participation.

**Coherence**

Another factor found to be a component of effective teacher professional development was that of coherence, or relevance. Coherence referred to the extent to which professional
development was consistent with the teachers’ goals, knowledge and beliefs, the school curriculum, and school, district, and state reforms and policies (Desimone, 2002; 2011). Thomas-Brown et al.’s (2016) examination of the impact of the Wayne Schools Global Geography Project professional development program concluded that “teacher participants should be able to establish connections between the extended PD program and various components of their classroom practice…” (p. 68). Small et al. (2020) found that teachers who attended APSIs benefited from the alignment of AP objectives to the curriculum and the sharing of lesson plans specific to AP content standards. Similarly, Garet et al. (2001) conducted a study of professional development and teacher learning with 1,027 math and science teacher participants. That study suggested that teachers who experienced PD aligned with standards and connected to other reform efforts were more likely to change their practices compared to teachers whose PD was not coherent with their curriculum and goals.

**Impact of Trainers**

In addition to considering Desimone’s core professional development features when evaluating a program which were content-focus, collective participation, sustained duration, active learning, and coherence, other researchers identified the trainer’s or leader's impact on teacher learning. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) and Firestone et al. (2020) concluded that “expert input” provided a supportive role for teachers and was a determinant in whether the PD offering was effective. Eroglu and Kaya (2020) interviewed twelve high school teachers about professional barriers to professional development and concluded that professional development trainers who were not perceived as skilled professionals set a negative tone for teachers from the onset. Similarly, as a result of Kennedy’s (2016) review of 28 studies of TPD, she reported that individuals who led effective programs had experience working with teachers and truly
understood their participants' problems and experiences. She evaluated the difference between coaches who observed and evaluated and those who collaborated with the participants and found that the latter model resulted in more effective programs. Likewise, Varga-Atkins et al. (2009) found from their examination of continuing professional development of teachers in the Liverpool, England schools that the role the leader fulfilled in the structure of the PD impacted the experience. Participants communicated that they appreciated the organizational skills, along with the energy level and knowledge, of the facilitator. The researchers discussed that a facilitator's enthusiasm and knowledge, or lack thereof, correlated with the level of participant motivation. Additionally, Small et al. (2020) studied how APSI participation met the professional development needs of teachers. Through a survey completed by 124 participants, teachers indicated that they felt they learned because of collaboration with their instructor.

Some researchers believed that more studies were needed to determine the impact of trainers on teacher professional development offerings, especially when considering contextual characteristics. For example, Wayne et al. (2008) questioned whether the same trainers from an outside organization yielded consistent results when delivering PD in differing contexts. He believed that there was not enough research to make a determination. This belief corroborated with the findings of Guskey (2008), as Guskey acknowledged that guidance from experts shed new light, but that guidance was contingent upon how those leaders related to the contexts of their environments. Another important determinant was administrative support of professional development.

**Role of Administration**

The decisions that school leaders made had a direct impact on working conditions, quality of instruction, and student learning. Fischer et al. (2019b), Hauge (2019), Klopfenstein
(2003), Kyndt et al. (2016), Martin et al. (2019), and Varga-Atkins (2009) reported that it was difficult for teachers to engage in meaningful PD without the support of their administration. Hauge (2019) analyzed 23 studies focused on collaborative TPD to learn about the ways teachers’ learning occurred within schools. He shared that one must consider the school’s structural and cultural conditions and that there must be trust between teachers and administrators to foster positive growth. Varga-Atkins et al. (2009) claimed that when the teachers felt supported, they were more apt to take risks, to acknowledge weaknesses, and to work toward improvement. Additionally, Fischer et al. (2019b) examined the relationship between school, teaching, teacher, and TPD characteristics and student scores on AP exams in the sciences and found a positive association between teachers’ perceived administrator support and student performance.

Kyndt et al. (2016) discussed that support took many forms. One example of support was the allocation of time for professional development. Administrators who saw value in continuing professional development found ways to either support release time for teachers to attend PD or provided opportunities embedded in the school calendar. Martin et al. (2019) used Mezirow’s transformational learning theory which said that teachers needed time to reflect upon learned material. According to Mezirow’s theory, “adults examine their beliefs and practices” and then that “reflective rational discourse leads adults to take action” (p. 180). Without that self-reflection, Martin et al. argued, teachers were prone to disregard new knowledge if it did not fit their current frame of understanding. Klopfenstein (2003) discussed how funding was yet another way that administrators supported teacher professional development. Administrators who encouraged TPD found ways to provide the tuition. In summary, Martin et al. (2019) shared that while teachers were the direct receivers of professional development, policies and practices at the
school and district level “can either help teachers in the transformation of their classroom practices or set up roadblocks for teacher transformation that could negatively impact student learning” (p. 184).

**Teacher Input and Attitudes**

While many structural factors accounted for teacher professional development’s generation of positive impacts on teacher and student performance, the teacher's attitude toward attending the professional development was also relevant. Kyndt et al. (2016) claimed that the attitude of the teacher was tantamount to whether or not the implementation of lessons learned from teacher professional development occurred. Furthermore, Klein and Riordan (2009) conducted a qualitative study in which they analyzed artifacts, conducted observations, and held interviews with eight teacher participants to address the connection between teacher professional development and student learning in the classroom. The authors determined that the teachers’ level of excitement about the PD was a determining factor in how much implementation took place. Finally, Hauge (2019) also used qualitative methodology to review 23 articles to identify ways to improve teacher professional development. He, too, espoused that teacher buy-in made a difference and that when teachers perceived themselves as professionals in control of their own learning, they contributed more to change and improvement.

Teacher input and whether the teachers chose to attend a professional development offering also played a role in determining success. Kennedy (2016) stated that when administration mandated that teachers attend PD, it generally did not garner positive results because “attendance is mandatory, but learning is not” (p. 973). Martin et al. (2019) also took issue with mandatory professional development and argued that cohesion between PD and the needs of the teachers and students was what was important. In another study examining the
impact of a specific teacher professional development activity called The Wayne Schools Global Geography Project, the researchers reported that beneficial PD needed to be responsive to the needs of teachers and the teachers must want to participate (Thomas-Brown et al., 2016). Wehbe (2018) investigated teachers’ perceptions of PD needs versus the perceptions of educational consultants and stated that teacher input was important, as PD was most effective when designed to take teachers’ needs into account. Varga-Atkins (2009) supported that claim and said that teacher buy-in amplified when teachers had a voice, as participants felt a shared purpose. When the contrary happened, as discussed in a study about the introduction of learning networks in Liverpool (O’Brien et al., 2008), the findings indicated that teachers had a negative perception of the PD. Participants saw the PD as imposed, due to a government political agenda. This finding supported the notion that teacher motivation, or intrinsic desire, resulted in better participant attitudes. A ‘top-down’ approach that was not teacher-initiated, like the one illustrated in the O’Brien et al. (2008) study, hindered the program’s success.

Tyagi and Misra (2021) conducted a qualitative study to study teacher self-initiative for continuing professional development and found that many teachers joined online teaching communities to engage in academic learning. Self-directed learning experiences, such as EdCamps, also demonstrated that teacher-led initiatives were increasing. What was notable about the structure of EdCamps was that a teacher can opt-out or leave a session that they felt was not relevant to their learning. While the study did not attempt to measure the impact on teacher learning, it still reflected the rising prevalence of these teacher-led structures and the importance of evaluating the role of teacher choice and input in PD (Holme et al., 2019). As pointed out by Fischer et al. (2019a) when analyzing the use of Twitter for professional learning by AP Biology
teachers, “given the…high stakes nature of the AP examination, teachers have many incentives to engage in professional learning activities to improve their instruction…” (p. 5).

Impact of Professional Development on Teachers and Students

The teachers’ attitude toward the professional development experience, along with professional development that had a focus on content, contained some form of collaboration or collective participation, was of sustained duration, had opportunities for teacher engagement, had coherence for the teacher participants, had supportive and knowledgeable trainers, and was supported by school district administration, contributed to changes in teacher instruction and improved student learning. Improving teacher effectiveness and increasing learning for students was always the intent of professional development. Belzer (2004) used the findings from an adult literacy education professional development system evaluation in Pennsylvania and identified different types of PD impacts. Among them were impacts on practice, teaching, learning and professional knowledge, and professional attitude.

The authors of the Wayne Schools Global Geography Project noted impacts on professional attitude. The authors reported teachers’ confidence increased regarding teaching social studies content (Thomas-Brown et al., 2016). Similarly, Small et al. (2020) found that as a result of attending an APSI, teachers reported that they believed their ability to improve student achievement improved. The participants attributed their belief in their improved ability to increase student performance to the learned content, the pedagogical skills and strategies garnered, and collaboration with their peers and instructor. They also indicated their increased knowledge of how to score the AP exam’s free response question (FRQ) responses.

In addition, Goss’s (2004) study demonstrated impacts on learning. He saw increased student achievement when teachers implemented what they learned. Monte-Sano (2008)
conducted a case study of the practices of two social studies teachers and their students' performance on evidence-based history essays and found that the methods teachers used in their classrooms were influencers of student performance. Advanced Placement professional development opportunities taught new methods, as teachers self-reported that as a result of attending the AP Statistics Reading, they gained new knowledge about teaching strategies, improved their content knowledge, and better understood student misconceptions (Jacobbe et al., 2013). Additionally, as demonstrated in a study by Sun et al. (2013) that focused on writing PD, teachers who participated in PD of longer duration were more likely to help others with teaching writing, which indicated a spillover effect.

As Belzer (2004) noted, professional development led to impacts on professional knowledge and attitude. Park and Wimmer (2014) evaluated student experiences in Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate (IB) programs and examined the student-teacher relationship. They noted that students’ conception of their teacher impacted students’ academic performance. They found that students disengaged when they saw the AP or IB program teacher as not proficient to teach the course. Similarly, Akram (2019) researched student perceptions of their teachers and correlated those results with ninth-grade achievement scores in English and mathematics on a standardized exam. Akram reported a correlation between students’ perception of teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

Many studies cited that the number of years employed as a teacher impacted the rate of implementation of the PD that the teachers experienced. Fischer et al. (2019b) found that teacher learning was incremental and was relative to the number of years in the classroom or the number of years teaching a specific course. Researchers in Belgium (Kyndt et al., 2016) analyzed studies about teacher learning in an informal context and researched teacher learning and confidence
levels at various stages in their careers, looking at the differences between beginner and experienced teachers. They found that newer teachers focused on learning classroom management, whereas more senior teachers were ready to engage in learning new teaching methods. They also reported that more experienced teachers tended to have higher levels of confidence, but that did not always equate to enhanced teacher learning. Day et al. (2008) found that teachers farther along in their careers were not as committed to new learning, but that students of teachers who were in a phase of their life that was stable, referred to by the researchers as middle-career teachers in years 8-15, were more likely to demonstrate success. Yet Klein and Riordan (2008) emphasized that there were variations in the level of transfer from professional development experiences to classroom implementation and found that contrary to most literature, “teachers move back and forth between points…and it was difficult to tease apart why” (p 69). These findings highlighted the external factors that researchers needed to consider when evaluating PD and the importance of keeping in mind the holistic nature of an educator. Variation in levels of transfer will be relevant to this researcher’s project because the researcher’s sample will include participants with varying career lengths.

Studies based on the impact of effective teacher professional development on student learning did not solely focus on increased standardized test scores. Klopfenstein (2003) stated that it was important not to fixate on student test scores as a stand-alone measure of success. The College Board stated, “AP examinations are not designed as instruments for teacher or school evaluation or comparison…” (College Board, 2002b, p. 11). If a student did not perform well on the AP examination, that did not mean that said student didn’t learn valuable skills in the course and demonstrate growth (Klopfenstein, 2003). In a longitudinal mixed-methods case study with math teachers, Spillane et al. (2018) looked at the relationship between teacher performance and
teachers’ collaboration with their peers. The researchers found that teachers did not view test scores as indicative of teacher performance. Instead, they found that teachers identified high-performing colleagues based on their expertise, their passion for the subject, and leadership.

Many factors affected student learning. Suldo et al. (2018) investigated elements that impacted academic performance among AP and IB students. They sampled 2,379 students in AP and IB courses across 19 high schools and concluded that academic performance linked to a student’s educational history, their family socioeconomic status, and their motivation and cognitive engagement. Guskey (2008) concurred that many contextual factors impacted student performance, as context also impacted the effectiveness of PD. Scott and Sutton (2008) conducted a mixed-methods study and evaluated whether teachers’ emotions, that is, their attitude toward the PD, correlated with the implementation of what people learned in professional development. They found that teachers’ past knowledge and the context in which they taught were important considerations.

**Barriers to Teacher Professional Development**

While studies have shown that quality teacher professional development did positively impact teachers and students, some teachers faced obstacles in gaining access to meaningful PD. The theory of andragogy discussed that adult learners faced responsibilities that conflicted with learning demands (Knowles, 1973). Some of the barriers cited in the literature were a lack of time, financial considerations, intense workloads, lack of support from administration, emotional barriers, and a lack of motivation (Baharudin, 2013; Day et al., 2008, Eroglu & Kaya, 2020; Hauge, 2019; Kara et al., 2019; Tyagi & Misra, 2021).

Tyagi and Misra (2021) studied the self-initiative of teachers to complete professional development and the challenges they faced. Through the collection and analysis of quantitative
data, the researchers found that teachers experienced obstacles such as not getting paid leave to attend, a lack of available PD in geographic proximity, and financial burdens. Eroglu and Kaya (2020) conducted a study to specifically identify the barriers that teachers experienced in terms of professional development and noted a lack of teacher motivation, along with job fatigue, lack of external rewards (i.e. no additional pay), and the feeling that administrators actually discouraged teachers’ attendance as additional challenges that teachers articulated. Similarly, Hauge (2019), through an analysis of articles on teacher professional development, also indicated limited time, intense workloads, and lack of support from administration as barriers.

Age, gender, and other contextual factors impacted if teachers availed themselves of professional development opportunities. Day et al. (2008) designed a mixed-methods study to better understand the relationship between teachers’ professional and personal lives and found that the commitment level of teachers varied based on the stages of the teachers’ personal and professional lives. Kara et al. (2019) studied the obstacles faced by adult learners in online distance education and found that female learners experienced more challenges due to family responsibilities.

**Gap in the Literature**

After conducting a review of literature about characteristics of effective professional development, the impact of professional development on teachers and students, and some common barriers related to professional development, the researcher identified a gap that needed to be filled. Researchers organized studies to focus on the elements necessary to deem professional development effective (Belzer, 2004; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Day et al., 2008; Desimone, 2002, 2009; Eroglu & Kaya, 2020; Fischer et al., 2019, 2020; Firestone et al., 2020; Garet et al., 2001; Guskey, 2003, 2008, 2016; Hauge, 2019; Kennedy, 2016; Klein &
Riordan, 2008; Klopfenstein, 2003; Kyndt et al., 2016; O’Brien et al., 2008; Sims & Wood, 2020; Small et al., 2020; Thomas-Brown et al., 2016; Tyagi & Misra, 2021; Varga-Atkins et al., 2009; Wayne et al., 2008; Yoon, 2007). While researchers conducted professional development program evaluations utilizing those characteristics, this researcher was unable to find an examination of the structure and impact of the AP World History: Modern Reading. In fact, the researcher only uncovered one study regarding the motivation for and benefits of attending the AP Statistics Reading (Jacobbe et al., 2013). Despite the growth in the AP Program and the increase in student examinations each year, researchers have not studied the Reading as a professional development opportunity. While there were some studies that examined the impact of attending APSIs (Goss, 2004; Institute of Educational Sciences, 2021; Klopfenstein 2003; Monte-Sano, 2008; Small et al., 2020), even those were few in number. The researcher’s current position as an AP World History: Modern table leader provided her with a unique opportunity to contribute to the research about the AP World History: Modern Reading. Despite her involvement, she maintained her objectivity.

Furthermore, while there were studies that utilized mixed methods to evaluate the characteristics and impact of professional development (Day et al., 2008, Fischer et al. 2019a; Kyndt et al., 2016; Monte-Sano, 2008; O’Brien et al., 2008; Rutherford, 2010; Scott & Sutton, 2008; Spillane et al., 2018; Thomas-Brown et al., 2016; Varga-Atkins et al., 2009; Wehbe, 2018), more can be done. This researcher evaluated the impact of the AP World History Reading as effective professional development with more detail and yielded more complete evidence through both quantitative and qualitative factors. The use of surveys, hearing from the participants' voices, and the integration of the two strands of data allowed for evaluation of contextual factors and the application of a social constructivist lens.
Chapter Summary

This chapter provided a review of the literature about teacher professional development and its impact on teacher and student performance. The researcher noted differing conceptual and theoretical frameworks that guided many studies, such as the work of Desimone and the constructivist view of Guskey, and the ideas in Knowles’ adult learning theory. She included literature that evaluated key core elements associated with effective professional development, such as its relation to content, its collaborative nature, the duration of the PD, the role of active learning, its coherence, the impact of the trainers or facilitators, the role of administration, and the attitudes and input of teachers regarding the process. Next, the researcher discussed literature regarding the impact of professional development on teachers and students, and focused on the impacts on practice, knowledge and skills gained, and the impact on teacher beliefs and student perception. The researcher then reviewed the challenges teachers struggled with regarding obtaining professional development. Finally, this researcher identified and discussed a gap in the research, which exposed the need for a study to analyze the perceived impact of the AP World History: Modern Reading on teacher knowledge, skills, practice, and beliefs, along with its correlation to student learning outcomes.

Chapter three will explain the researcher's methodology that was used to answer the research questions. It described the selection of participants and addressed the procedures for data collection and analysis. Chapter three also included a comprehensive description of the survey instrument and focus group discussion protocol questions, and a description of the method of data analysis. Additionally, the researcher discussed validity, reliability, ethical considerations, and methodological limitations.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The researcher designed this study to evaluate if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development and to learn if it impacts teachers and students. The study used a mixed-methods approach to uncover teacher perceptions of the professional development characteristics of the AP World History: Modern Reading and to assess if participation in the Reading changes their teaching practices, knowledge, and beliefs. Furthermore, the study investigated the perceived impact on student performance as a result of having attended the Reading. The researcher designed a survey instrument to collect quantitative data and conducted a focus group to gather qualitative information.

This chapter explains the methodology that this researcher used to answer the research questions. It included a thorough description of the survey instrument called *Impact of Attending the AP World History: Modern On-Site Reading-Teacher Questionnaire* (Appendix A). This chapter also includes details about the design and validity and reliability of the questionnaire and the focus group interview protocol. The researcher included a detailed discussion of the collection and screening process and the transcription steps for the responses to the focus group questions. In addition, the researcher included the plans for data analysis for the quantitative phase of data collection, which included the variables the researcher used to determine if there were any correlations between teacher demographics and identified teacher perceptions, practices, beliefs, and student impact. Furthermore, the researcher also included the plan for the coding of the qualitative data, along with ethical considerations related to the study. Finally, the chapter ends with a discussion of methodological limitations.

**Research Questions**
First, the researcher designed the research questions to evaluate if teacher attendance and participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading translated to increased teacher effectiveness and student learning. These research questions led to the questions created for the survey and the questions scripted for the focus group session.

RQ1. In what ways, if at all, does participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading result in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development?

RQ2. In what ways, if at all, does teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impact teachers' perceived practices and beliefs?

RQ3. In what ways, if at all, do teachers perceive that participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts student performance?

Research Design

Based on the research questions, the researcher utilized a mixed methods approach as it, according to Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), “provides more evidence for studying a research problem than either quantitative or qualitative research alone” (p. 13). The researcher structured the study using an explanatory sequential design, which means that the data collection and analysis occurred in two distinct stages. Stage one of the data collection and analysis consisted of quantitative data collected through a questionnaire. The quantitative data analysis helped inform the researcher's decisions as to which participants to seek for the second phase of study, which consisted of a focus group discussion. She wanted to choose individuals with a range of perspectives about the impact of the AP World History: Modern Reading.
**Integration Phase**

The researcher triangulated the data as she integrated the two strands for analysis and comparison. The merging of the quantitative data and the qualitative data helped the researcher answer what results emerged from comparing the qualitative data about teacher and student performance as a result of participating in the AP World History: Modern Reading with the quantitative data measured on the survey instrument. The qualitative component shed insight into the reasons behind the different perceptions of the impact of the Reading experience.

To plan, connect, and demonstrate the integration of the data strands, first the researcher developed a joint display to represent the participant selection for phase 2. She created a display
that linked quantitative results to participants purposefully selected for the focus group discussion sample. Then, the researcher created a second joint display to link the quantitative findings from all of the participants with the qualitative results from the focus group participants for the purpose of further explanation and increased understanding of the research questions.

**Development of Survey Instrument**

This section detailed the creation and implementation of the instrument used in this study. In reviewing literature related to professional development, few previous research studies were similar to this study. One investigated the motivation and benefit of attending the AP Statistics Reading (Jacobbe et al., 2013), but the survey description did not align with the researcher’s purposes. However, Small’s (2020) study, *Professional Development for Teachers of Advanced Placement Courses*, which evaluated the impact of attending AP Summer Institutes, utilized the same conceptual framework and had much overlap with this researcher’s proposed study. This researcher contacted the author to inquire if she would share her survey instrument for review and possible adaptation. Small agreed and communicated the content and construct validity methods that she had used. Of her 36 questions, the researcher modified 13, did not use 23, and created 12 unique questions. The researcher thus created the revised survey instrument, *Impact of Attending the AP World History: Modern On-Site Reading-Teacher Questionnaire* (Appendix A). Because of the revisions, the researcher circulated the questionnaire among colleagues for feedback on clarity and construction of the instrument (Appendix B and C).

Two of the five Readers who provided feedback on the survey instrument had served in leadership roles at the Reading. One Reader who provided feedback was an Early Table Leader, and the second had served as a Table Leader. The other three Readers who provided feedback had attended the Reading varying lengths of time. One was a Reader who had attended five or
more times, another had participated in the Reading two to four times, and the sixth colleague attended the Reading one time. The researcher revised the survey as necessary based on their input.

Like Small, this researcher opted to use a Likert-type scale for this study as Likert scales meet the researcher's needs when there are attitudes, beliefs, or reaction items (Likert, 1932) due to its ability to allow the respondent to express how much they agree or disagree with a particular statement (McLeod, 2008). While Small’s survey included a neutral selection, this researcher opted to remove that midpoint selection after conversations with her committee and two statistics professors because potentially participants will select the neutral category as a default rather than expressing their opinion and, therefore, the inclusion of the neutral value may not be good for data dependability. When running descriptive statistics with the five-point Likert scale, ambiguity from neutral responses could inadvertently distort the distribution of responses which could cloud the interpretation of the mean. The researcher decided to use a four-point scale with (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) disagree, and (4) strongly disagree. She instructed the participants to read statements and select the option that most closely represents their response. The first parameter to consider was teacher demographics.

**Teacher Profile Section of the Survey**

In creating the survey instrument, the research questions, conceptual framework, theoretical framework, and literature review were at the forefront of the design. The first section of the instrument consisted of eleven questions that collected demographic and descriptive teacher information. A core adult learning principle was the importance of the prior experience of the learner. Therefore, the researcher collected information about years of teaching experience, the degree earned by the participant, and the number of times the participant attended
the Reading. The researcher also inquired as to whether the participant had served in a leadership role at the Reading. The researcher used this information to provide a sense of where and how outcomes varied across different types of teacher profiles.

**Perceptions of Professional Development Section of the Survey**

The second section corresponded to RQ1: *In what ways, if at all, does participating in the AP World History: Modern Reading result in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development?* Question 12 is the y, or the dependent variable, for RQ1. Questions 13-20 discussed professional development characteristics tied to Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework and the literature review. Question 13 asked about improvements in content knowledge, question 14 asked about engagement as a learner, question 15 asked about the alignment of activities at the Reading with the AP course content as outlined by the College Board, question 16 inquired about the length of time allocated to scoring student work at the Reading, and question 17 was about collaboration with other participants. Additional literature (Darling-Hammond, 2017; Firestone, 2020; Hauge, 2019; Kennedy, 2016; O’Brien et al., 2008; Sims and Fletcher-Wood, 2020; Varga-Atkins et al., 2009) espoused that the impact of the trainer, teacher input, and the role of administration were also important elements, therefore, question 18 inquired about the impact of learning from a table leader. Question 19 sought to uncover if the participants’ decision to attend the Reading was self-motivated, and question 20 asked about school district administrative support of the participant.

Many of these questions aligned with the principles of andragogy. Question 13 addressed the learner’s need to know by asking if the Reading demonstrated coherence with AP course content. Questions 14 and 15 addressed the Readers’ orientation to learning through inquiring about the level of engagement and participation, as those factors related to active learning and
coherence. Question 19 reflected the adult learning principles of learner self-concept and self-directing principles, along with motivation to learn, as it examined teacher input and attitudes.

**Perceived Changes in Teacher Practices, Knowledge and Beliefs Section of the Survey**

The third section of the survey corresponded to RQ2: *In what ways, if at all, does teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impact teachers' perceived practices and beliefs?* This aligned with Desimone’s organizing principles of how effective teacher professional development impacted changes in teacher practices, knowledge and beliefs. The questions also aligned with Knowles’ principle of andragogy in that they related to relevance and impact on teacher practices.

Question 21 was the y for RQ2 and asked the participant if they changed how they teach the course, question 22 asked if there was a change in the manner of assessing student learning, and questions 23 and 24 inquired about changes in teacher self-efficacy levels related to their ability to teach and assess students.

**Perceived Impact on Students Section of the Survey**

The fourth section corresponded with RQ3: *In what ways do teachers perceive that participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts student performance?* This section investigated the impact on student performance. Questions 25 and 26 of the teacher questionnaire represented RQ3 and connected to Desimone’s Framework. Question 25 asked if teachers expected their students to perform better due to attending the Reading, and question 26, the y for RQ3, asked participants if they saw improvements in their student scores since they began serving as a Reader. These questions connected to Knowles’ theory of the orientation and readiness to learn. Knowles proposed that adult learners were problem-centered and that their learning was connected to the relative use learning could offer.
An optional open-ended question was also included for further anecdotal information to allow for more participant voice and insight. At the conclusion of the survey, the researcher asked participants if they were willing to participate in a follow-up focus group discussion.

Table 3.1
*Teacher Questionnaire Correlated to Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1-11</td>
<td>Gender, years of experience teaching, years teaching the course, # of years participated in the Reading, which FRQs were assigned, any leadership roles held at the Reading, degree, school setting, description of AP students, how many APWH students are taught each year, average class size for a section of APWH.</td>
<td>Teacher descriptive information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12</td>
<td>Was the Reading thought to be beneficial professional development?</td>
<td>Y for RQ1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q 13-20 | Has participation in the Reading:  
|         | • increased content knowledge?  
|         | • been engaging?  
|         | • been relevant to my classroom teaching of the course?  
|         | • been of adequate duration?  
|         | • included collaboration that contributed to learning?  
|         | Was the ability to learn from a table leader beneficial?  
|         | Was the decision to attend self-motivated?  
|         | Did school district administration support attendance?  |
| Q 21   | Has participation in the Reading changed how the participant teaches the course?  |
| Q 22-24 | Has participation in the Reading:  
|         | • increased confidence in teaching the course?  
|         | • changed how student learning is assessed?  
|         | • increased confidence in assessing student learning?  |
Table 3.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 25</th>
<th>As a result of participation, does the attendee expect better student performance?</th>
<th>RQ3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 26</td>
<td>Have improvements in student scores on the AP exam been seen since becoming a Reader?</td>
<td>Y for RQ3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please feel free to share any comments about the AP World History: Modern Reading as it relates to professional development, instructional practices and beliefs, and/or student performance.</td>
<td>Optional Open-Ended Anecdotal Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development of the Focus Group Discussion Protocol Questions**

For phase two of data collection, the researcher created a focus group interview question protocol (Appendix D) to answer the research questions and align with the study's conceptual framework. She asked participants what made them apply to become a Reader. This question correlated with RQ1, *In what ways, if at all, does participating in the AP World History: Modern Reading result in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development*, as it assessed teacher input and motivation. In addition, the researcher scripted other questions and sub-questions about the Reading’s structure tied to each element of Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework, as shown in the table below. Additional questions to help answer RQ1 asked if the participants’ administration supported attending the Reading and inquired as to the participants’
perceptions of the structure of the Reading in terms of its coherence, active learning opportunities, impact of the trainer, duration, and collective participation.

Similarly, to answer RQ2: *In what ways, if at all, does teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impact teachers' perceived practices and beliefs*, the researcher crafted questions to discuss perceived changes, if any, to teacher knowledge, beliefs, and instructional practices. For example, the researcher asked participants how the Reading impacted their teaching. Sub-questions included inquiring about any changes to content knowledge, changes in their beliefs about their ability to teach the course and assess student work, changes in their ability to prepare students for the exam, and discussing if any changes were made in instruction as a result of participation.

For RQ3: *In what ways, if at all, do teachers perceive that participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts student performance*, the researcher asked participants if participation at the Reading has yielded improvements in student scores. If participants answered yes, she followed up asking why that might that be, and similarly, if they answered no, she also inquired as to why they think that might be.

Additionally, the researcher asked participants overarching questions. She asked participants to discuss if they believed there are any other impacts of attendance at the Reading, and for those who have attended the Reading more than once, if they felt that the experience or impacts varied from year to year. She also asked participant what they feel are the strengths and weaknesses of the Reading and if there was anything else that they would like to share in relation to the Reading.
### Table 3.2

*Teacher Focus Group Interview Protocol Questions Correlated to Conceptual Framework and Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Questions and Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Why did you choose to become a reader?</td>
<td>● Teacher Input and Motivation</td>
<td>● RQ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does your administration support your attendance at the Reading?</td>
<td>● Role of Administration</td>
<td>● RQ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● What are your thoughts about how the Reading is structured?</td>
<td>● Elements of Effective Professional Development</td>
<td>● RQ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Did you feel that the activities that you participated in had relevance to your classroom?</td>
<td>● Coherence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Did you find the practice of scoring student assessments beneficial?</td>
<td>● Active Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ How did working with a table leader impact your experience?</td>
<td>● Impact of Trainers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Was the duration of the Reading</td>
<td>● Sustained Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>○ appropriate? Too long? Too short? Just right? ○ Did you find working with other high school teachers and college professors useful?</th>
<th>● Collective Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● How has the Reading impacted your teaching? ○ Did your content knowledge improve? ○ Do you feel that you can now teach the course in a better way? ○ Do you find that you can now better prepare students for the exam? ○ If so, can you share what you do differently as a result of the Reading to prepare students for the exam? ○ Do you find that you can now better assess student work?</td>
<td>● Changes in teacher practices, knowledge and beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● RQ2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If so, can you share what you do differently to assess student work?

Did you make any changes in your instruction as a result of participation?

If you made changes in instruction, can you share what you do differently?

Do you feel your attendance at the Reading impacted your students?

Have you seen improvements, declines, or no change in student scores?

If scores have not improved, can you discuss why you think that might be?

If scores have declined, can you discuss why you think that might be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on student performance</th>
<th>RQ3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Table 3.2 Continued**
Table 3.2 Continued

| ● If scores have not changed, can you discuss why you think that might be? | ● Overarching Questions | ● RQ1, RQ2, RQ3 |
| ● For those of you who have attended the Reading more than once, did the experience, or your perception of the Readings’ impact, vary from year to year? If so, what factors were different? | ● Overarching Questions | ● RQ1, RQ2, RQ3 |
| ● What do you feel are the strengths of the Reading? | ● Overarching Questions | ● RQ1, RQ2, RQ3 |
| ● What do you feel are the weaknesses of the Reading? | ● Overarching Questions | ● RQ1, RQ2, RQ3 |
| ● Is there anything else you would like to share? | ● Overarching Questions | ● RQ1, RQ2, RQ3 |

**Sampling and Participants**

For the quantitative data collection, the researcher used purposive sampling as she was specifically seeking participants who were teachers of AP World History: Modern in high schools who have attended the on-site Reading. The researcher invited these participants to
attend to evaluate these teachers’ perceptions of the characteristics of the AP World History: Modern Reading and their perceived impact of having attended the AP World History: Modern Reading on teacher and student performance. The researcher used an online platform to reach participants. She asked for volunteers through the closed AP World History: Modern Facebook group, which consists of approximately 7,000 members. To gain additional respondents, the researcher also posted to the AP World: Modern NerdFest 2021 Facebook page, which has 531 members who are all Readers (some on-site and some distributed).

She sought high school teachers who have been teaching the APWH course for at least two years (a requirement for being accepted as an AP Reader) and who have attended the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading.

For the qualitative data collection phase, the researcher used maximum variation sampling. She invited participants based on the findings from the quantitative analysis. For example, if the number of years of teaching differentiated their responses, she selected focus group participants along those characteristics. She also chose individuals who held diverse perspectives about the impact of attending the AP World History: Modern Reading. The contributions of those participants in the focus group discussion allowed the researcher to gain a more complete understanding of the research questions. The qualitative phase provided an opportunity to address questions that emerged during the quantitative analysis and gain deeper knowledge. The sample size for the qualitative phase was 8 participants. Researchers recommended an ideal size for academic focus groups of between 5 and 8 people, as it allows people to share insights (Kruger & Casey, 2009). The researcher used this sample for data collection.

Data Collection
For phase one, the researcher chose to modify and administer a survey to gather a large amount of data in a reasonable amount of time. Surveys have a broad capability to provide information on various characteristics of a large population. Additionally, surveys can be administered from afar utilizing technology. The technology allows the researcher to bridge geographic challenges and allows input from a larger swath of people. She used the online platform, Typeform, as Typeform allowed design customizability, including allowing participants to view one question at a time, and it has a thorough privacy policy.

To encourage participation, five participants who completed the survey were randomly selected to receive a $20 Amazon gift card. The researcher believed that the teachers who have attended the APWH Reading and who have joined the AP Facebook group would want to participate, but the added incentive of a potential gift card might have increased motivation.

The data collected from the survey helped answer the research questions, as the researcher carefully crafted the survey instrument to reflect those questions. The researcher asked participants to indicate background and contextual information, then respond to questions about the perceived professional development characteristics of the Reading, perceived changes in teacher practices, teacher knowledge, and teacher beliefs, and their perceived impact on student learning as a result of attending the AP World History: Modern Reading. At the conclusion of the survey, the researcher asked participants if they would be willing to participate in a follow-up focus group discussion.

For phase two of data collection, the researcher conducted a focus group discussion with semi-structured interview questions. Participants who completed the survey and selected that they were willing to participate in a focus group discussion constituted the pool of candidates. The researcher chose eight participants for the focus group who represented a range of
perspectives about the impact of the AP World History: Modern Reading. A focus group discussion was held on Zoom and recorded for the purpose of transcription and analysis.

**Validity and Reliability**

The researcher put procedures into place to establish the credibility of this study. Credibility comes from validity, which is the extent to which a concept is accurately measured in a quantitative study. Heffner (2017) stated that “a study is internally valid if it is able to determine whether a causal relationship exists between one or more independent variables and one or more dependent variables” (para 2). The researcher’s choices of the participants, and the methods of collecting, recording the data, and analyzing the data all played a role in determining internal validity. External validity describes the ability to generalize a study. Reliability, or the accuracy of an instrument, is yet another measure to establish credibility. In quantitative studies, this refers to dependability, or whether the survey instrument will have the same results if administered in the same situation on different occasions (Cherry, 2020).

**Survey Instrument Validity and Reliability**

The development of the teacher questionnaire underwent processes to ensure construct and content validity. Creswell and Creswell (2018) discussed that construct validity meant that the items measured the hypothetical constructs or concepts. To improve construct validity, the researcher aligned survey items with Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework, Knowles’ principles of andragogy, literature about the qualities that render professional development effective, and Desimone’s model for how successful professional development leads to improvements in student learning. Creswell and Creswell (2018) also stated that another method to check for content validity is through testing with the intent to “improve questions, format, and instructions” (p. 154). The researcher borrowed 13 of the 25 survey questions with permission
from a researcher who conducted pre-tests, received feedback from experts in the field, and then made revisions. As there were 12 additional questions that this researcher created, she, too, sought the expertise of others. The researcher sent the survey to six on-site AP World History: Modern Readers to receive feedback on whether the survey questions were clear and readable. The researcher revised the survey as necessary based on their input. Goforth (2015) said that for an instrument to be reliable, there should be covariance among the items relative to the variance. Therefore, the researcher used Cronbach’s alpha to measure the internal consistency, or reliability, of survey items.

**Focus Group Discussion Validity and Reliability**

By their very nature, focus groups tend to be strong in validity, as the researchers’ use of semi-structured questions helped ensure that the subjects were on topic and the researcher was measuring what was intended (Chioncel et al., 2003; Krueger & Casey, 2009). Like the creation of the survey questions, this researcher carefully crafted the focus group discussion protocol questions to align with the conceptual framework and to answer the research questions. In addition, this researcher recorded the session to aid in the accuracy of the transcription.

One way the researcher enhanced focus group discussion reliability was through purposive sampling that allowed for a variety of perspectives. According to Chioncel et al. (2003), researcher’s enhanced reliability through an approach where the data collected represented the population. Additionally, for both validity and reliability, the researcher allowed the participants to provide feedback on the draft of the transcription and analysis. She asked if participants could verify the accuracy of their intent, which minimized researcher bias.

As this study used multiple data sources, the findings of each component were compared, which served as yet another measure to increase validity and reliability. This triangulation was
another means to minimize researcher bias, test the consistency of findings, and allow the researcher to gain a more complete understanding of the issue.

**Ethical Considerations**

Reliability and validity are important in research, but so are ethics. Principles of ethical considerations guide one’s research designs and practices. Some basic principles are to minimize the risk of harm, to ensure voluntary participation, to receive informed consent, to protect anonymity and confidentiality, and to avoid deceptive practices (Long Island University Institutional Review Board, 2019). Prior to data collection, the researcher received permission to conduct the research from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) office at Long Island University Post.

For the collection of quantitative data, the researcher included an introductory overview in the Facebook post with a link to the informed consent page (Appendix E). Those who clicked the link then read about the intent of the study and the procedures, and the anticipated benefits and consequences of participating in this research study (Appendix F). The researcher informed the participants that the questionnaire will take no longer than 10 minutes to complete and that their participation is voluntary. Furthermore, the researcher communicated on the informed consent page that selecting “agree to participate” indicated that the participants read the text and had the opportunity to print the consent form and ask questions about the purposes and procedures of the study. If they did not consent, the survey did not begin. Participants did not have to sign their name or provide any information that identified them. Before reviewing the results, the researcher de-identified any submissions from the dataset that voluntarily included email addresses for the purpose of winning a gift card or indicated agreement to participate in the
focus group in order to insure anonymity during the data analysis. The communication to participants also included the researcher’s contact information.

For the qualitative phase of data collection, the researcher sent a consent letter (Appendix G) to eight selected participants who indicated their willingness to participate. She informed them that there was no guarantee of privacy within the online discussion group itself, as is the nature of a focus group, but asked the participants to keep information discussed during the session confidential. She communicated that in the study, their identification would not be identifiable to others, as she referred to each as participant 1, participant 2, etc. She also asked that participants agree to the recording of the Zoom session to aid her in transcription, and ascertained that they were available to attend on a specific date and time. Once eight participants agreed, the researcher communicated to all others who expressed interest to thank them for their time and to inform them that their services were not needed.

The researcher used Typeform for the collection of quantitative data, as their privacy policy and data storage met IRB guidelines. With Typeform, all data is secured through encryption processes and Typeform does not store respondent IP addresses (Typeform, n.d.). After she concluded the study, the researcher will store and maintain the recording and transcription on a password protected computer for five years.

Data Entry

Phase One

The researcher collected data through an online survey shared on the closed AP World History: Modern teachers Facebook page. She created a response rate table to indicate the number of responses collected on each day. If additional posts were needed to encourage more responses, she indicated that as well. Furthermore, when the rate and number of responses were
slow, the researcher also posted to the AP World: Modern NerdFest 2021 Facebook page, which has 531 members who are all Readers (some on-site and some distributed).

Once the surveys were submitted, the researcher exported the data as a comma-separated values (CSV) file and imported it into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The researcher then performed data cleaning to prevent errors in data analysis. Since the researcher set the survey items to require completion in order to proceed, missing information was not an issue. The researcher assigned a variable code to each of the 26 survey items and inputted those into the variable view pane of the SPSS program. For questions using the Likert-scale, the researcher coded responses beginning with higher values indicating a greater level of agreement. Finally, the researcher added an ID variable to identify participants with a number.

The SPSS program allowed the researcher to analyze information quickly and in multiple ways. She first completed descriptive statistics to examine the demographics and how the variables were trending. The researcher then conducted inferential analyses to address the research questions.

**Phase Two**

The researcher conducted a focus group interview through Zoom. She asked participants to agree to the recording of the session, and the researcher later manually transcribed the meeting. The researcher did not use any transcription services as she believes going through the process of transcribing aided her in identifying themes. Once the researcher transcribed the content, she then conducted in vivo coding.

**Research Measures**

**Quantitative Data Analysis**

In SPSS, the researcher first performed univariate analyses and ran frequency distributions for each of the variables in the survey. She then determined the central tendency for
each variable, identifying a modal value for the nominal demographic items, and, as the Likert-scaled items were ordinal variables, the median and mean.

The researcher explored RQ1: *In what ways, if at all, does participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading result in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development* using survey statements 12 through 20. These questions directly addressed perceptions of elements of teacher professional development. The researcher included a table of descriptive statistics.

The researcher then examined RQ2: *In what ways, if at all, does teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impact teachers' perceived practices and beliefs* using survey statements 21-24. These questions were designed to measure perceptions of changes in teacher practices, knowledge, and beliefs. The researcher included a table of descriptive statistics.

For RQ3: *In what ways, if at all, do teachers perceive that participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts student performance*, the researcher ran descriptive statistics on survey statements 25 and 26. These items measured the perceptions of impact of participating in the Reading on student performance. Again, the researcher included a table of descriptive statistics.

Next, the researcher conducted bivariate analysis to examine relationships between variables. She conducted an exploratory set of analyses to examine means for key outcomes [Q12-Q26] via crosstabs with chi-square tests included in the output. This provided a sense of where and how these outcomes varied across different types of teacher profiles (using control variables collected in the survey).
First, the researcher cross-tabulated using Pearson Chi-square to determine if there was a relationship between if the participant perceived the Reading overall to be beneficial and their perceptions of the professional development characteristics of the Reading according to each of the following demographics: gender, years of experience, years of teaching the course, number of times participated in the Reading, which FRQs were scored, leadership roles that were held, educational attainment, school setting, description of students, how many AP World students are taught each year, and average class size.

Next, the researcher cross-tabulated using Pearson Chi-square to determine if there was a relationship between any perceived changes in teacher practices, knowledge and beliefs according to each of the following demographics: gender, years of experience, years of teaching the course, number of times participated in the Reading, which FRQs were scored, leadership roles that were held, educational attainment, school setting, description of students, how many AP World students are taught each year, and average class size.

Lastly, the researcher cross-tabulated using Pearson Chi-square to determine if there was a relationship between perceived student outcomes and each of the following demographics: gender, years of experience, years of teaching the course, number of times participated in the Reading, which FRQs were scored, leadership roles that were held, educational attainment, school setting, description of students, how many AP World students are taught each year, and average class size.

The researcher then used logistic regression analysis. Regression analysis can show “how well all our predictor variables together predict the outcome variable” and “can look at the relationship between each of our predictors separately and the outcome variable” (Muijs, 2011, p. 172). The researcher used logistic regression to analyze what might predict participation in the
AP World History: Modern Reading to be seen as beneficial teacher professional development, what might predict that participation in the Reading leads to perceived changes in teacher practices, knowledge and beliefs, and what might predict that participation in the Reading leads to improved student achievement.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

The researcher used in vivo coding to analyze the qualitative data from the focus group discussion. The researcher used the actual words of the participants to aid in uncovering patterns and more deeply understanding the impact of attending the Advanced Placement World History Reading on teachers and students. The qualitative component shed insight on the reasons behind the different perceptions of the impact of the Reading experience.

Then, analyzing the qualitative data helped the researcher answer what results emerged from comparing the qualitative data about teacher and student performance as a result of participating in the AP World History: Modern Reading with the quantitative data measured on the survey instrument. The researcher developed joint displays to represent the connection for the sequential integration. One display showed the quantitative scores that demonstrated the diversity of results that helped inform the purposeful sampling decisions. The researcher created a second joint display to visually represent insights from the qualitative phase which helped better explain the quantitative score.

**Methodological Limitations**

The researcher identified that there were limitations related to the data analysis. A limitation of the proposed quantitative stage of this methodology was the use of teacher self-reports. Researchers (Chan, 2008; Jupp, 2006) found that subjects may exaggerate responses or answer what they perceive is the socially accepted response. However, because the participants
were not face-to-face with an interviewer for the quantitative survey, they may have been more likely to feel anonymous and thus provided more accurate responses. A limitation of the qualitative data collection phase was that focus groups could create a situation where participants did not feel comfortable speaking freely in front of others. Through using mixed-methods and triangulation, the researcher was able to compare the two strands of data, minimizing the weaknesses of each, and gleaned insight into the participants' perceptions.

Another limitation may have been related to the external validity of the data. The AP World History: Modern Readers on Facebook might not represent the overall population of APWH Readers. Teachers who are more motivated to engage in professional development and value online collaboration voluntarily join the Facebook group if they know about it. There may also be an age bias, as older readers may not be as apt to use social media and younger Readers are using other platforms. However, seeing as there were close to 7,000 members of this Facebook group that was still a large enough population to draw from and it provided the ability to reach geographically diverse participants.

Chapter Summary

This chapter's purpose was to describe the research methodology, the subjects, the instruments used to measure the dependent variables, and the statistical procedures the researcher followed. The researcher chose the methods in this study to gather an adequate number of participants to make valid inferences about the role of the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading as teacher professional development, and to see if participants perceive that it impacts their practices, knowledge and beliefs, and impacts student performance. Also, she hoped to further add to the literature on professional development. The study used a mixed-methods approach and utilized a survey instrument consisting of 25 questions and a focus group
discussion to collect this information. The researcher used descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze the quantitative results and in vivo analysis for the qualitative phase to answer the research questions.

Chapter four presents the quantitative data collected from the survey and the qualitative data from the focus group discussion, along with the researcher’s analysis of that data. Finally, in chapter five, the researcher summarized, discussed, provided a conclusion about her findings, and made recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The researcher designed this study to investigate if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development and if participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts teacher practices, knowledge and beliefs. The researcher also investigated if there are any perceived impacts on student performance as a result of attending the Reading. The study used a mixed methods research design. In phase one of the study, the researcher used an online Likert style survey to collect quantitative data. Phase two of the study consisted of a focus group discussion to collect qualitative data. This chapter revisits the research questions, reviews the study design, discusses data collection, provides details about the study’s participants, and provides an analysis of the data in each phase of the study.

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study were as follows:

\textit{RQ1. In what ways, if at all, does participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading result in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development?}

\textit{RQ2. In what ways, if at all, does teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impact teachers’ perceived practices and beliefs?}

\textit{RQ3. In what ways, if at all, do teachers perceive that participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts student performance?}

Phase One

As mentioned, the researcher used an online survey to collect quantitative data about teacher perceptions regarding attending the AP World History: Modern Reading (Appendix A). The first section of the instrument consisted of eleven questions that collected demographic and
descriptive teacher information. The researcher designed the second section of the survey (nine questions), to gather information about teacher perceptions of the Reading as professional development. The next section contained four questions crafted to investigate perceived changes in teacher practices, knowledge, and beliefs as a result of attending the Reading. The final section contained two questions which measured the teachers’ perceived impact on students of attending the AP World History: Modern Reading. The researcher also included an optional open-ended question for further anecdotal information to allow for more participant voice and insight. At the conclusion of the survey, the researcher asked participants if they were willing to participate in a follow-up focus group discussion.

Survey Reliability

The researcher used Cronbach’s alpha to measure the internal consistency, or reliability, of survey items. Cronbach's alpha is a statistic used to determine whether the individual questions (stimuli) contribute to the aim of the study and are reflected in the resulting measurement. Higher values mean higher consistency of stimuli. A value greater than 0.7 is considered satisfactory for this statistic (Pallant, 2020).

Cronbach's alpha of all variables from section RQ1 was 0.644. This result represented a questionable degree of reliability. It is necessary to realize that the number of variables influences the value of Cronbach's alpha. When alpha comes out low for a dataset with a larger number of variables, it is more suspect than in this case (Pallant, 2020). The researcher did not consider this value to be much of a deviation from the required reliability. By successively eliminating the variables AdmSupport, Relevant and Collab, the researcher was able to increase the reliability to 0.684. The discarded variables mentioned had low correlation coefficients with the other variables.
For the third section of the survey instrument, Q21-24, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.747. That was above the 0.70 threshold, which is considered good. The variables in section two had stronger correlations with each other than the variables in section one. This may have accounted for the higher reliability.

Finally, for the fourth section of the survey which measured the impact of attending the Reading on student performance, Cronbach’s alpha was a low 0.301. In this case, there were only two questions in the section, which meant the assumptions could not be tested in this manner. In addition, the two variables in this section used different scales and, therefore, the values could not be interpreted in the same way. As a result, the researcher could only calculate the correlation between the items.

**Response Rate**

To disseminate the survey, the researcher identified avenues for recruitment that targeted the desired population of Advanced Placement World History: Modern teachers who have attended the on-site Reading. On October 20, 2022, she posted a recruitment request (Appendix E) on the closed AP World History Teachers page that has approximately 7,300 members. Not all members of that group have served as AP World History: Modern Readers, but she believed there would be many potential participants from that sizable number. Immediately after she posted, the administrator of the group posted a comment encouraging members to participate in the survey. This helped to acknowledge the post’s legitimacy, showed the Facebook group administrative support for the activity, and further increased interest.

Despite the large number of members and administrative support, the response rate was lower than the researcher anticipated. Therefore, on October 22, 2022, the researcher posted the
The researcher posted a total of four times requesting participation. In addition to the two postings mentioned, the researcher posted a second time to the AP World History Teachers Facebook page on the morning of Tuesday, October 25, 2022, and a second time to the Nerdfest page on the morning of Wednesday, October 26, 2022. The researcher closed the survey on October 28, 2022.

**Table 4.1**

*Response Rate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/20/22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographics of Study Participants**

As discussed, the first part of the teacher questionnaire collected teacher profile data.

Questions asked the participants to identify their gender, how many years of teaching experience
they had, how many years they had taught the AP World History: Modern course, how many
times they had attended the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading, which free response
questions they had scored, if they had held a leadership role at the Reading, if they had an
undergraduate major, minor, or graduate degree in history, and to classify their school setting,
the academic ability of their students, how many AP World History: Modern students they teach
each year, and their average class size.

A total of 83 AP World History: Modern teachers who had attended the on-site Reading
responded to the teacher survey. Women made up 81.9% of the respondents. The highest number
of respondents taught for 16 years or more (73.5%) and taught the AP World History: Modern
course for 7-15 years (60.2%). Most respondents had participated in the Reading five or more
times (49.4%), with most having scored all three free response questions (37.3%). Of the 83
respondents, 26 (31.3%) had served in a leadership role at the Reading. For data analysis
purposes, the researcher decided to collapse the specific responses for all leadership roles (Table
Leader, Early Table Leader, Question Leader) and only differentiate between whether one served
as a leader or not. The researcher asked participants to indicate if they had an undergraduate
major in history, an undergraduate minor in history, or a graduate degree in history. The greatest
number of respondents shared that they had an undergraduate major in history (34.9%). Here,
too, for data analysis purposes, the researcher collapsed the degree earned category and only
differentiated between the highest degree in history earned and the others, with 27.7% having
earned a graduate degree in history and 72.3% having an undergraduate major or minor in
history or no major in history at all. The majority of participants work in suburban public school
settings (61.4%). When asked about their students' academic skills, 48.2% selected the choice in
the survey that “some” students had strong academic skills. In addition, the majority of teachers
indicated that they teach 76 or more AP World History: Modern students a year with an average class size for a section of AP World History: Modern class ranging from 19-25 students.

Table 4.2

Participant Teacher Profile Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years of teaching experience do you have?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years of experience do you have teaching the AP World History: Modern course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you participated in the AP World History: Modern on-site (in-person) Reading?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 times</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more times</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ (Free-Response Question)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBQ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEQ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAQ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBQ + LEQ</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBQ + SAQ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEQ + SAQ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBQ + LEQ + SAQ</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAQ (Short Answer Question)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEQ (Long Essay Question)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBQ (Document Based Question)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadRoles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Degree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate major in history</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate minor in history</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree in history</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate major in history &amp; Graduate degree in history</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate major in history &amp; Undergraduate minor in history &amp; Graduate degree in history</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following best describes your school setting?</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban public</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban public</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you describe your AP Students?</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students in my AP course have strong academic skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most students in my AP course have strong academic skills</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some students in my AP course have strong academic skills</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few students in my AP course have strong academic skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many AP World History: Modern students do you teach each school year?</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76+</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your average class size for a section of the AP World History: Modern course?</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

After collecting data about the demographics of the participants, the second, third, and fourth sections of the surveys gathered teacher perceptions about the professional development characteristics of the Reading, the perceived changes in teacher practices, knowledge, and beliefs as a result of attending the Reading, and the teachers’ perceived impact on students of teachers’ attending the AP World History: Modern Reading. Table 4.3 displays the frequency distributions for each of those individual questions, which the researcher evaluated using a Likert scale with values 1 - 4, where 1 meant ‘strongly disagree’ and 4 ‘strongly agree.’ Thus, higher values meant a higher level of agreement. Some of the variables later used as dependent variables did not contain all categories as participants did not select ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree.’ For example, respondents to question 12 answered only ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree.’ Question 21 included the possibility of ‘disagree,’ but no respondents selected ‘strongly disagree.’ Responses for the last question, 26, included all Likert scale choices.

Table 4.3

Frequency Distributions for Q12-26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q12: Participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading was beneficial to me as professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13: Participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading improved my AP course content knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14: Participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading engaged me as a learner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15: Activities at the AP World History: Modern Reading were relevant to my classroom teaching of the course.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16: The 56 hours of scoring student work at the AP World History: Modern Reading adequately supported my learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17: Collaboration with teacher participants at the AP World History: Modern Reading contributed to my learning.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18: I found the ability to learn from a table leader beneficial to my understanding of course requirements.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19: The decision to attend the AP World History: Modern Reading was self-motivated.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20: My school district administration supports my attendance at the AP World History: Modern Reading.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21: Participation at the AP World History: Modern Reading changed how I teach the AP World History: Modern Course.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q22: As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have increased belief in my ability to teach the AP World History: Modern course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23: As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have changed how I assess student learning in my AP course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24: As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have increased belief in my ability to assess student learning in my AP course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25: As a result of my participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading, I expect better student performance on the AP exam than if I had not participated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26: I have seen improvements in my student scores on the AP exam since I began serving as a Reader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher calculated the mean and standard deviation for variables on the Likert scale. Mean values were between 3.51 and 3.87. The variable Participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading was beneficial to me as professional development reached the highest mean value. At the same time, this variable had one of the lowest standard deviations, which corresponded to the fact that only two categories, ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree,’ were included among the answers.
The researcher also identified the median. Its value corresponded to the middle value of the data set. The median value was higher than the mean value for all variables. This indicated a negative skewness of the distribution of the variables.

**Table 4.4**

*Descriptive Statistics for Q12-26*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading was beneficial to me as professional development.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading improved my AP course content knowledge.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading engaged me as a learner.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities at the AP World History: Modern Reading were relevant to my classroom teaching of the course.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 56 hours of scoring student work at the AP World History: Modern Reading adequately supported my learning.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with teacher participants at the AP World History: Modern Reading contributed to my learning.</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found the ability to learn from a table leader beneficial to my understanding of course requirements.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decision to attend the AP World History: Modern Reading was self-motivated.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school district administration supports my attendance at the AP World History: Modern Reading.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation at the AP World History: Modern Reading changed how I teach the AP World History: Modern Course.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have increased belief in my ability to teach the AP World History: Modern course.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have changed how I assess student learning in my AP course.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have increased belief in my ability to assess student learning in my AP course.</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of my participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading, I expect better student performance on the AP exam than if I had not participated.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have seen improvements in my student scores on the AP exam since I began serving as a Reader.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Related to Research Question One

RQ1. In what ways, if at all, does participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading result in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development?

The first research question investigated if participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading resulted in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development. Respondents answered questions 12-20 which discussed professional development characteristics tied to Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework and the study’s literature review which identified additional characteristics of effective professional development. Table 4.5 displays the descriptive statistics for this first section of questions. A deeper comparison is seen in Figure 4.1. On this boxplot, one can see that there was only one ‘strongly disagree’ answer and that was for the question *The 56 hours of scoring student work at the AP World History: Modern Reading adequately supported my learning.* On the contrary, the answer ‘strongly agree’ occurred as an answer to all questions. The placement of the boxes at the top of the range corresponded to negative skew and represented that the data did not follow a normal distribution curve. For these questions, most answers had a value of 4, and only a few had a lower value.
Table 4.5

Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Professional Development Characteristics

| Participating in the AP World History: Modern Reading was beneficial to me as professional development. | 83 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 3.8675 | .34113 |
| Participating in the AP World History: Modern Reading improved my AP course content knowledge. | 83 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 3.5663 | .60873 |
| Participating in the AP World History: Modern Reading engaged me as a learner. | 83 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 3.6506 | .52808 |
| Activities at the AP World History: Modern Reading were relevant to my classroom teaching of the course. | 83 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 3.6386 | .57548 |
| The 56 hours of scoring student work at the AP World History: Modern Reading adequately supported my learning. | 83 | 1.00 | 4.00 | 3.6265 | .59900 |
| Collaboration with teacher participants at the AP World History: Modern Reading contributed to my learning. | 83 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 3.9036 | .29691 |
| I found the ability to learn from a table leader beneficial to my understanding of course requirements. | 83 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 3.5060 | .65096 |
| The decision to attend the AP World History: Modern Reading was self-motivated. | 83 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 3.8554 | .38675 |
The researcher used correlation coefficients to assess the strength of associations between data variables. She used it to assess the existence of a linear dependence of two continuous variables. Table 4.6 provides the correlation coefficients of the variables in the second section of questions. This coefficient uses values from -1 to 1, where values approaching the extreme
values indicated strong linear dependence. Values around 0, on the other hand, indicated the absence of this dependence.

Most correlation coefficients were positive. The researcher found the highest value of the correlation coefficient (0.531) between the variables Participation in the Reading was Beneficial Professional Development (PBenefit) and Duration. The researcher interpreted this correlation coefficient as a moderately strong dependence. From these results, one can deduce that there is a direct relationship between Duration and PBenefit. As the value of Duration went up, the value of PBenefit also increased. In other words, when participants agreed that the 56 hours of scoring student work supported their learning, the more likely the participant was to agree that participation in the Reading was beneficial professional development.

Table 4.6

Correlation Coefficients of Perceptions of Professional Development Characteristics Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PBenefit</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Engaged</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Collab</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>SelfMot</th>
<th>AdmSupport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBenefit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.349**</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.223*</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.353**</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.345**</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>.349**</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.353**</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>.353**</td>
<td>.353**</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.272*</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collab</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.218**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.345**</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.272*</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelfMot</td>
<td>.223*</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdmSupport</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.218*</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Chi-Square Tests
The researcher conducted Pearson Chi-square tests to determine whether the teacher profile variables related to any of the survey items. This data analysis provided information on whether any variable had a dependent relationship with an independent variable. If the p-value was less than or equal to the significance level set at 0.05, there was a statistically significant association between the variables.

First, the researcher used the Pearson Chi-square test to measure dependence between teacher profile characteristics and question Q12 (*Participation in the Reading was Beneficial Professional Development*), determined as a dependent variable for the first group of questions. The researcher performed the test at the 5% significance level. Table 4.7 displays that all p-values were greater than 0.05. As a result, the researcher concluded there was no dependence between the variable Q12 and all teacher profile variables. Therefore, teacher profile characteristics did not significantly influence the respondent's answer to if the Reading was perceived as beneficial professional development.

Pearson's Chi-square test has relatively strict requirements for expected frequencies in the individual fields of the table. The assumption of the Chi-square test is that in at least 80% of the fields of the table the expected frequencies will be at least 5, in the others at least 2. Unfortunately, these conditions were not always met as the expected values were too low, so the dependence was also evaluated using Fisher’s Exact test. Even so, all p-values were greater than 0.05, which did not change the researchers’ judgment that teacher profile characteristics did not significantly influence the respondent’s answers to Q12.
Table 4.7

Chi-Square Test of Teacher Profile Variables and Participation in the Reading was Beneficial Professional Development (PBenefit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-square test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTeach</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTeachAP</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPanAPR</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ_SAQ</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ_LEQ</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ_DBG</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadRoles</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDegree</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchSet</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudSkill</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumStud</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AvgSec</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the Chi-square test, the researcher also tested the dependence between the variable PBenefit (Participation in the Reading was beneficial professional development) and the other questions from the professional development characteristics section of questions. The researcher used the p-value to evaluate test results. From the results, the researcher concluded that the dependency PBenefit existed on the variables Content, Engaged, Relevant, Duration, and Selfmot (whether the participant was self-motivated to attend the Reading). The most significant existence of a dependency was with the Duration variable. This corresponded to the previous findings using the correlation coefficient. The variables Content, Engaged, Relevant, Duration, and Selfmot also had a higher correlation coefficient with the PBenefit variable in the correlation table.
Table 4.8

Chi-Square Test of Q13-20 and PBenefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
<th>Exact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collab</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfmot</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admsupport</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Related to Research Question Two

RQ2. In what ways, if at all, does teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impact teachers' perceived practices and beliefs?

The second research question investigated perceived changes in teacher practices, knowledge, and beliefs as a result of attending the AP World History: Modern Reading. Questions 21-24 inquired about perceptions of changes in teaching and assessment practices, along with perceptions about belief in teaching and assessing students after attending the Reading. The researcher first conducted a comparison of descriptive statistics. The mean values of the individual variables were not very different. This was likely because responses with a value of 4 (‘strongly agree’) occurred most often. The variable, As a result of the APWH Reading, I have changed how I assess student learning in my AP course (StudAssess) was the most diverse. This variable had the lowest mean and the highest standard deviation.

Table 4.9 displays the descriptive statistics for this section of questions. The boxplot displays that there was only one ‘strongly disagree’ answer and that was for the question Participation at the APWH Reading changed how I teach the AP World History: Modern
Most answers had a value of 4 (‘strongly agree’) which was indicated by the lines at the top of the boxplot. For those questions (TeachCourse, BeliefTeach, and BeliefAssess), the points represent outliers.

### Table 4.9

**Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Changes in Teacher Practices, Knowledge, and Beliefs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimu m</th>
<th>Maximu m</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TeachCourse</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.7831</td>
<td>.44305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BeliefTeach</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.8434</td>
<td>.36566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudAssess</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.7108</td>
<td>.48212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BeliefAssess</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.8072</td>
<td>.39687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4.2

**Boxplot of Descriptive Statistics of Perceived Changes in Teacher Practices, Knowledge and Beliefs**

The researcher also conducted tests to measure the association between variables.

Correlation coefficients of all variables were positive, which corresponded to a positive linear relationship. All correlation coefficients were considered significant at the .05 level. The
researcher found the strongest correlation coefficient between the variables about if participation at the APWH Reading changed how the participants teaches the AP World History: Modern Course (TeachCourse) and if as a result of attending the Reading the participant gained an increased belief in his/her ability to teach the APWH course (BeliefTeach).

Table 4.10

<p>| Correlation Coefficients of Perceived Changes in Teacher Practices, Knowledge, and Beliefs |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeachCourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BeliefTeach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudAssess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BeliefAssess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Chi-square Tests

The dependence between teacher profile characteristics and the dependent variable TeachCourse (Participation at the APWH Reading changed how I teach the AP World History: Modern Course) was determined using Pearson's Chi-square test. Again, the researcher used Fisher’s Exact test as the frequency requirements were not all met. The variables about the number of years a teacher participated in the AP World History: Modern Reading (YPartAPR) and if any leadership roles were held (LeadRoles) had a significant influence on the value of this variable. As the value of YPartAPR increased, the value of the dependent variable increased. The value also increased if the respondent was a leader.
Table 4.11

*Chi-square test of Teacher Profile Variables and TeachCourse*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
<th>Exact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTeach</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTeachAP</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPartAPR</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ_SAQ</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ_LEQ</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQDBG</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadRoles</td>
<td>0.040*</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDegree</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchSet</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudSkill</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumStud</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AvgSec</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

From these results, the researcher identified a significant relationship between all variables. The data from the correlation coefficients also supported this result. When the value of one variable increased, the value of the TeachCourse variable increased.

Table 4.12

*Chi-square Test of Q21-24 and RQ2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
<th>Exact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BeliefTeach</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudAssess</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BeliefAssess</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Data Related to Research Question Three**

*RQ3. In what ways, if at all, do teachers perceive that participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts student performance?*
The third research question analyzed the teachers’ perceived impact on students of attending the AP World History: Modern Reading. The researcher asked participants if they expected better student performance as a result of having attended the Reading and if they have seen improvements in student scores after attending the Reading.

The researcher compared the descriptive statistics of the variables in this section in Table 4.17. There were larger differences in mean values, however, these variables were not measured using the same scale. The values of the StudScores variable (I have seen improvements in my student scores on the AP exam since I began serving as a Reader) cannot even be considered ordinal. The mean value in this case did not say much about the variable. Seen on the box graph, the largest proportion of respondents chose the ‘not sure’ option (79.5%).

Table 4.13

Descriptive Statistics of Perceived Impact on Student Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimu</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ExpStudPrf</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.6024</td>
<td>.58309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudScores</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.7590</td>
<td>.50823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correlation coefficient between these two variables was positive. Therefore, the researcher considered this a medium to strong linear relationship between these two variables, meaning that they changed together at a constant rate. Respondents who expected student performance (ExpStudPrf) to change positively also tended to report positive changes in student scores (StudScores).

**Table 4.14**

*Correlation Coefficients of Perceived Impact on Student Performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ExpStudPrf</th>
<th>StudScores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ExpStudPrf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudScores</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square Tests

Using the Chi-square test, the researcher determined the dependence of the variable about if participants had seen improvements in their students’ scores \((StudScores)\) on the number of years the participant had been teaching \((Yteach)\). The researcher interpreted this dependence as respondents with more years teaching the AP World History: Modern course \((YTeachAP)\) having a higher dependent variable value. The Chi-square test also confirmed the dependence between \(StudScore\) and whether the participant responded that they expected student scores to increase as a result of the teachers’ participation \((ExpStudPrf)\), which was already shown with the correlation coefficient.

**Table 4.15**

*Chi-square Test of Teacher Profile Variables and RQ3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
<th>Exact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTeach</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTeachAP</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPartAPR</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ_SAQ</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ_LEQ</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ_DBG</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadRoles</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDegree</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchSet</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudSkill</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumStud</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AvgSec</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 4.16

Chi-square Test of Q26 and RQ3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
<th>Exact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ExpStudPrf</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Logistic Regression

RQ1

The researcher used binary logistic regression to analyze what might predict participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading as beneficial teacher professional development. The researcher used binary logistic regression for analysis due to the nature of the responses received. While the survey question (PBenefit) presented a four-point Likert scale, the 83 survey respondents only indicated either ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ to the question of whether or not participation was beneficial as professional development.

The researcher re-coded some variables to look at simpler comparisons due to the limited n. For example, the researcher decomposed FRQ, LeadRoles, HDegree, and SchoolSet into binary elements. The researcher used dummy variables to represent the subgroups in the other explanatory variables. The reference category used was the ‘agree’ category, and therefore all interpretations were compared to those who responded ‘agree.’

Logistic regression first identified which questions from this section were significant for the explained variable. Only the Duration variable could be observed as significant (p-value 0.036). The researcher concluded that respondents with more positive ratings for Duration were more likely to choose the ‘strongly agree’ option in response to the question about whether
participation was beneficial as professional development. As the *Duration* value increased by 1, the chance of choosing the ‘strongly agree’ category increased by 15.61.

**Table 4.17**

*Logistic Regression for RQ1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-19.16</td>
<td>6.964</td>
<td>7.570</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>5.885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>5.885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>2.461</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>13.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>2.751</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>3.215</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>12.783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>2.748</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>7.445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>2.168</td>
<td>112.367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>- .034</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>20.751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collab</td>
<td>- .056</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>2.235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>3.784</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>21.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelfMot</td>
<td>- .233</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>4.801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdmSupport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The reference category is: Agree.

Furthermore, the researcher assessed RQ1 using forward stepwise regression to assess if any of the teacher profile characteristics made a significant difference. Adding any of the variables did not significantly affect the model.

**RQ2**

The researcher used multinomial logistic regression to analyze if participation at the AP World History: Modern Reading changed how participants teach the AP World History: Modern course (*TeachCourse*), as this dependent variable had three categories that were selected by participants. The reference category used was ‘disagree.’ However, there was only one
respondent who chose the ‘disagree’ option for the TeachCourse variable. Such small frequencies had a negligible effect on the result.

The researcher identified a significant relationship for the ‘agree’ category with whether a participant gained an increased belief in his/her ability to teach the AP World History: Modern course as a result of attending the AP Reading (BeliefTeach). The researcher interpreted this relationship as respondents with a higher BeliefTeach value had a lower chance of choosing the option ‘agree’ compared to the reference category. The chance was lower by $1.720 \times 10^{-12}$, which was relatively small.

**Table 4.18**

*Logistic Regression for RQ2 (Reference Category: Disagree)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>TeachCourse&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>123.</td>
<td>4749.</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td></td>
<td>.219E-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BeliefTeach</td>
<td>-27.0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.720E-12</td>
<td>2.192E-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StudAssess</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>758.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>760224.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BeliefAssess</td>
<td>-13.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1042.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>1.104E-6</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>4749.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td></td>
<td>.219E-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BeliefTeach</td>
<td>-23.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>9.039E-11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StudAssess</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>758.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>9450530.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BeliefAssess</td>
<td>-13.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1042.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>1.063E-6</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> The reference category is: Disagree.

<sup>b</sup> Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.
Since there was only one disagree response recorded for the variable about if participation at the AP World History: Modern Reading changed how participants teach the AP World History: Modern course (TeachCourse), the researcher also performed logistic regression analysis only for the categories ‘agree’ and ‘strongly disagree.’ As a result, the researcher obtained different results. The variables BeliefTeach (As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have increased belief in my ability to teach the AP World History: Modern course) and StudAssess (As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have changed how I assess student learning in my AP course) showed significance. The researcher found that as more respondents indicated ‘strongly agree’ to these variables, there was a higher chance that the respondent would choose ‘strongly agree’ that participation at the APWH Reading changed how the participant teaches the AP World History: Modern Course (TeachCourse). In the case of BeliefTeach, with an increase of 1, this chance increased by 52,554, whereas in the case of StudAssess, this growth was 12,431.

Table 4.19

Logistic Regression for RQ2 (Reference Category: Agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>TeachCoursea</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-22.24</td>
<td>5.889</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>6.697</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>412.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BeliefTeach</td>
<td>3.962</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>6.697</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>412.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StudAssess</td>
<td>2.520</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>6.689</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>83.942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BeliefAssess</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>6.845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The reference category is: Agree.
The addition of any of the teacher’s characteristics did not have a significant effect on the value of the variable, Participation at the APWH Reading changed how I teach the AP World History: Modern course (TeachCourse), when comparing a model containing the ‘disagree’ category or a model that did not contain this category.

Follow Up Analysis on RQ2

The researcher also investigated the participant perceptions of the professional development characteristics of the Reading (Q13-20) with the dependent variable of RQ2 to see if the elements of the Reading would predict if teachers would change their practices. Almost all variables were insignificant. The researcher found only one significant coefficient in the variable Collab in the category ‘agree.’ The researcher found that as the value of Collab increased, the chance that the respondent chose ‘agree’ as the answer to the Teachcourse question increased.

Table 4.20

Logistic Regression for RQ2 and Professional Development Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TeachCourse</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-88.44</td>
<td>4397.6</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>560.5</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>9.091E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>7.012</td>
<td>511.1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>1109.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>321.6</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>54705466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>5.832</td>
<td>682.1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *b* indicates a significant coefficient.
### Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>z-score</th>
<th>Lower Conf.</th>
<th>Upper Conf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>21.06</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>289.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97.687</td>
<td>14081052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2.123E+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9.340E+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelfMot</td>
<td>-2.091</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>770.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdmSupp</td>
<td>4.098</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>744.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.198</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>z-score</th>
<th>Lower Conf.</th>
<th>Upper Conf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>95.87</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>875.349</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>-23.51</td>
<td>560.5</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.126E-11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>6.775</td>
<td>511.1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>875.349</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>321.6</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11652590</td>
<td>1.808E+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.508E+2</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>-682.1</td>
<td>5.020</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collab</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5354065.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5354065.</td>
<td>5354065.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5354065.</td>
<td>5354065.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>289.9</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24706722</td>
<td>3.724E+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.639E+2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelfMot</td>
<td>-1.082</td>
<td>770.8</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdmSupp</td>
<td>4.454</td>
<td>744.1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.953</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The reference category is: Disagree.

b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

The researcher also analyzed the effect of teacher perceptions that participation in the Reading was beneficial professional development (PBenefit) on the value of if participation at the APWH Reading changed how the participants teach the AP World History: Modern Course (TeachCourse). First, the researcher used a model with all available categories. As a result, the researcher found that the variable PBenefit had a significant influence on the value of TeachCourse. Increasing the value of PBenefit decreased the chance that the respondent would choose the category ‘agree’ (decrease by 3.553E-6) as opposed to strongly agree.
**Table 4.21**

*Logistic Regression for RQ2 and PBenefit (Reference Category: Disagree)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TeachCoursea</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>52.58</td>
<td>2.820</td>
<td>347.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.553</td>
<td>9.213E-7 1.370E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBenefit</td>
<td></td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>331.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.553</td>
<td>E-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>48.22</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>2287.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.545</td>
<td>1.615E-5 1.615E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBenefit</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.615</td>
<td>E-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a. The reference category is: Disagree.  

The researcher then removed the ‘disagree’ category from the model and found the coefficient of the *PBenefit* variable still significant. As the value of *PBenefit* increased by 1, the chance that the respondent in the variable *TeachCourse* would indicate the ‘strongly agree’ category increased by 4.545.

**Table 4.22**

*Logistic Regression for RQ2 and PBenefit (Reference Category: Agree)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TeachCoursea</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4.360</td>
<td>2.614</td>
<td>2.781</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>4.545</td>
<td>1.179 17.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBenefit</td>
<td>1.514</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>4.834</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>4.545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a. The reference category is: Agree.  

**RQ3**

The researcher again used multinomial logistic regression to investigate the perceived impact on students as a result of teachers attending the AP World History: Modern Reading. The
researcher analyzed the responses to the question, As a result of my participation in the APWH Reading, I expect better student performance on the AP exam than if I had not participated (ExpStudPrf) with the dependent variable that measured if participants had seen improvements in student scores since serving as a Reader (StudScores). For the dependent variable, there were three categories that respondents selected: ‘agree,’ ‘not sure,’ or ‘disagree.’ The researcher used ‘disagree’ as the reference category. In the case of both ‘agree’ and ‘not sure,’ the coefficient of the ExpStudPrf variable was significant. In both cases, as the value of ExpStudPrf increased, the value of the variable StudScore increased. If the value of ExpStudPrf increased by 1, the odds that the respondent would choose the ‘not sure’ category increased by 19.168. With the same increase in the ExpStudPrf variable, the odds that the respondent would choose the category ‘agree’ increased by 34,991.

Table 4.23

Logistic Regression for RQ3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>StudScores²</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²a. The reference category is: Disagree.

The researcher added teacher characteristic variables to the model using stepwise regression. The number of years the participant had been teaching the AP World History: Modern course (YTeachAP) proved to be significant. As the value of YTeachAP increased, it is expected that the value of StudScores will decrease. With an increase in the value of YTeachAP
by 1, the chance that the respondent will indicate the ‘agree’ category decreased by 4.18E-8. In
the case of the ‘not sure’ category, there is a decrease of 6.53E-9.

**Table 4.24**

*Logistic Regression for RQ3 with Teacher Profile Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Effect(s)</th>
<th>-2 Log Likelihood</th>
<th>Chi-Square&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 0</td>
<td>Entered</td>
<td>Intercept, ExpStudPrf</td>
<td>86.998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Entered</td>
<td>YTeachAP</td>
<td>70.578</td>
<td>16.420</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stepwise Method: Forward Stepwise

- The chi-square for entry is based on the likelihood ratio test.
- The chi-square for removal is based on the likelihood ratio test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>StudScores&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.988</td>
<td>4.609</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExpStudPrf</td>
<td>17.66</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>46827270.</td>
<td>1804265.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTeachAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>990.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.53E-9</td>
<td>2.02E-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-2.687</td>
<td>4.359</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExpStudPrf</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>1.660</td>
<td>123.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>10516629</td>
<td>4060798.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTeachAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.18E-8</td>
<td>4.18E-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The reference category is: Disagree.

**Summary of Phase One**

The researcher used quantitative analysis to investigate the research questions. She
performed descriptive statistics and conducted bivariate analysis to examine relationships
between variables. She examined means for key outcomes [Q12-Q26] via crosstabs with chi-
square tests included in the output. This provided a sense of where and how these outcomes
varied across different types of teacher profiles. The researcher then used logistic regression to analyze what might predict participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading to be seen as beneficial teacher professional development, what might predict that participation in the Reading leads to perceived changes in teacher practices, knowledge and beliefs, and what might predict that participation in the Reading leads to improved student achievement.

**Phase Two**

The researcher then collected and analyzed qualitative data in order to triangulate the data and develop a more comprehensive understanding of the research questions. For phase two of data collection, the researcher conducted a focus group discussion on November 30, 2022. In advance, the researcher created a focus group interview question protocol (Appendix D) to answer the research questions and align with the study's conceptual framework. As the research design was exploratory sequential, this strand of data collection did not occur until after the quantitative data was analyzed. The quantitative data analysis helped inform the researcher's decisions regarding where to seek elaboration and clarification of results.

**Focus Group Discussion Study Participants**

The researcher used maximum variation sampling to select the focus group discussion participants. Of the 83 survey respondents, 32 indicated their willingness to take part in the focus group. From those, the researcher selected participants who demonstrated diversity in some teacher profile characteristics and indicated differing levels of agreement with the Likert scale questions. Leadership roles, the number of times participating in the Reading, and the number of years teaching the course seemed to make a difference for participant responses. Therefore, the researcher emphasized diversity in those areas when selecting participants. Since gender, degree level, school setting, number of students taught, class size, self-motivation, administrative
support, and which FRQs teachers scored did not seem to make a difference when teachers responded, the researcher did not consider those factors in the selection process.

A joint display represents a visual representation of the integration of data from phase one of the study with the selection of participants for phase two. The ‘agreement rating’ column indicates the level of agreement with the Likert-scaled questions. As ‘strongly agree’ was equated to 4 and strongly disagree with 1, the higher total equals stronger agreement levels. The highest agreement rating possible was a 59 and the lowest level indicated by respondents was 45.

Table 4.25

Joint Display Showing Integration of Data from Phase One with Selection of FGD Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th># of Years Teaching the Course [YTeach]</th>
<th># of Times Participating in APWH Reading [YPartAP]</th>
<th>Leadership Position Held at Reading [Leader]</th>
<th>Agreement Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-6 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7-15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7-15 years</td>
<td>2-4 times</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7-15 years</td>
<td>2-4 times</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7-15 years</td>
<td>2-4 times</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>5 or more times</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>5 or more times</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus Group Discussion Session
All eight participants attended the focus group discussion held on Zoom on November 30, 2022. The meeting began promptly at 7:00 pm and lasted one hour, five minutes. Participant 2 arrived on time, but had her camera off until she first spoke at 13:30. She explained that she had childcare issues. That same participant left the meeting at 51:52. Participant 4 also left the meeting early, at 43:00, due to childcare concerns. The researcher found that some participants knew each other, which may have increased their comfort level. However, even those who did not have prior relationships still felt comfortable speaking.

Table 4.26

*Focus Group Participant Contributions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number of Times Contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Six times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Three times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Six Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Four Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Five Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Seven times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Five times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ten times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The participants with the fewest contributions were the same participants who only attended for part of the session.*

**Codes, Categories, and Themes**

The researcher transcribed the recording of the focus group discussion and then performed inductive descriptive coding (Appendix I). There were instances where simultaneous coding occurred as the researcher assigned some excerpts multiple codes. Next, the researcher
organized the codes into categories to better identify and classify the findings. After categorizing, the researcher then conducted thematic analysis. Doing so allowed her to generate new insights derived from the data. Since the semi-structured focus group discussion questions closely aligned with the conceptual framework that guided the study, the codes, categories, and themes that emerged were similar. Throughout the coding process, the researcher also crafted analytic memos to assist her in analyzing the data.

Table 4.27

*Focus Group Discussion Codes and Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Recommendations of others</td>
<td>PD Characteristics of the Reading (1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Understanding the rubric</td>
<td>Changes in Teaching (2, 4, 5, 6, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Only teacher at school</td>
<td>Changes in Assessing (6, 8, 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Turnkey to others</td>
<td>Impact on Students (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Teaching</td>
<td>Demographic Differences (14, 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Consistency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Role of Table Leader/Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Confidence of teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – Impact on students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – Multiple Reads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – Perspective of being a leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – Relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher conducted thematic analysis of the qualitative data related to research question one: *In what ways, if at all, does participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading result in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development?* The researcher identified motivation to learn, relevance to classroom practice, the role of leaders, collaboration, content learned, and duration of the Reading as the overarching themes.

**Motivation to Attend**

The researcher asked participants why they chose to become a Reader. This question tied to the survey question inquiring whether the decision to attend was self-motivated. Six of the eight participants answered the question. All six respondents shared that recommendations from other Readers motivated them to attend. For example, participant 5 shared, “Because the [former] Chief Reader is a friend of mine, and consistently was like, do it, do it, do it.”
Participant 8 spoke of her first APSI consultant’s recommendation back in 2003. She reported, “He's like you’ve got to come.” Similarly, participant 3 also received encouragement from her APSI consultant. She reported,

And so he [APSI consultant] gushed about it. And he told us all the first year, I had never taught AP World before, it was the first training I ever had, and he told us all as soon as you can apply to be a Reader. And then I went to another training with him about three years later, and he was like, you got to do it, you got to do it now.

While participant 6 also spoke of a colleague recommendation, she added that she was the only teacher of the course at her school and that she felt she would not get help within her own department.

**Relevance to Classroom Practice**

After a discussion of what prompted participants to become a Reader, the researcher asked if the participants felt that the activities at the Reading had relevance to their classroom teaching. Participants nodded their heads and two gave thumbs up in response. Participant 4 then spoke of how he trains his students to be “mini-readers” and it is “because of what he picked up from the Read.” Participant 1 shared “I can’t overstate how much it’s had an impact on my classroom.” The researcher then elaborated and asked participants to speak to the practice of grading actual student work at the Read. Participant 8 responded that it allowed her to see “This is where our kids are going wrong….it makes for good immersive professional development.” Participant 3 chimed in,

…with the actual grading of student work, and not just the exemplars…I would try to make that connection of okay, what is this teacher doing consistently to get
these really high scoring DBQ’s, and I took note of a lot of the strategies they had, like they’re clearly setting up context this way.

**Role of Leaders**

During the discussion of relevance, a couple of participants mentioned Table Leaders. The researcher used those mentions to transition to a discussion of the role of leaders. The researcher acknowledged that some focus group members served in leadership roles at the Reading. She encouraged even those to reflect back to their days as Readers and asked participants to speak to how working with a Table Leader impacted their experience. Participant 2, who had not served in a leadership position at the Read, discussed that their ability to provide feedback made an exceptional Table Leader. She continued that a Table Leader explaining why a point was earned or why it was not, helped her to “clean up my own grading.” She likened working with a Table Leader to “having a really good PLC [professional learning community] partner.” Participant 8, a Table Leader herself, concurred by adding, “The best leaders are the ones that are going to give that feedback.”

While the focus of this study was about on-site Reading, all of the focus group participants have also scored AP World History: Modern FRQs as Distributed Readers. Participant 4 discussed the lack of immediate feedback from Table Leaders in the remote setting. He expressed that he has had good leaders, but virtually he has been unable to get immediate feedback. Similarly, participant 2 spoke of dissatisfaction in a remote setting with only being able to put three essays in hold at a time and waiting for Table Leader feedback.

Additionally, this past year the Reading was extended because all student work was not scored at the end of the seven day period. All scoring was then completed online. Participant 2 referenced the remote Reading experience last year and explained that she “struggled this past
year when I was on a question that didn’t have a Table Leader after it was over. I felt like I was probably mis-scoring things.” Participants 5 and 6 corroborated that the absence of leadership was problematic. Participant 5 expressed that it was an issue when College Board did not provide Table Leaders. Similarly, participant 6 reflected on scoring online last year and shared “when we lost leadership…it was only if you happened to know somebody else who was still Reading that you were able to get any support.”

While the majority of participants spoke of having good experiences with leadership, one participant did speak to problems with ego. Participant 8 felt that 90% of the leadership put their egos aside, but she did share that ego gets in the way…and she “wishes everyone would just pocket it [their ego] during the Reading.” She shared her opinion that everyone should get through the Reading together and it should be a “leave no man behind kind of thing.”

**Collaboration**

In addition to interactions with leadership, the researcher asked participants to speak to how working with other high school teachers and college professors impacted their experience. Six participants discussed being able to “bounce ideas off others,” share lessons and ideas, and form a network. Some comments were:

- “The ability to share ideas with someone right next to you is just so helpful” (Participant 1).
- “We can talk about how do you teach this in your class period” (Participant 4).
- “We would share best lessons and it was this group, this nerdfest” (Participant 8).
“I feel like that's 100% hands down the best part about being at the Reading is the fact that you have all of your table buddies, you have your Table Leader, and honestly, I learned so much from other people just at lunch and dinner….People will kind of give me their insight on what's going on with LEQ's and I'll get to talk to the SAQ people and I mean that kind of informal collaboration is the best part for me. I've learned so much that way” (Participant 3).

“We made connections with others…connections with the college professors…I have an incredible network” (Participant 6)

“I’m surrounded by people…that are like, if I’m struggling, here’s a lesson on this” (Participant 7).

Participants also reflected on how they are sometimes the only teacher of the course at their school. Participant 5 said that “as the only AP World History teacher in the school, I had nobody to guide me.” Likewise, participant 6 shared, “I have this incredible network of colleagues that I don’t have at my own personal school.”

**Content Learned at Reading**

All focus group participants work as high school teachers and collaborate with college professors who also serve at the Read. Participant 1 discussed partnering with a college professor at her table and shared that the professor had great historical knowledge. The researcher asked participants to discuss if they found that the Reading helped them improve their content knowledge. Participant 1 was emphatic in her response and said that she “learned so much about the Indian Ocean and trading post empires” as a result of scoring the DBQ. Participant 8 said she learned about battles she had no idea about, as well as other terms that her
textbook does not address. As a long time Reader, participant 8 recalled how at earlier Readings attendees “used to get all those textbooks.” She also discussed how the College Board would schedule evening events with specialists. She reminisced, “hey, the Latin Americanist is talking tonight…We learned stuff.”

**Duration of Reading**

Not factoring in evening events, the researcher asked participants about the 56 hour duration of the Reading. She prompted participants to comment if that was too long, too short, or just right. Some participants interpreted that question from the point of view of the length of time needed to finish scoring all of the FRQs, and so the researcher had to fine tune her question. She asked participants to consider the duration from the perspective of professional development. Many participants referenced gaining an understanding of the rubric so the researcher asked them to consider if the duration was appropriate as a learner. Participant 2 expressed, “I needed like a full three to four days before I was like, oh my gosh, I see the matrix, I totally understand this.” Participant 4 echoed her sentiment and said, “Same thing, about three to four days. I think knowing the rubric and understanding how to then apply it to my teaching I could probably get done in three to four days.”

Another idea that emerged in the discussion of duration was the need for more breaks. Participant 4 said, “more breaks would help because those mornings are long.” Similarly, participant 5 expressed that “without breaks you stop being as good as you could be.” She shared that too long of a duration can “cause people to get sloppy in their grading and [she thinks] that leads to less consistency.”

**RQ2 Themes**
In conducting thematic analysis, the researched identified four themes related to research question two: *In what ways, if at all, does teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impact teachers' perceived practices and beliefs?* Similarly to RQ1, the themes aligned with the conceptual framework. As a result of the insights from focus group participants, the researcher identified the themes of understanding the rubric, teacher confidence, changes of instruction, and changes of assessment.

**Understanding the Rubric**

Participants frequently spoke of their lack of understanding of the rubric prior to attending the Reading. The DBQ for the AP World History: Modern exam contains seven documents and requires students to craft a historically defensible thesis statement, describe the broader historical context that relates to the prompt, incorporate evidence beyond the documents, source at least three documents for purpose, historical situation, point of view, or audience, and demonstrate a complex understanding of the focus of the prompt (College Board, 2020b, p. 197). Similarly, the LEQ for the AP World History: Modern exam requires students to craft a historically defensible thesis statement, describe the broader historical context that relates to the prompt, use specific evidence to support the claim, and demonstrate a complex understanding of the focus of the prompt (College Board, 2020b, p. 198). While the SAQ does not have a formal rubric, scoring guidelines are created each year by a team of leaders.

Participant 1 expressed her lack of understanding of the rubric when she said, “I felt really uncomfortable with the rubric and I really didn’t understand it.” Likewise, participant 8, who has been teaching the course for over 16 years said, “I don’t think I understood the rubric in total until I went to the Reading….I probably didn’t even get SAQ stuff until I graded it during the pandemic.” The College Board introduced the SAQ during a redesign that launched
in 2018. Similarly, participant 3 recalled how prior to attending the Read she did not have her students write a lot of DBQs because she said, “I didn’t know what to do with them….I didn’t really know how to grade them.”

**Teacher Confidence**

Prior to attending the Read, many participants reflected on their lack of understanding of the rubric. Participant 8 mentioned, “we didn’t understand what synthesis looked like or contextualization and we were seeking that validation in our classrooms.” After attending, participants reported clarity and increased teacher confidence. For example, participant 3, who spoke of not knowing what to do with DBQs in her classroom before attending the Reading, shared that “having graded DBQs professionally, I feel so much more comfortable that I work DBQs from week one.” Participant 1 agreed with her and added, “after the Read, I felt so much more comfortable with actually grading the writing.” Participant 1 also shared her lack of understanding of the rubric and reported that after attending, “knowing and understanding the rubric myself it makes it better for my students.” Along those same lines, participant 4 said, “For me, it allowed me to get a better understanding of the thesis.”

A Reader who has seen multiple changes of course requirements over the years, reflected on how each change instilled a lack of confidence in her. She stated that when SAQs first started, “it was a big deal.” However, after scoring them, her attitude is now “it’s just, we can.” She discussed all the in-class writing that her students do and shared, “If I wouldn’t have done the Reading, I would have never been that comfortable doing that.”

A participant who is in higher leadership reflected on her ability to better understand and communicate about the rubric. Participant 7 spoke of how, as a Question Leader, she had to learn “to be crystal clear to be able to explain to a Table Leader so that they feel comfortable
and can explain to a Reader what it [an acceptable response] is.” She went on to say that the clarity that is needed “gives you a sense of confidence in your own classroom.”

**Change of Instruction**

According to participants, increased understanding and confidence led them to implement changes to instruction in their own classrooms. Multiple participants discussed how they now have their students write more in their classrooms. For example, participant 3 said, “I teach DBQs a lot more….” Similarly, participants 1 and 8 said that they, too, assign more writing. Participant 8 said, “my kids last year wrote eight DBQs. I would have never given that much class time to do that before doing this.”

In addition to more writing, participants stated that they also changed how they teach the students to answer the free response questions. For example, participant 4 discussed how he’ll “have them [students] sit there and highlight their thesis, highlight their context” so that the students can visually identify if they attempted all requirements. He will also dialogue with students in class about what is considered acceptable or not. As a result of grading student work and making note of successful strategies used by other teachers, participant 3 said that she “makes sure that I make these connections or use these certain phrases.” Participant 6 shared that she became much more incisive in her instruction.

**Change of Assessment**

At the Reading, Table Leaders work with Readers to standardize scoring. Participant 6 expressed that “interrater reliability” works for consistency. Participant 1 says that she is “an advocate for group grading because I think it just makes it more consistent.” The researcher asked participants how they assess their own students differently as a result of attending the Reading and many spoke to being able to standardize scoring in their own classrooms, assess
faster and more efficiently, and felt like they could better prepare students to earn the points required.

As a result of scoring student work at the Reading, participant 1 expressed that it has made her a “more efficient and faster grader.” She also shared her ability to recognize “you either have it or you don’t.” That same concept of “you got it or you don’t” was stated by participant 6 as she shared that she “lives in a one point rubric.” In other words, Readers assess with less subjectivity and either award the rubric point or not. Participant 8 explained how she approaches assessing student work in her own classroom differently after having attended the Read. To standardize, she will now grade all the A’s of a task first before moving on to the B’s, and so forth. She, too, said, “I’m able to give each class two or three different essays because again, fast, efficient, on standard.”

However, participant 5 noted that she has seen the “inconsistency of the College Board” which informed how she assesses in her own classroom. From her experience, there have been times when an SAQ task asked students to identify and since the student did not also provide an explanation, the student did not earn the point. She explained that in teaching SAQs, “I don’t care if it says identify, I don’t care if it says explain, you’re doing the same thing every single time.” Participant 4 also expressed that he is consistent in assessing students to prepare them for earning points. He said, “I don’t care what the actual rubric is, per se, but like for SAQs, you’re doing it this way because I know that’s the safe bet to make sure that you’re going to get the point.” Participant 5 also noted that she has “become a little bit easier in my grading because of the Read.” After seeing what is acceptable at the Read, she now believes that she knows what is “good enough” and what will earn students the point.

RQ3 Themes
The researcher identified two themes connected to research question three: *In what ways, if at all, do teachers perceive that participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts student performance?* Participants spoke of improved student scores and also student growth.

**Increased Scores**

Three participants spoke of improved student scores. Participant 8 shared that after attending the Reading she reported that she has fewer students who receive one’s. Participant 2 also shared that she saw an increase in student scores. She elaborated that she saw the biggest increase after [scoring] SAQs, because “I think I thought they were easier than they were.” Finally, Participant 3 expressed the following:

I definitely have seen a change in overall results. Since I've become a Reader, my pass rate has increased every single year...no matter how you look at it, everything has gotten better consistently...less ones, more fives. This last year, I had more fives than I had ones, which is huge for me. And pass rate overall, I mean, I've crossed a threshold now to where I have 75%. And I'm at a Title One school in a rural county and teaching kids who you wouldn't expect 75% from. I owe it, a lot of it at least, to the Reading. They are able to pass the exam because I have taught them the specifics about the exam, and there's so much that I know is unknown to a lot of teachers, and not necessarily inaccessible, but just, if you don't go to the Reading, I mean, how many people are going to jump on the College Board website and read the scoring rubrics and read all of the extra notes? I mean, it's just not realistic for most teachers.

**Student Growth**
While not all participants discussed if their scores changed, five participants did speak to student growth. They mentioned improved student confidence and students performing better in future AP Social Studies classes. Participant 6 confided that she doesn’t always look at the final score. She acknowledged that she is “still getting those one’s and two’s but they’re gaining confidence in other areas.” Participant 7 said,

I see the growth not necessarily in the same school year, but those kids that come back after AP United State History…and they have those skills, and they built on those skills. So for me personally, I see that growth in later years. In how kids, you can see that their confidence level and how they write and what they write. Similarly, participant 2 discussed skills transferring to future social studies classes. She said, “even if my kids get a two for me, those same kids might get the four or the five the very following year.” Participant 8 expressed that she’ll “never get, teaching 14 years old’s, 100% pass rate…I’m worried about did you learn a skill that’s going to transfer to your next AP class? Did you grow as a thinker because of this class?”

Follow Up Analysis

As a result of analyzing the quantitative data, the researcher wanted to investigate further the perceived impact of some of the teacher profile characteristics. Two themes that emerged from the qualitative analysis were the perceptions of those in leadership roles and the differences in attending the Reading more than one time.

Leadership Positions

Three participants in the focus group discussion have held leadership roles at the on-site Reading. While the researcher did not ask specific questions to differentiate their experiences from others, on their own accord, two of them made references to learning that takes place in
those positions that is different from serving as a Reader. For example, participant 8 discussed
the ability for Table Leaders to write notes and gather samples. She said, “Readers don’t
necessarily get to do that, but as leadership we get to do that.” In addition, participant 7 spoke of
her role as Question Leader and her revelation that she needed to be more explicit to be able to
communicate to lower leadership and then to Readers.

**Number of Times Attending the Reading**

The researcher asked participants who had attended the on-site Reading more than once if
their perception of the impact of the Reading varied from year to year. Multiple participants (6
and 3) discussed that the first year it was “eye-opening.” Participant 6 described the experience
of subsequent years with the statement, “it intensified.” She said, “it just became more clear each
year and we made connections with others….it was just more.” While participant 3 agreed with
the “eye-opening” nature of the first year, she disagreed with the intensity factor. Participant 3
felt like “it has been the same since year two forward.”

Participants also discussed the idea of learning something new each year. Participant 8
explained that “each year there’s something that we’re tuning in on…if my IPR [Instructional
Planning Report] said this part was weak, I go intentionally trying to find the trend to have my
kids avoid.” Participant 5, however, expressed dissatisfaction with always being assigned the
same FRQ. Similarly, participant 6 said, “as soon as you get retrained on another question, it’s
really helpful because it just gives you more tools in your toolkit.”

The participants discussed changes in morale over time and made attributions to revisions
to the course, the change in Reading location, and the move to reading on computers.

**Integration**
In this study, the researcher developed a joint display representing the participant selection for phase two (Table 4.25). She created a display that linked quantitative results to participants purposefully selected for the focus group discussion sample. After qualitative data collection and analysis, the researcher created a second joint display to link the quantitative results from all participants with the qualitative findings from the focus group participants for the purpose of further explanation and increased understanding of the research questions.

Table 4.28

*Juxtaposed Findings from Quantitative and Qualitative Inquiry*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Quantitative Results of Survey</th>
<th>Qualitative Focus Group Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Q19 – The decision to attend the APWH Reading was self-motivated.</td>
<td>P5 – Because the [former] Chief Reader is a friend of mine, and consistently was like, do it, do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 86.75 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>P8 - He's [APSI Consultant] like you’ve got to come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 12% Agree</td>
<td>P3 - And so he [APSI consultant] gushed about it. And he told us all the first year, I had never taught AP World before, it was the first training I ever had, and he told us all as soon as you can apply to be a Reader. And then I went to another training with him about three years later, and he was like, you got to do it, you got to do it now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 1.2% Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Q15 – Activities at the APWH Reading were relevant to my classroom teaching of the course.</td>
<td>P1 - I can’t overstate how much it’s had an impact on my classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 67.5% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>P3 – ...with the actual grading of student work, and not just the exemplars...I would try to make that connection of okay, what is this teacher doing consistently to get these really high scoring DBQ’s, and I took note of a lot of the strategies they had, like they’re clearly setting up context this way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 30.1% Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 2.4% Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.28 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Quantitative Results of Survey</th>
<th>Qualitative Focus Group Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Role of Leaders  | Q18 - I found the ability to learn from a table leader beneficial to my understanding of course requirements.  
● 59% Strongly Agree  
● 32.5% Agree  
● 8.4% Disagree  | P2 - The exceptional Table Leaders was they didn't just take stuff I would put in hold aside...and be like, okay, I've graded it and I've moved on, but I got feedback that said, here's why that got the point and here's why it didn't, which then cleaned up my own grading, which then was basically like having a really good PLC partner.  
P4 - I’ve had good leaders. The entire time we were given great support, but it’s being able to say immediately, hey, I’m working on this, can you give me some feedback.  
P2 – I struggled this past year when I was on a question that didn’t have a Table Leader after it was over. I felt like I was probably mis-scoring things.  
P8 - I’d say, let's say 90% of the leadership, the best leaders are the ones that are going to give that feedback and put their ego to the side if they're challenged. The only issue that I've seen is...when ego gets in the way. | |
| Collaboration    | Q17 – Collaboration with teacher participants at the APWH Reading contributed to my learning.  
● 90.4% Strongly Agree  
● 9.6% Agree  | P1 - The ability to share ideas with someone right next to you is just so helpful.  
P4 – We can talk about, how do you teach this in your class period.  
P8 – We would share best lessons and it was this group, this nerd fest.  
P3 – I feel like that's 100% hands down the best part about being at the Reading is the fact that you have all of your table | |
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### Themes

**Quantitative Results of Survey**

- **Themes:** buddies, you have your Table Leader, and honestly I learned so much from other people just at lunch and dinner....People will kind of give me their insight on what's going on with LEQ's and I'll get to talk to the SAQ people and I mean that kind of informal collaboration is the best part for me. I've learned so much that way.

- **Qualitative Focus Group Findings:**

  - P6 – We made connections with others...connections with the college professors...I have an incredible network.

  - P7 – I'm surrounded by people...that are like, if I’m struggling, here’s a lesson on this.

### Content

**Q13 – Participation in the APWH Reading improved my AP course content knowledge.**

- **Results:**
  - 62.7% Strongly Agree
  - 31.3% Agree
  - 6% Disagree

**P1 - I read the DBQ on the Indian Ocean. I learned so much about the Indian Ocean, like Trading Post empires, so forth and so on, like, you know, just you start to talk about it.**

**P8 - I learned about battles you had no idea about. I mean our curriculum doesn't go into that.**

**P8 - We used to get all of those textbooks....and they would do those talks in the evening, where it's like, oh, hey, this Latin Americanist is talking tonight.**

### Duration

**Q16 – The 56 hours of scoring student work at the APWH Reading adequately supported my learning.**

- **Results:**
  - 67.5% Strongly Agree
  - 28.9% Agree
  - 2.4% Disagree
  - 1.2% Strongly Disagree

**P2 - I needed like a full three to four days before I was like, oh my gosh, I see the matrix, I totally understand this.**

**P4 - Same thing, about three to four days. I think knowing the rubric and understanding how to then apply it to my teaching I could probably get done in three to four days.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Quantitative Results of Survey</th>
<th>Qualitative Focus Group Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Teacher Confidence** | Q22 - As a result of the APWH Reading, I have increased belief in my ability to teach the APWH course.  
  ● 84.3% Strongly Agree  
  ● 15.7% Agree  
  Q24 - As a result of the APWH Reading, I have increased belief in how I assess student learning in my AP course.  
  ● 80.7% Strongly Agree  
  ● 19.3% Agree | P4 – More breaks would help because those mornings are long.  
  P5 - Without breaks you stop being as good as you could be...[can]cause people to get sloppy in their grading and [she thinks] that leads to less consistency.  
  P3 - Having graded DBQs professionally, I feel so much more comfortable that I work DBQs from week one.  
  P1 - After the Read, I felt so much more comfortable with actually grading the writing.  
  P8 - If I wouldn’t have done the Reading, I would have never been that comfortable doing that.  
  P7 - Gives you a sense of confidence in your own classroom. |
| **Change of Instruction** | Q21 - Participation at the APWH Reading changed how I teach the AP World History: Modern Course.  
  ● 79.5% Strongly Agree  
  ● 19.3% Agree  
  ● 1.2% Disagree | P3 - I teach DBQs a lot more.  
  P3 – I make sure that I make these connections or use these certain phrases.  
  P4 – I have them [students] sit there and highlight their thesis, highlight their context.  
  P8 - My kids last year wrote eight DBQs. I would have never given that much class time to do that before doing this. |
### Table 4.28 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Quantitative Results of Survey</th>
<th>Qualitative Focus Group Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of Assessment</td>
<td>Q23 - As a result of the APWH Reading, I have changed how I assess student learning in my AP course.</td>
<td>P1 – I am a more efficient and faster grader. You either have it or you don’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 72.3% Strongly Agree</td>
<td>P6 – I live in a one point rubric. You got it or you don’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 26.5% Agree</td>
<td>P8 - I'm going to grade all the A's first. We're going to standardize. I’m able to give each class two or three different essays because again, fast, efficient, on standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2% Disagree</td>
<td>P5 - I don’t care if it says identify, I don’t care if it says explain, you’re doing the same thing every single time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4 - I don’t care what the actual rubric is, per se, but like for SAQs, you’re doing it this way because I know that’s the safe bet to make sure that you’re going to get the point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P5 - I have become a little bit easier in my grading because of the Read.</td>
<td>P5 – I have become a little bit easier in my grading because of the Read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in Scores</td>
<td>Q26 – I have seen improvements in my student scores on the AP exam since I began serving as a Reader.</td>
<td>P8 – There's less [sic] ones...I'll never get teaching a 14 year old, I'll never get 100% pass rate. So I'm not worried about pass rate. I'm worried about did you learn a skill that's going to transfer to your next AP class? Is there a gain? Did you grow as a thinker because of this class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 79.5% Agree</td>
<td>P3 - I definitely have seen a change in overall results. Since I've become a Reader, my pass rate has increased every single year...no matter how you look at it, everything has gotten better consistently...less ones, more fives. This last year, I had more fives than I had ones, which is huge for me. And pass rate overall, I mean, I've crossed a threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 3.6% Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 16.9% Not Sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.28 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Quantitative Results of Survey</th>
<th>Qualitative Focus Group Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>now to where I have 75%. And I'm at a Title One school in a rural county and teaching kids who you wouldn't expect 75% from. I owe it, a lot of it at least, to the Reading. They are able to pass the exam because I have taught them the specifics about the exam, and there's so much that I know is unknown to a lot of teachers, and not necessarily inaccessible, but just, if you don't go to the Reading, I mean, how many people are going to jump on the College Board website and read the scoring rubrics and read all of the extra notes? I mean, it's just not realistic for most teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 - I see the growth not necessarily in the same school year, but those kids that come back after AP United State History...and they have those skills, and they built on those skills. So for me personally, I see that growth in later years. In how kids, you can see that their confidence level and how they write and what they write.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 - Even if my kids get a two for me, those same kids might get the four or the five the very following year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reflexivity and Credibility**

Throughout the study, the researcher continually reflected on her position as an AP World History Reader, Table Leader, and APSI consultant, and how her positionality impacted the study. She practiced reflexivity and took additional steps to increase the credibility and the trustworthiness of the research.

For the qualitative data collection, the researcher utilized Krueger and Casey’s (2009) suggestions for moderating a focus group and assessed her performance. The researcher believed
that she fostered an environment where participants felt comfortable speaking and that it was a casual conversation among colleagues instead of an interrogation. She set the tone in the beginning that participants “have no obligation to reply to any or all questions.” As noted, there was equitable participation amongst members (Table 4.24). The researcher built rapport by smiling, being conversational, and demonstrating that she was listening to the participants. Numerous times the researcher reflected on what the participants said as evidenced by “So a couple of you mentioned Table Leaders” and “I’m going to go back to something you said,” and “You said something that I thought was intriguing.” The researcher was also mindful of not using dichotomous questions and, early on in the conversation (5:23) was conscious of that issue and therefore re-phrased her question, “Well, this is kind of a yes or no question, but we can elaborate.” The researcher also utilized a suggestion from the authors to encourage participants to “think back.” She used expressions like, “so even reflecting back, do you feel…, and if you can think back” and “I know it might be hard to reflect back.”

Many of this researcher’s comments demonstrated the notion of keeping an open-minded about the topic such as “I’m really intrigued to dig a little deeper into this [duration]...I’d really love to hear your thoughts,” and “It’s an interesting thought, have you seen changes in your students’ scores?” However, the researcher did, at one point, acknowledge that she is “one of you” and then did share her thoughts on seeing student misconceptions in student work. This statement was early on in the conversation (7:18) and done to aid in rapport building. While she followed that up with, “But I would love to hear from you,” she realized that she should have left her experiences out.

While engaging in reflexivity enhanced the study’s credibility, the researcher also took other steps. During the collection of qualitative data, the researcher jotted notes and thoughts
during the discussion and engaged in the process of analytic memoing. Those are two skills recommended by Krueger and Casey (2009) to increase the defensibility of results. The researcher also acknowledged the importance of the lens of the participants and made sure to represent their words accurately. The researcher asked focus group participants if they wanted to provide any feedback on the transcription document with codes (Appendix I) to make sure that she transcribed and interpreted their words correctly.

The researcher also used triangulation as a research strategy. Quantitative and qualitative data sets addressed the research questions and the researcher integrated those data strands. Answering the research questions with different tools helped to reduce researcher bias.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter’s purpose was to revisit the research questions, review the study’s design, discuss data collection, provide details about the study’s participants, and analyze the data in each phase of the study. The researcher presented the quantitative data results from the teacher questionnaire and the qualitative data findings from the focus group discussion. She also demonstrated integration of the two strands of data. Furthermore, the chapter provided details about the researchers’ reflexivity and the study’s credibility. In chapter five, the researcher summarizes, provides conclusions about the results and findings, reflects on the limitations of the study, and makes recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher designed this study to evaluate if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development and if it impacts teachers and students. The study used a mixed-methods approach to uncover teacher perceptions about the structure of the AP World History: Modern Reading and to assess if participation in the Reading changed their teaching practices, knowledge, and beliefs. Furthermore, the study also investigated if teachers perceived any impact on student performance as a result of having attended the Reading. The researcher structured the study using an explanatory sequential design, which meant that the data collection and analysis occurred in two distinct stages. Stage one of the data collection and analysis consisted of quantitative data collected through a questionnaire. The second phase of data collection and analysis consisted of a focus group discussion to gather qualitative information. The researcher integrated the two strands for analysis and comparison.

Research Questions

The research questions in this study were as follows:

RQ1. In what ways, if at all, does participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading result in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development?

RQ2. In what ways, if at all, does teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impact teachers' perceived practices and beliefs?

RQ3. In what ways, if at all, do teachers perceive that participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts student performance?

Summary
Overall, participants perceived attending the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading as beneficial professional development. Collaboration, engagement, relevance to classroom practice, and the increased confidence teachers gained in teaching and assessing students were factors leading to that positive perception. While some teachers also felt that attending the AP World History: Modern Reading improved their students’ scores, others reported that they were not sure if there were increases in scores, but they felt that attending contributed to growth in student learning. The perception of the role of the Table Leader varied amongst participants, as did the perception of their ability to learn content. There was limited indication that the support of administration played a role in participants’ perceptions of the Reading experience.

**RQ1 Conclusions and Discussion**

The results and findings indicated that the AP World History: Modern Reading is beneficial professional development. No respondents disagreed with that statement, and the majority strongly agreed. While survey respondents were under no obligation to share additional comments, quite a few volunteered that the Reading was “Hands down the best PD I have experienced throughout my teaching career. I always recommend it to anyone capable of going,” and “This is the best PD I do for my AP instructional practices.”

The study investigated what might lead participants to that perception. The researcher utilized Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework (2009) as an evaluative tool. Desimone claimed that there were core critical features of effective teacher professional development: a focus on content, active learning, coherence, duration, and collective participation. The researcher also identified additional characteristics from a review of other literature that posited the additional importance of the role of administration, the impact of trainers, teacher input, and teacher attitude toward PD. The researcher studied which factors correlated with participants
indicating stronger agreements with the benefits of the Reading. Based on this study’s findings, the on-site Reading structure reflected many of those elements.

Content

Participants’ perceptions about learning content from the Reading varied. According to the literature, researchers found that professional development that emphasized discipline-specific curriculum improved student learning because the focus on content correlated with the relevance of the PD for teacher participants (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Many participants strongly agreed (62.7%) or agreed (31.3%) that the Reading improved their content knowledge and spoke to how reading student work and speaking with colleagues, some of whom are college professors, helped improve their content knowledge. However, others disagreed (6%), and commented that “in-depth content learning isn’t what I have gained.”

The data showed that in the earlier years of the Reading there was more of an emphasis on providing content enrichment for the participants. Survey and focus group participants discussed “evening speaker events” held in earlier years which increased their content knowledge. For example, a survey participant stated, “I will say that where I felt the greatest increase in my content knowledge was at the optional evening speaker events and in the ability to collaborate with tablemates.” Similarly, during the focus group discussion, a long-time Reader shared “we used to get all those textbooks and they would do those talks in the evening [with specialists].”

Teacher Engagement

Teacher engagement was one of the principles of Knowles’ adult learning theory (1963). Knowles believed that teachers were more successful when they actively participated in their learning. Desimone (2009) referred to teacher engagement as “active learning.” Studies of
professional development programs found that lecture-based PD was less likely to translate into improved teacher knowledge (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Garet et al., 2001). At the Reading, participants scored student free response questions (FRQs), which is an example of active learning.

The researcher found that the majority of participants felt engaged by the Reading activities. Most respondents strongly agreed (67.5%) or agreed (30.1%) that the Reading engaged them as a learner. One participant noted, “the in-person Read is by far better professional development and more engaging as both a learner and regarding collaboration with colleagues.” In addition, after speaking with focus group participants, the researcher felt there was an overlap between engagement and relevance. For example, teachers spoke of the benefits of scoring student work and the direct connection the activity had on their classroom practice.

**Relevance**

Desimone referred to relevance as ‘coherence’ in her Core Conceptual Framework. Relevance is the extent to which professional development aligns with a teachers’ goals and a teachers’ curriculum (Desimone, 2002; 2011). The statistical results of the Reading’s relevance to the participants’ classroom teaching of the course were very similar to the results for engagement. Based on the quantitative and qualitative data, the researcher summarized that the practice of scoring student work at the Reading is relevant to the classroom practices of AP World History: Modern teachers. Participants shared,

- The grading itself is immensely useful for learning what College Board is looking for when scoring and has certainly shaped how I approach my course.
- Seeing the trends of students from the previous year makes it better for my current students to avoid those pitfalls.
The AP Read has provided me with valuable insight into the scoring rubrics, as well as the writing structure of all FRQs.

...with the actual grading of student work, and not just the exemplars…I would try to make that connection of okay, what is this teacher doing consistently to get these really high scoring DBQ’s, and I took note of a lot of the strategies they had, like they’re clearly setting up context this way.

**Duration**

Just as there was much discrepancy in the literature review about what duration was necessary for a professional development opportunity to translate to meaningful learning, there was also not unanimity as to the appropriateness of the duration of the AP World History: Modern Reading. The on-site AP World History: Modern Reading takes place over seven days, and Readers work eight hours daily. Through the quantitative analysis, the researcher identified a direct relationship between duration and whether or not participants felt that the Reading was beneficial professional development. However, the researcher could not deduce from the quantitative data alone whether respondents felt the duration was too long, too short, or just right. Therefore, during the focus group, the researcher asked that specific question. Some participants expressed that three to four days was needed to learn and to be able to apply the rubric. Others spoke to the need for more breaks and the concern that when the duration was too long “it can cause people to get sloppy in their grading and…lead to inconsistency.”

The researcher reports that there is the sense among some that the Reading “is more about a race to grade the exams rather than talk through things on the exams.” One participant said, “they [College Board or ETS] are driving us, like, you know, there's pressure to get it done.” The duration allocated is not necessarily what is best from a professional development
standpoint, but rather more utilitarian surrounding the need to score all student responses and complete the task.

**Collaboration**

Much of the literature reviewed that related to collective participation espoused the importance of teacher collaboration in professional development. For example, Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) found PD that was collaborative aided in positive results as “teachers create a collective force for improved instruction and serve as support groups for each other’s work on their practice” (p. 10). The findings from this study indicated that teachers enthusiastically valued the collaborative nature of the Reading. All participants agreed that collaboration contributed to their learning, with 90.4% of respondents rating it a 4 (*strongly agree*).

At the on-site Reading, participants worked at a table with seven other Readers and a Table Leader. As a result, participants reported they shared ideas and made connections with fellow Readers and leaders. All focus group participants discussed the benefits of working with others and many opted to write about collaboration on the survey. In addition, many participants shared that they were the only teacher of the course at their school and felt this was one of the few opportunities to learn from peers and build a network of support. Some participant comments about the benefits of collaboration at the Reading were:

- The ability to communicate with other teachers that are in the trenches with you is invaluable, especially when you're the only teacher of the subject in your school. No one understands as well as someone that has gone through it also. The exchange of techniques and lessons, the confirmation that you are doing it right, the comradery and the fellowship and friendships make the long hours reading worth it.
As the only teacher in my building that teaches AP World History, the ability to connect with other teachers that understand my content is invaluable. I have learned from fellow high school teachers as well as made connections with college professors that I would not have had the ability to do if not for the on-site Reading. The professional connections with these fellow educators have profoundly influenced my teaching.

In the years I participated in the AP Read the discussions with the other members of my table(s) provided not only ideas on how to teach certain topics but also a much needed sounding board between professionals who face the same issues. My collaboration with them has continued even when we are not at the Read. I am the only teacher in my district who teaches AP World History: Modern. This is the only real professional development that I have been able to use.

The best part of the Reading is being able to consult with and learn from colleagues and discuss best practices.

Other comments made by participants corroborated additional findings from the literature review. The researcher reviewed literature about informal collaborative opportunities, such as EdCamps and TeachMeets (Fischer et al., 2019a; Holme et al., 2019). In addition, Kyndt et al. (2016) analyzed 74 studies about teachers’ informal learning and found that a common space that facilitated interactions generated collaboration. Multiple participants in this study spoke to informal opportunities to collaborate. One focus group participant discussed how she “learns so much from other people just at lunch and dinner.” Survey respondents also wrote,

- It is often the non-reading times (breaks, lunch, evenings) where ideas and lessons are shared between colleagues. I have also been able to take ideas back to my school and share with other department members.
Interestingly, it is the self-directed activities at the Read that really helped, like ‘lunch and learns,’ that were set up by the teacher social media groups.

**Role of Administration**

Researchers in the field of teacher professional development found that it was difficult for teachers to engage in meaningful PD without the support of their administration (Fischer et al., 2019b; Hauge 2019; Klopfenstein, 2003; Kyndt et al., 2016; Martin et al. 2019; Varga-Atkins, 2009). However, this researcher did not find the role of administration to have an impact in this study. In quantitative analysis, the researcher did not identify a dependence between the support of administration and whether the Reading was seen as beneficial professional development. As a result, the researcher did not discuss the topic during the focus group discussion.

The researcher believes there are a couple of reasons why this factor did not prove meaningful. First, the Reading is held in June when many school districts are not in session. Therefore, many participants do not have to seek release time from school. In addition, the costs associated with attending are paid for by the College Board and not by the teacher or school district.

**Teacher Input and Attitudes**

As mentioned, the Reading takes place in June. Therefore, high school is no longer in session in many parts of the country and teachers are on summer break. Based on the timing of the Reading, many participants voluntarily give up some of their summer holiday. Studies by Kennedy (2016) and Martin et al. (2019) found that when teachers are mandated to attend PD as opposed to choosing to attend, there is less success. Participants in this study reported an intrinsic desire to attend. The teacher questionnaire results showed that 98.7% of participants strongly agreed or agreed that the decision to attend was self-motivated. The one respondent who
indicated disagree was a focus group participant. She spoke to how she attended due to the recommendations of a Reader. While she may have felt pressure, she still decided to attend, as opposed to her school district mandating her attendance. Others in the focus group also spoke of how they were encouraged by Readers to attend.

Klein and Riordan (2009) determined that the teachers’ level of excitement about the PD was a determining factor in how much implementation took place. In this case, the researcher also believed that the level of excitement played a role in how Readers recommended attending the Read to others. For example, a participant exclaimed, “I was highly encouraged to participate in the Reading by the previous APWH teacher in my building and I do the same to other AP teachers I meet.” Further evidence to support this claim was that 70 of the 83 survey respondents had attended the Reading more than once.

Role of Leaders

Much literature on teacher professional development discussed the trainer's or leader’s impact on teacher learning. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) and Firestone et al. (2020) concluded that “expert input” provided a supportive role for teachers and was a determinant in whether the PD offering was effective. In this study, participants had mixed feelings about whether the Table Leader at the AP World History: Modern Reading was beneficial to aiding in their learning. This question received more disagree responses than any other (8.4%). The researcher investigated this further in the focus group discussion.

Many participants raved about their experiences with Table Leaders and expressed how the Table Leaders provided meaningful feedback. A survey participant supported a finding from Kennedy (2016) that individuals who led effective programs had experience working with teachers and truly understood their participants' problems and experiences. The respondent in
this study shared that “The discussions were very beneficial, especially if the TL was a good high school teacher.”

Participants also expressed their dissatisfaction with scoring in the absence of a Table Leader, as can happen in a virtual setting at times. The reoccurring comments about the structure of the virtual Read in relation to the role of the Table Leader substantiated the value that Readers placed on having good leadership.

However, both in the focus group and through the survey, participants shed light on problems with leadership. In the focus group discussion, a participant shared,

I'd say, let's say 90% of the leadership, the best leaders are the ones that are going to give that feedback and put their ego to the side if they're challenged. The only issue that I've seen is…when ego gets in the way.

That participant also discussed the power that some have to blacklist others from advancing. A survey participant similarly stated, “I disagree with the way that the leadership assigns roles. I feel that I had to know someone to get into my role.”

**RQ1 Summary**

The results and findings indicated that the AP World History: Modern Reading is beneficial professional development and that the teachers’ decision to attend was self-motivated. Participants indicated that actively scoring student work was engaging and relevant to their classroom practice. In addition, participants perceived that the ability to collaborate with others also contributed to their learning. While 56 hours of scoring students work was thought by some to be too lengthy, participants indicated that it was of a long enough duration for them to gain understanding and to support their learning. The perception of the role of the table leader and of the ability to learn content varied amongst participants. There was limited indication that the
support of administration played a role in whether the Reading was seen as beneficial professional development.

**RQ2 Conclusions and Discussion**

The study’s results and findings indicated that the AP World History: Modern Reading impacted teachers’ perceived practices and beliefs. As a result of attending the Reading, teachers said they modified instruction and assessment practices. Participants also experienced perceived gains in confidence. These findings aligned with Desimone’s framework (2009) which integrated a theory of instruction and change as a result of attending effective professional development.

**Changes in Knowledge and Beliefs**

Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework (2009) claimed that a result of effective teacher professional development was that teachers gained increased knowledge and skills that corresponded with changes in attitudes and beliefs. As a result of this study, the researcher found that AP World History: Modern on-site Reading participants experienced increased knowledge and improved beliefs in their ability to teach the course and assess their students. Survey participants spoke to increased knowledge gained as a result of attending the Reading.

- The AP Read has provided me with valuable insight into the scoring rubrics, as well as the writing structure of all FRQs. The trainings to 'get on standard' are extremely helpful, especially when in person.
- The nuance of what is acceptable for earning a point which is not clearly communicated on the rubric is grasped at the in-person Reading.
- Being an AP Reader helped me understand the level of skills students needed to do well in the exam. I truly didn’t understand the scope of the course until I became a Reader.
All participants strongly agreed or agreed that as a result of attending the Reading they increased their belief in their abilities to teach the course and to assess student learning in their classrooms. Survey respondents shared:

- Scoring essays gave me the utmost confidence that how I scored my students’ work was preparing them for the exam and future academic courses.
- The confirmation that you are doing it [assessing student learning] right...make the long hours reading worth it.
- Valuable professional contacts add to my worth as a professional educator.
- I devote much more class time to writing skills since being a Reader, mostly because I believe in my abilities to teach those skills more with the confirmation that I know what College Board wants to see.
- My confidence in applying the rubric came largely from the scoring itself.
- It [the Reading] allows you to get an "inside" view on the scoring process, and feel much more confident. And we all know that confidence in a teacher breeds confidence in the students in the classroom.

Similarly, focus group participants expressed in detail the lack of clarity they had regarding internalizing and applying the rubrics before attending the Reading, and improved understanding and confidence in the rubrics as a result of attending the Reading.

**Changes in Instruction**

According to Desimone (2009), changes in instruction took place as a result of effective professional development, increased teacher knowledge and skills, and changes in teacher beliefs. The researcher found that to be true for this study. All but one respondent to the survey indicated that they changed how they teach the course as a result of attending the Read. Many
participants spoke of “the exchange of techniques and lessons” amongst attendees. Focus group participants elaborated that they teach much more writing, and survey respondents shared similar takeaways.

- The grading itself is immensely useful for learning what College Board is looking for when scoring and has certainly shaped how I approach my course. I devote much more class time to writing skills since being a Reader.
- Having a greater understanding of the rubric has changed my teaching practices around skill development and assessment. I train my students to become more critical readers of each other’s work during class time.
- Seeing the trends of students from the previous year makes it [my instruction] better for my current students to avoid those pitfalls. Reading in person helps me understand in real time what changes I need to make in my own practice.
- It absolutely helps me teach essay writing skills better. It has given me better ideas for activities.

The quantitative data analysis indicated that the number of years a teacher participated in the Reading and if a participant held a leadership role influenced how likely the participant was to respond that they did change their teaching practices. Almost half of the survey respondents had attended the Read five or more times (49.4%). More than a third of the study participants held a leadership role at the Reading (31.3%). After analyzing both strands of data, the researcher believes there is benefit from attending the Reading more than once, as the learning and networking increased in subsequent years. Participants shared that their learning “intensified” and became “more clear [sic] each year and we made connections with others.” Another participant expressed that “each year there’s something that we’re tuning in on.” Furthermore,
Readers can be assigned to score different FRQs each year and that “as soon as you get retrained on another question, it’s really helpful because it just gives you more tools in your toolkit.”

In addition, experiencing the Read as a leader provides additional opportunities for learning and understanding. A Question Leader reflected on the depth of understanding necessary from the point of view of someone in higher leadership. She shared that a leader needs to be “crystal clear to be able to explain to a Table Leader so that they can explain to a Reader” and that the clarity that is needed “gives you a sense of confidence in your own classroom.” A Table Leader also discussed that there is more of an ability to write notes and gather samples in that position.

**Changes in Assessing Students**

In conjunction with changes in instruction, this study also revealed that AP World History: Modern teachers who attended the Reading made changes in their assessment practices. Similar to the question about changes in instruction, all but one respondent to the survey indicated that they changed how they assess student learning as a result of attending the Read. Many AP World History: Modern teachers who have attended the Reading stated that they can assess student work faster and more efficiently and are more standardized in their grading. Teachers who attended the Reading said they can apply the rubric less subjectively. Focus group participants expressed the idea that “you got it or you don’t” when referring to awarding rubric points.

Additionally, participants expressed that they gained insight into what constituted acceptable responses at the Reading. Due to that knowledge, the teachers reported that they could better prepare students to meet with success.

**Additional Impact on Teachers**
In this study, the researcher also noticed an additional impact of the Reading on teacher attendees. The researcher identified the practice of Reading participants’ turn-keying learning to non-participants. As demonstrated in a study by Sun et al. (2013) that focused on writing PD, teachers who participated in PD of longer duration were more likely to help others with teaching writing, which indicated a spillover effect. That ‘spillover’ effect was evidenced in statements by participants such as, “And now I am the lead in training other folks in my department who are finally taking on AP,” and “I have also been able to take ideas back to my school and share with other department members.”

**RQ2 Summary**

The study’s results and findings indicated that the AP World History: Modern Reading impacted teachers’ perceived practices and beliefs. Participants shared that they experienced increased knowledge and improved their beliefs in their ability to teach the course and assess their students. As a result of attending the Reading, teachers said that they modified instruction and assessment practices. In addition, participants turn-keyed their learning from the Reading to other non-participants.

**RQ3 Conclusions and Discussion**

This study investigated the perceived impact of participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading on student performance. The final piece of Desimone’s Core Conceptual Framework (2009) involved improved student learning as a result of effective teacher professional development, changes in teacher knowledge and beliefs, and changes in instruction. As a result of this study, the researcher found many teachers reported that students’ scores improved after they had attended the AP World History: Modern Reading. However, even for
those who did not indicate increases in their own students’ scores, participants indicated student growth as a result.

**Increased Scores**

When asked if participants had seen growth in student scores since they began serving as a Reader, 79.5% reported that they had. Survey participants shared comments like “my students’ essay scores improved” and “there’s less [sic] one’s.” Focus group participants also expressed improvements in scores. One teacher said,

> I definitely have seen a change in overall results. Since I've become a Reader, my pass rate has increased every single year… less ones, more fives. This last year, I had more fives than I had ones, which is huge for me. And pass rate overall, I mean, I've crossed a threshold now to where I have 75%. And I'm at a Title One school in a rural county and teaching kids who you wouldn't expect 75% from. I owe it, a lot of it at least, to the Reading.

Logistic regression analysis indicated that the number of years the teacher had been teaching the course predicted how likely the participant was to respond that their student scores increased. The analysis predicted that as the number of years teaching the course increased, the value of student scores improving decreased. That finding is in line with much research about the impact of teacher experience and teacher effectiveness. “Studies generally have found that although teachers improve at greater rates during the first few years of their careers, teachers continue to improve, albeit at lesser rates, throughout their careers” (Kini & Podolsky, 2016). However, the researcher does not believe this study yielded significant findings to substantiate that there is much of a difference in student score results from those who have attended the Read correlated to the number of years the participant had been teaching the course. Upon further
analysis, the survey data revealed that the majority of not sure responses were from participants who have only been teaching the course for 2-6 years. Since College Board does not accept AP World History: Modern Readers who have not taught the course for two years, many participants in that bracket of years probably have not had enough time to determine if student scores had improved.

**Student Growth**

As indicated, some respondents (16.9%) were unsure if, after attending the Reading, their student scores had improved. However, many participants supported the findings of Klopfenstein (2003) that if a student did not perform well on the AP examination, that did not mean that said student didn’t learn valuable skills in the course and demonstrate growth. During the focus group discussion, multiple participants expressed that they had seen student growth in the form of increased student confidence and students performing better in future AP Social Studies classes. One participant shared,

I see the growth not necessarily in the same school year, but those kids that come back after AP United State History…and they have those skills, and they built on those skills. So, for me personally, I see that growth in later years. In how kids, you can see that their confidence level and how they write and what they write.

Klopfenstein (2003) also concluded that it was important not to fixate on student test scores as a stand-alone measure of success. A participant in this study stated, “I'm not worried about pass rate. I'm worried about did you learn a skill that's going to transfer to your next AP class? Is there a gain? Did you grow as a thinker because of this class?”

Guskey (2008) stated that many contextual factors impacted student performance. Focus group participants discussed the differences between teaching this course to ninth graders versus
sophomores, juniors, or seniors, and the challenges of teaching in lower-income schools. One participant said, “teaching a 14 year old, I'll never get 100% pass rate.”

**RQ3 Summary**

The study’s results and findings indicated that many teachers perceived that students’ scores improved after they had attended the Reading. However, other participants were not sure if their students’ scores improved, but did not indicate increases in student growth in the form of increased student confidence and students performing better in future AP Social Studies classes.

**Final Conclusions**

AP World History: Modern teachers need training to understand the course and exam requirements and best prepare their students for success. This study found that attending the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading is beneficial teacher professional development. The structure of the in-person Reading provides meaningful collaboration with fellow high school teachers and college professors. In addition, per the responses, the activities at the Reading engage participants and are relevant to the attendees’ classroom practice.

As a result of the research about attending the Reading, teachers perceived increased knowledge and understanding of exam requirements, most notably how to internalize and apply the scoring rubrics. Furthermore, the participants perceived increased levels of confidence in their abilities to instruct students and assess student learning. The study also found that increased knowledge and understanding can be gained from attending the Reading more than once and from holding a leadership position.

Many teachers perceived that attending the AP World History: Modern Reading improved their students’ scores. The study also found that attending the Reading contributed to
perceived growth in student learning in other areas, such as increased student confidence and with students performing better in future AP Social Studies classes.

**Limitations of the Study**

The researcher acknowledges that this study has limitations. For example, there could have been improvements in survey design to increase reliability and also glean more knowledge. The researcher also acknowledges limitations with the sampling in that the recruitment method was solely through social media and the sample size was lower than she had anticipated.

First, in terms of survey design, the survey's *Impact on student scores* section only consisted of two questions. Additionally, one of those two used a different scale. Question 26 asked participants if they saw improvements in student scores on the AP exams since becoming a Reader. The response selections veered from the 4-point Likert scale and only consisted of *agree, disagree,* and *not sure.* As such, it was difficult to assess the reliability of the instrument for that section. However, correlation between the items was calculable and important findings still resulted. In hindsight, the researcher also wishes she had collected the state in which the participant taught for teacher demographic information. The analysis of that information might have shed new insight into the role of administration. Participants who teach in a state where their school is not yet on summer break in June need school district approval for release time.

Another limitation identified was the external validity of the data. The researcher recruited participants through the AP World History: Modern Teachers Facebook page and the AP World: Modern NerdFest 2021 Facebook page. The researcher acknowledged that all Readers were not on those social media pages. However, those two groups allowed the researcher to reach over 7,500 AP World History: Modern teachers. The researcher believed that was a large enough population to draw from and it provided the ability to reach geographically
diverse participants. The researcher also used purposeful sampling to select qualitative participants with differing viewpoints.

Lastly, based on the number of teachers in the AP World History Teachers Facebook group, the researcher anticipated that the sample size would be larger. However, there was much traffic on the AP World History Teacher Facebook page so it was easy for a post to get overlooked. In addition, there was the possibility that people did not want to take the time to respond to a survey. Due to the initial low response rate, the researcher implemented a secondary plan and posted the survey to the AP World: Modern NerdFest 2021 Facebook page. That yielded more success. Yet, with 83 participants the findings of this study still offer new information that has useful implications for multiple stakeholders.

**Implications of the Study**

This study contributes to the field and can benefit many stakeholders. It can add to the body of knowledge about effective teacher professional development characteristics and build upon previous studies related to AP professional development opportunities. As mentioned in chapter 1, there are few studies evaluating the impact of attending the AP World History: Modern Reading and little in the field about the impact of teacher attendance at College Board Readings. A study about the impact of attending the AP Statistics Reading that used quantitative methods found that teachers gained knowledge about teaching strategies and content, found value in collaborating with peers, and better understood student misconceptions as a result of attending the Reading (Jacobbe, et al., 2013). This study about the impact of attending the AP World History: Modern Reading has similar findings. The researcher believes this current study is generalizable to other AP disciplines.
This study can encourage teachers to apply to become a Reader because it supplies knowledge of the benefits of attending. It may also encourage Readers to continue to serve, since there is evidence that the number of times participating in the Read generates deeper learning. It may also help Readers determine which Reading opportunity (on-site or remote) to attend. While this study evaluated the on-site Reading experience, many participants shared insights about the different experiences between in-person and distributed Reads. The common refrain was that the remote Read does not allow for as much feedback and learning. Participants shared, “The remote Read is not nearly as effective, and if I were a first time Reader the training would do me very little good,” and “I firmly believe that in-person at the site is much better than online at home. I have done both over the past five years (pandemic era) and there is more professional development on-site by far.” Being mindful of the theory of Andragogy (Knowles, 1963), and that for some, the in-person Reading may not be logistically possible, when there is the equal ability to choose one or the other, these findings may help teachers decide.

The study can also help inform school district administrators about the value of attending so that they may encourage and support attendance as a form of effective teacher professional development. High school institutions may also benefit, as employing teachers who serve as Readers could increase their rankings if student scores increase as a result of teachers’ attendance.

Another important implication of this study is that if more teachers do become Readers, students might benefit. The study found that participants perceived student learning improved as a result of their teachers having attended the Reading. In addition, some teachers believed students experienced increases in test scores and experienced transference of skills to future courses as a result of being taught by those who had participated in the Reading.
Lastly, the College Board can benefit from this study, as research that substantiates the value of their offering may generate more interested Reader applicants which can help them score student responses. The College Board may also use the information found in this study to re-evaluate the opportunities provided to Readers, both in-person and virtually. Many participants expressed dissatisfaction with changes in Reading experiences over the years. Participants expressed that “it’s unfortunate that off-site Readers do not have the same experiences and options as on-site Readers.” Another said,

I have watched the AP Reading change since I first started as a Reader in 2002. I still feel that it was much better when I first started. I do feel that there was much more of an emphasis on the Reader by giving out [providing opportunities for] professional development.

Others spoke of the benefits of evening talks by specialists that could be brought back and streamed for distributed Readers.

Recommendations for Future Research

As a result of this study, the researcher envisions future research. While this study did not intend to evaluate the differences in Reading experiences for on-site versus distributed Readers, it is certainly a valuable topic for a future study. Participants wanted to talk and share their feelings about the different options. As the College Board seems to be increasing the virtual scoring piece, such a study could have practical implications.

Due to only sampling participants through social media platforms, the researcher could conduct the same research, but survey participants at the actual in-person Reading as opposed to online recruitment. While she feels the sample population of those who attend the Read and
those who join the course specific Facebook groups may be similar, addressing the same research problem in a different context may corroborate the findings or yield new insights.

Another idea for future research involves addressing the same research problem with a different method. For example, the researcher could utilize a case study approach where she contacts local Social Studies coordinators to conduct an in-depth case study of one geographic area.

Finally, to investigate research question three about the impact of the Reading on student scores, utilizing actual score reports instead of teacher perceptions would provide more information. Researchers (Chan, 2008; Jupp, 2006) found that subjects may exaggerate responses or answer what they perceive is the socially accepted response. Therefore, replacing self-reported data with concrete student exam scores might yield different results.

**Final Reflections**

AP World History: Modern teachers are challenged with preparing young students to meet with success on a college level examination. The researcher postulated that teachers of this course needed specific training on the particular competencies involved in the AP World History: Modern course. Teachers, school district administrators, and the College Board should all be working together to support student learning. One approach to meet that aim is by attending, supporting, and providing effective teacher professional development.

The results and findings of this study indicated that the AP World History: Modern Reading is a beneficial form of teacher professional development. The study found that teachers who attended the Reading expressed increased knowledge and understanding of exam requirements and increased their levels of confidence in their abilities to instruct students and
assess student learning. As a result, participants expressed that attending the Reading positively impacted student learning.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Impact of Attending the AP World History: Modern On-Site Reading-
Teacher Questionnaire

Directions: Please complete the survey and select “submit” when finished. The survey should take no more than 10 minutes to complete.

Introduction

1. Gender
   1. Male
   2. Female
   3. Non-binary
   4. I prefer not to say

2. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
   1. 2-6
   2. 7-15
   3. 16 or more

3. How many years of experience do you have teaching the AP World History: Modern course?
   1. 2-6
   2. 7-15
   3. 15 or more

4. How many times have you participated in the AP World History: Modern on-site (in-person) Reading?
   1. 1 time
   2. 2 - 4 times
   3. 5 or more times

5. Which free-response questions have you been assigned to score at the on-site Reading? (Check all that apply)
   1. DBQ
   2. LEQ
   3. SAQ

6. Have you served in any of the following Leadership roles at the Reading? (Check all that apply)
1. Table Leader (TL)
2. Early Table Leader (ETL)
3. Question Leader (QL)
4. I have not served in a leadership role at the Reading

7. Which of the following degrees have you completed?
   1. Undergraduate major in History
   2. Undergraduate minor in History
   3. Graduate degree in History
   4. None of the above

8. Which of the following best describes your school setting?
   1. Urban public
   2. Rural public
   3. Suburban public
   4. Private
   5. Charter
   6. International School

9. How would you describe your AP Students?
   1. All students in my AP course have strong academic skills
   2. Most students in my AP course have strong academic skills
   3. Some students in my AP course have strong academic skills
   4. Few students in my AP course have strong academic skills

10. How many AP World History: Modern students do you teach each school year?
    1. Under 20
    2. 21-50
    3. 51-75
    4. 76 +

11. What is your average class size for a section of the AP World History: Modern course?
    1. Under 10
    2. 11-18
    3. 19-25
    4. 26-30
    5. 31 +

**Perceptions of Professional Development Characteristics**
12. Participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading was beneficial to me as professional development.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

13. Participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading improved my AP course content knowledge.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

14. Participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading engaged me as a learner.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

15. Activities at the AP World History: Modern Reading were relevant to my classroom teaching of the course.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

16. The 56 hours of scoring student work at the AP World History: Modern Reading adequately supported my learning.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

17. Collaboration with teacher participants at the AP World History: Modern Reading contributed to my learning.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree
18. I found the ability to learn from a table leader beneficial for my understanding of course requirements.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

19. The decision to attend the AP World History: Modern Reading was self-motivated.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

20. My school district administration supports my attendance at the AP World History: Modern Reading.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

Perceived Change of Teacher Practices / Teacher Knowledge and Beliefs

21. Participation at the AP World History: Modern Reading changed how I teach the AP World History: Modern Course.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

22. As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have increased belief in my ability to teach the AP World History: Modern course.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

23. As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have changed how I assess student learning in my AP course.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

24. As a result of the AP World History: Modern Reading, I have increased belief in my ability to assess student learning in my AP course.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

**Perceived Impact on Students**

25. As a result of my participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading, I expect better student performance on the AP exam than if I had not participated.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

26. I have seen improvements in my student scores on the AP exam since I began serving as a Reader.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree
   3. Not sure

**Optional Open-Ended Question**

Please feel free to share any comments related to the AP World History: Modern Reading as it relates to professional development, instructional practices and beliefs, and/or student performance.

(Optional) If you would like your name to be entered into a drawing for one of five $20 gift cards, please enter your name and email below.
Name _________________________ Email _________________________

(Optional) If you would be willing to participate in a follow-up focus group discussion via Zoom at a mutually agreeable time, please enter your name and email below.
Name _________________________ Email _________________________

Thank you for your participation!
Appendix B – Communication to Colleagues for Survey Feedback

Good morning, name of Reader,

I am reaching out because I am currently working on an academic dissertation. The purposes of the study are to evaluate if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective professional development and to learn if it impacts teachers and students. This is an independent study not connected to the College Board. I will be asking for any and all who have attended the on-site (in-person) Reading to complete a survey that should take no more than 10 minutes.

At this time, I am contacting you because I value your insight and expertise. I want to make sure that the survey measures the intended concepts and that the questions are clear. Would you be willing to read the questionnaire and then provide your feedback?

If you are willing to help, please read and send back by September 29, 2022. Use the link below: https://8gqihkh5xst.typeform.com/to/PW6zH9Mi

Thank you so much for your help.

Sincerely,

Christina Cone
Appendix C – Survey Feedback Questions

Thank you for reading the survey. At this time, I would like to ask for your feedback regarding the questionnaire.

Please note that the following are the research questions for the study:

*RQ1.* In what ways, if at all, does participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading result in the perception that it is effective teacher professional development?

*RQ2.* In what ways, if at all, does teacher participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impact teachers' perceived practices and beliefs?

*RQ3.* In what ways, if at all, do teachers perceive that participation in the AP World History: Modern Reading impacts student performance?

1. Does the survey fulfill the data collection needs of the study as defined in the purpose of the research and in these three research questions? If not, how could the survey be improved? Explain.

2. Were directions for completing the survey clear? Explain.

3. Were the statements clear? Explain.

4. Were there any statements that you feel need revision? Explain.
5. Were there any grammatical, structure, or spelling errors? Explain.

6. Approximately how long did it take you to complete the survey?

7. Were there any issues with the navigation of the survey? If so, please explain.

Thank you very much. Your time, input and expertise are appreciated.
Appendix D: Teacher Focus Group Discussion Protocol

OPENING - Welcome and thank you for agreeing to participate in a discussion about the impact of attending the AP World History: Modern on-site reading on your teaching and students. I would like to state that I, Christina, am speaking today from the position of a researcher pursuing my doctorate, and not on behalf of the College Board. I want to acknowledge that you voluntarily agreed to participate today and answer any questions. To be sure that we have an accurate record of today’s conversation, I am going to supplement my notes by using Zoom, with audio and video, as previously agreed to by all participants. If anyone has any concerns with this plan, please let me know before we proceed.

Today is November 30, 2022 and I am speaking with AP World History: Modern teachers who have participated in the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading. I am going to be posing some questions in regard to the AP World History: Modern Reading. If there is anything you do not know the answer to or do not feel comfortable answering, that is fine. You have no obligation to reply to all of the questions. This should not take longer than one hour.

● Why did you choose to become a reader?
  ○ Did your administration support your attendance at the Reading?
● What are your thoughts about how the Reading is structured?
  ○ Did you feel the activities that you participated in had relevance to your classroom?
  ○ Did you find the practice of scoring student assessments beneficial?
  ○ How did working with a table leader impact your experience?
Was the duration of the Reading appropriate? Too long? Too short? Just right?

Did you find working with other high school teachers and college professors useful?

How has the Reading impacted your teaching?

Did your content knowledge improve?

Do you feel that you can now teach the course in a better way?

Do you feel that you can now better prepare students for the exam?

If so, can you share what you do differently as a result of the Reading to prepare students for the exam?

Do you feel that you can now better assess student work?

If so, can you share what you do differently as a result of the Reading to assess students work?

Did you make any changes in your instruction as a result of participation?

If so, can you share what changes were made?

How do you feel your attendance at the Reading has impacted your students?

Have you seen improvements, declines, or no change in student scores?

If scores have not improved, can you discuss why you think that might be?

If scores have declined, can you discuss why you think that might be?

If scores have not changed, can you discuss why you think that might be?

If scores have not changed, can you discuss other impacts that you have noted?

For those of you who have attended the Reading more than once, did the experience, or your perception of the Readings’ impact, vary from year to year? If so, what factors were different?

What do you feel are the strengths of the Reading?
- What do you feel are the weaknesses of the Reading?
- Is there anything else you would like to share?

CLOSING - Thank you very much for your time. I will be following up with you to allow you to provide feedback on the draft of the transcription and analysis. You will be under no obligation to do so, but if you would like, you will have the opportunity to verify the accuracy of your words and the researcher’s analysis in an effort to minimize researcher bias. I will also share with you the results of the study when it is completed. Thank you again.
Calling all on-site AP Readers!!! I am a long-time AP World teacher and contributor to this group. I am currently working on an academic dissertation and would like to conduct research. The purpose of the study is to evaluate if the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading is effective professional development. This is an independent study and not connected to the College Board.

I am asking for any and all who have attended the on-site (in-person) Reading to complete a survey that should take no more than 10 minutes. This can be done completely confidentially, or if you would like to supply your email there is the option of entering to win one of five $20 Amazon gift cards as a thank you. I will also gladly share the results of the study with this group.

The survey will be open from now until October 28th. Your help will be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please contact Christina Cone at Christina.Cone@my.liu.edu. Thank you!

Link will be included here. (https://8gqihkh5xst.typeform.com/to/Z9K8zbv3)
Appendix F: Informed Consent Document for Teacher Questionnaire

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Study Title: An analysis of if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development.

Faculty Investigator: Dr. Louisa Vida, Educational Leadership, Educational Technology, and Interdisciplinary Ed.D. (Post), 720 Northern Blvd, Greenvale, NY 11548, Louisa.Vida@liu.edu address, 516-299-2150.

Student Investigator: Christina Cone, Educational Leadership, Educational Technology, and Interdisciplinary Ed.D. (Post), christina.cone@my.liu.edu, 631-371-1776

You are being asked to join a research study. Participation in this study is voluntary. Even if you decide to join now, you can change your mind later.

This research is being done to evaluate the role of the AP World History: Modern Reading as professional development and to examine its impact on teachers and students.
People who have participated in the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading may join. Please note that the on-site Reading refers to the in-person Reading, as opposed to the distributed Reading, or remote Reading.

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire where you will read statements and select the option that most closely represents your response. This should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

The risks associated with participation in this study are no greater than those encountered in daily life. Although your IP Address will not be stored in the survey results, there is always the possibility of tampering from an outside source when using the Internet for collecting information. While the confidentiality of your responses will be protected once the data is downloaded from the Internet, there is always the possibility of hacking or other security breaches that could threaten the confidentiality of your responses. There is the risk that information about you may become known to people outside this study. Even if identifiers are removed, the information will not be used or distributed for future research studies.

While there is no direct benefit for your participation in the study, if you choose to participate what you are doing is of benefit to the field of professional development.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You choose whether to participate. If you decide not to participate, there are no penalties, and you will not lose any benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled.
In compensation for your time, if you supply your email address I can enter you into a pool to win a $20 Amazon gift card. You understand that you may stop participation at any time. However, you also understand that you will only be eligible to receive the research compensation if you complete the research protocol and your participation is deemed adequate.

Any study records that identify you will be kept confidential to the extent possible by law. The records from your participation may be reviewed by people responsible for making sure that research is done properly, including members of the Long Island University Institutional Review Board and officials from government agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the Office for Human Research Protections. (All of these people are required to keep your identity confidential.) Otherwise, records that identify you will be available only to people working on the study, unless you give permission for other people to see the records.

All data will be secured through encryption processes and IP addresses will not be stored. Before reviewing the results, the researcher will de-identify any submissions from the dataset that voluntarily included email addresses for the purpose of winning a gift card or indicating agreement to participate in the focus group in order to insure anonymity during the data analysis. Data collected will be destroyed after five years. Results will be reported only in the aggregate.

This study has been reviewed by an Institutional Review Board (IRB), a group of people that reviews human research studies. The IRB can help you if you have questions about your rights as a research participant or if you have other questions, concerns or complaints about this research
study. You may contact the IRB at osp@liu.edu.

Contact the student investigator, Christina Cone at 631-371-1776, christina.cone@my.liu.edu or the faculty investigator, Dr. Louisa Vida at 516-299-2150, Louisa.Vida@liu.edu. If you wish, you may contact the principal investigator by letter. The address is on page one of this consent form. You can also contact the department chair, Dr. Tonie McDonald at 516-299-2267, Tonie.McDonald@liu.edu. If you cannot reach the investigators or wish to talk to someone else, contact the IRB office at osp@liu.edu.

You can ask questions about this research study now or at any time during the study.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or feel that you have not been treated fairly, please call the Institutional Review Board at Long Island University at osp@liu.edu.

By marking the “Agree to Participate” box below, you are indicating that you have fully read the above text and have had the opportunity to print the consent form (printable at this link - https://bit.ly/3qHxHJG) and ask questions about the purposes and procedures of this study. If you choose not to participate, please choose the “Decline to Participate” box below.

☐ I agree to participate

☐ I decline to participate
Appendix G: Focus Group Discussion Participant Email

Thank you so much for completing the survey about the AP World History: Modern Reading and for indicating your willingness to participate in a focus group discussion.

Again, I am currently working on an academic dissertation. The purposes of the research study are to evaluate if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective professional development and to learn if it impacts teachers and students. This is an independent study not connected to the College Board.

I would like to hold a discussion with AP World History teachers who have attended the on-site Reading on Zoom on November 30, 2022 at 7:00pm Eastern Time. I expect that this should take approximately one hour. If you are able to make it at that time, I ask that you read the linked informed consent (https://8gqihkh5xst.typeform.com/to/bbCPZzIX). If you accept, I will follow up by emailing you the Zoom link.

If you have any questions, please contact Christina Cone at Christina.Cone@my.liu.edu.

Your help is greatly appreciated. Thank you!
Appendix H: Informed Consent Document for Focus Group Discussion

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

**Study Title:** An analysis of if the AP World History: Modern Reading is effective teacher professional development.

**Faculty Investigator:** Dr. Louisa Vida, Educational Leadership, Educational Technology, and Interdisciplinary Ed.D. (Post), 720 Northern Blvd, Greenvale, NY 11548, Louisa.Vida@liu.edu address, 516-299-2150.

**Student Investigator:** Christina Cone, Educational Leadership, Educational Technology, and Interdisciplinary Ed.D. (Post), christina.cone@my.liu.edu, 631-371-1776.

You are being asked to join a research study. Participation in this study is voluntary. Even if you decide to join now, you can change your mind later.
This research is being done to evaluate the role of the AP World History: Modern Reading as professional development and to examine its impact on teachers and students.

People who have participated in the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading may join. Please note that the on-site Reading refers to the in-person Reading, as opposed to the distributed Reading, or remote Reading. In addition, you have received this invitation because you completed the teacher questionnaire about your perceptions of the Reading and you indicated your willingness to take part in the focus group discussion.

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to participate in a focus group discussion in which you respond to questions about your attendance at the AP World History: Modern Reading. This should take approximately one hour. The focus group will be held on Zoom on November 30, 2022 at 7:00pm Eastern Time.

As part of this research, we are requesting your permission to create and use a video recording and audio recording of the Zoom session. The recording will not be used for advertising or non-study related purposes.

You should know that:

● You may request that the recording be stopped at any time.
● If you agree to allow the recording and then change your mind, you may ask us to destroy that recording. If the recording has had all identifiers removed, we may not be able to do this.
● We will only use the recording for the purposes of this research.
● The audio recording will be transcribed by the student investigator who will keep all data confidential.
● The recording and transcription will be stored on a password protected computer and maintained for five years after the research is concluded.

The risks associated with participation in this study are no greater than those encountered in daily life. You may get tired or bored when we are asking you questions. You do not have to answer any question you do not want to answer. There is the risk that information about you may become known to people outside this study. Even if identifiers are removed, the information will not be used or distributed for future research studies.

While there is no direct benefit for your participation in the study, what you are doing is of benefit to the field of professional development.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You choose whether to participate. If you decide not to participate, there are no penalties, and you will not lose any benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled.

Any study records that identify you will be kept confidential to the extent possible by law. The records from your participation may be reviewed by people responsible for making sure that research is done properly, including members of the Long Island University Institutional Review Board and officials from government agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the
Office for Human Research Protections. (All of these people are required to keep your identity confidential.) Otherwise, records that identify you will be available only to people working on the study, unless you give permission for other people to see the records.

Your identity as a participant will remain confidential. In the study itself, your identification will not be identifiable to others, as the researcher will refer to each as participant 1, participant 2, etc. This consent form is the only document identifying you as a participant in this study; it will be stored securely on a password protected computer available only to the investigator. Data collected will be destroyed after five years. Results will be reported only in the aggregate.

This study has been reviewed by an Institutional Review Board (IRB), a group of people that reviews human research studies. The IRB can help you if you have questions about your rights as a research participant or if you have other questions, concerns or complaints about this research study. You may contact the IRB at osp@liu.edu.

Contact the student investigator, Christina Cone at 631-371-1776, christina.cone@my.liu.edu or the faculty investigator, Dr. Louisa Vida at 516-299-2150, Louisa.Vida@liu.edu. If you wish, you may contact the principal investigator by letter. The address is on page one of this consent form. You can also contact the department chair, Dr. Tonie McDonald at 516-299-2267, Tonie.McDonald@liu.edu. If you cannot reach the investigators or wish to talk to someone else, contact the IRB office at osp@liu.edu.

You can ask questions about this research study now or at any time during the study.
If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or feel that you have not been treated fairly, please call the Institutional Review Board at Long Island University at osp@liu.edu.

By marking the “Agree to Participate” box below, you are indicating that you have fully read the above text and have had the opportunity to print the consent form and ask questions about the purposes and procedures of this study. If you would like to print a copy of this form for your records, please use bit.ly/3BQMfNr. If you choose not to participate, please choose the “Decline to Participate” box below.

☐ I agree to participate

☐ I decline to participate
FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION – November 30, 2022
Welcome and thank you for agreeing to participate in a discussion about the impact of attending the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading on your teaching and students. I would like to say that I, Christina, am speaking today from the position of a researcher pursuing my doctorate and not on behalf of the College Board. I want to acknowledge that you voluntarily agreed to participate today and answer my questions. To be sure that we have an accurate recording of today's conversation, I'm going to supplement my notes by using the Zoom recording feature, as previously agreed to by all participants. If anyone does have any concerns, please do stop me now.

Okay, so today is November 30 2022, and I'm speaking with AP World History: Modern teachers who have participated in the AP World History: Modern on-site Reading. I am going to be posing some questions in regard to the AP World History: Modern Reading. If there's anything you don't know the answer to or don't feel comfortable answering, that is fine. You certainly have no obligation to reply to any or all questions. I don't anticipate that this will take longer than an hour. And of course, I certainly understand if you need to jump off earlier. So, I'm just going to pose a question and anyone who wants to chime in, feel free to do so. So, the first thing I'm wondering is, why did you choose to become a Reader?
Participant 5 - I can answer that. Because the Chief Reader is a friend of mine, and consistently was like, \textit{do it, do it, do it}. So that that's my answer.

Researcher - The current Chief Reader?

Participant 5 - Well, the former, with Jody Eastberg. I'm on the exec board of the Midwest World History Association and so she was the President when I joined. And so she has been kind of pushing me\textsuperscript{1} in that direction. And I am friends with Craig Miller too, though. It works out.

Researcher - Yes. Good. Thank you. So recommendations of others, right?

Participant 8 - Mine was Bard Keeler. He was our consultant when I was trained back in 2003. And he, you know, it was new, he's like \textit{you've got to come}.\textsuperscript{1} And that pretty much I did whatever Bard told me to do. So I went, and then I was, because now I found friends. And they're all sitting here.

Researcher – Yea, we have a good group!

Participant 3 - That's the same with me, Colin Ramsey. That's why he was my first training consultant. And so he gushed about it\textsuperscript{1}. And he told us all the first year, I had never taught AP World before, it was the first training I ever had, APSI, and he told us all as soon as you can apply to be a Reader\textsuperscript{1}. And then I went to another training with him about three years later, and he was like, \textit{you got to do it, you got to do it now}.\textsuperscript{1} And I did it. And that year, I became a Reader and I sat with him at lunch every day.

Participant 1 - So my experience was similar to what everyone else was saying. Two of my colleagues were Readers. I was teaching the nine honors program, and I felt really uncomfortable with the rubric\textsuperscript{2}, and I really didn't understand it, and I really felt like this might be an opportunity to try it. But honestly, it was mostly because I had colleagues who already had been through the process\textsuperscript{1} and could talk me through the process of applying and whatnot. And that's really why I went.
Participant 4 - Yea, that would be the same for me. I had two colleagues, one of them David Mayer from macroeconomics. He became my academic dean my second year at my current campus, and he just kept telling me, it's the best professional development\textsuperscript{1} you're going to get the entire time in your career for your subject area. So, I finally got to go and I've been doing that ever since. But yea, colleague recommendation\textsuperscript{1} was the best one for me.

Researcher - Excellent, thank you.

Participant 6 - Mine is the same colleague recommendation\textsuperscript{1} from the APSI. I was the pilot person in my school and knew I wasn't going to get any support within my department\textsuperscript{2} even though we had somebody teaching APUSH, it was not nearly the same.

Researcher - You know, that's definitely tough when you're like on an island to yourself. I think well, we'll talk about that probably when we get to the structure of the Reading and talk about that collaborative element. So actually, why don't we do that? Why don't we move to the structure of the Reading, then? Some of this might be a little overlap from the survey questions,

Participant 7 - None of us remember the survey questions. It's fine!

Researcher – Well this is kind of a yes or no question, but we can elaborate. In the studies of all the literature, about what makes beneficial professional development, the studies tend to talk about that connection to your teaching. Does it have relevance to your teaching? So, do you feel that the activities, or the structure of the Reading itself, really does have relevance to your classroom? And if so, can you elaborate on why or how? Thumbs up are good too,\textsuperscript{16} we've got the video component!

Participant 1 - Oh, go ahead, please.

Participant 4 - Sorry. Absolutely. We actually, like just do this regularly. Now, whenever we write an essay in our class, the next day, I train the kids to be like little mini readers. And yeah, I don't read necessarily the whole essay, but it's alright, you guys are going to focus in on like the thesis statement, and we're talking about what's considered acceptable, not acceptable. And it, for me, it allowed me to obviously, you know, get a better understanding of the thesis.\textsuperscript{2} But
hopefully now my students are now understanding, hey, what is an actual good thesis look like? So, we keep practicing that throughout the year, and it's because that's what I picked up from the read.

06:35
Participant 1 - I can't overstate the, how much it's had an impact on my classroom. Similar to what you were saying, like, just I can give kids three examples of thesis statements and say, Okay, which one would actually earn the point, based on the rubric? Because the rubric, because we teach writing so much in the classroom, knowing and understanding the rubric myself, it makes it better for my students, and I can, they can articulate, like, what they can include in their essay to earn those points, the stronger the kids writings will be when the exam comes.

07:18
Researcher - So you know, actually, that's maybe an overlap with the next question. I'm thinking of a comment that a participant did make about identifying student misconceptions. So, the question is, do you find the practice of scoring student assessments beneficial? And I know, as I'm one of you, which is maybe sometimes unique in this situation, in terms of a study, I can say, like, yeah, when you see, oh, these are the common mistakes, I find that that's a really important takeaway. But I would love to hear from you. How do you feel about the scoring of actual student work, as opposed to maybe, you know, exemplars only written by educators or whatnot?

08:05
Participant 8 - I don't think that I understood the rubric in total, until I went to the Reading. I don't think I understood it even when we redesigned to align with Euro, how we didn't understand what synthesis looked like or contextualization. And we were seeking that validation in our classrooms, because we hadn't been through a Reading yet to see a sample of what that could look like in our classrooms. And how that just was so a-ha moment for us where it was, like, immediately, I had a notepad, I'm writing notes, I'm making sure that I have like, samples and non-samples and good, like, here's why this doesn't get it. And, you know, taking the minute and I know that Readers don't necessarily get to do that, but as leadership, we get to do that. So that, you know, we can as consultants or as you know, your team lead in a district or whatever, take it back and say, Okay, this is where our kids are going wrong. And I didn't get it. I mean, and I, you know, I probably didn't even get SAQ stuff until I graded it during the pandemic, of what a real good, I was requiring too much. I don't need to require that like, it needs to be a complete sentence, but let's just get the point and move like we don't have time for that. And I don't think I understood it until, and please, I mean, the pandemic, so we did that, what 2016 and, and the pandemic is 2020, so there's four years where my kids didn't get the best of me instructing, so.
10:03
Researcher - Don't sell yourself short! But I hear what you're saying.

10:05
Participant 6 - I found that I was much more incisive in my instruction, where it's like, change this word here to something else. And all of a sudden, your statement of fact became a thesis. It's a word. Yeah. And what I used to do so I was at the Reading, I think, in my third year of teaching, maybe my second, it was the last year at Fort Collins, and how it just transformed my whole classroom the next year. I focused on multiple choice questions, because I thought that was important. And it's not and it was trivial pursuit. Because it was, 06, 05, I don't know, my kids were babies then so I lost time. But how, how much more focused, I am in the classroom. And now how I am the lead in training other folks in my department who are finally taking on AP, and then they move on to other places, but I still stay on that treadmill. I keep talking interrater reliability, and everyone looks at me, like I've got four heads. And I'm like, no, no, this is what we have to do. And they all look at me like, No, I've got my own work to do. I'm just letting you know this is actually going to work.

11:39
Participant 8 – Yeah, and it will.

11:41
Participant 3 - I just wanted to say too, with the grading the actual student work, and not just the exemplars and everything, I noticed, especially I loved it when we actually had the books, you know, and you can see the school codes. And I would notice, like some schools, you know, when you get large chunks like that, you know, they clearly were taught a certain way. And sometimes that wasn't always good. Because sometimes they all weren't getting a point. But in the cases that they were all getting a point, I would try to make that connection of okay, what is this teacher doing to consistently get these really high scoring DBQ's? And, you know, I took note of a lot of the strategies that they had, like, oh they're clearly setting up context this way, like, every single one of these essays is setting up context in this way, or they're doing sourcing in this particular way. And like, oh, I need to make sure that I make these connections or use these certain phrases. And I would take note of like, oh, this teacher is doing something right, by grading their student's work. And I just feel like that's been a really helpful part of the actual grading process for me learning from it.

12:29
Participant 6 - It does.

12:30
Researcher - Yeah, that's really reflective. So a couple of you mentioned Table Leaders. And I know some of you have served in leadership roles, and some haven't. So those of you who have served in leadership roles, of course, you didn't do so your first year. So even reflecting back, do you feel that working with a Table Leader has impacted your experience? And have you had good experiences with Table Leaders? Do you feel that there's value in working with a colleague in that position or whatnot?

13:30
Participant 2 - I do. Absolutely. Sorry, I was in my car for the first part. I have just been a grunt reader. I am not in leadership. And I think I'm too slow to be in leadership. But I feel like I've had really good Table Leaders every time, even virtually. And I feel like, you know, when I was in person, versus when I was online, I've had really exceptional Table Leaders every time. And I feel like what made the exceptional Table Leaders was they didn't just take stuff I would put in hold or put like, you know, like aside or ask questions when I was in person, and be like, okay, I've graded it. And I've moved on. I got feedback that said, here's why that got the point. And here's why it didn't, which then cleaned up my own grading, which then was basically like having a really good PLC partner, because you're just like, I know exactly how I should go forward with this point. And it felt like, you know, you could talk to them about this kind of stuff. The only struggle was, you know, when you're virtual, you only get three in the hold and then if you hit that marker, or then the other struggle I had this past year was when I was on a question that didn't have a Table Leader after it was over. I felt like I was probably mis-scoring things and I couldn't ask anybody any questions once I switched questions. So I felt like that was kind of a mess. But that was virtual and I think this is more about the in person read.

15:05
Researcher - Sure, although I mean, definitely not that I want to do it, but if any of you are interested, fantastic idea for a future study! Anyone else want to speak about leadership? Otherwise, we can move on, which is fine. No pressure for everyone to respond to every question.

15:22
Participant 8 - Well, and I'd say, let's say 90% of the leadership, the best leaders are the ones that are going to give that feedback and put their ego to the side if they're challenged, right. Like those are the best leaders. The only issue that I've seen is just, I mean, it happened to one of our colleagues, where she kind of, you know, questioned, because, you know, she had all of us to question and she could get the feedback from us. But her Table Leader said this, and then the Table Leader gave her a bad evaluation and she's kind of been banned from leadership since then. And you know, that, like when ego gets in the way, and it's just like, come on, we're trying to do the best for these kids, right? Like your ego of not having that point, please point it out to me, if I'm missing something I need to know so that the kids get the best scoring opportunity.
with as many points available to them as I can possibly give being fair, consistently. And when ego gets in the way, I think that's just the one thing that I wish that everyone would just pocket during the Reading. It's like, you know what, you're awesome because you're here. Like, let's not, I don't know, people, you have to know me to understand the statement, but like, to brown nose to like, what's the point? Like, what? Are you're really just going to get more essays to grade? Like, why, why? Why have this climb mentality of like, let's just serve the kids where they are and where we are with this. And get through the Reading together. And all of us together, like it's a leave no man behind kind of thing. And I just get so frustrated when egos get in the way and like people get hurt with that, because then they don't get to spend all those time, those days with their friends. Because they've been blackballed from leadership and like, come on, people just want to serve.

17:29
Researcher - Well, and I'm going to go back to something you said. Again, first and foremost, is we're here for the kids, like what is best, and that that should be at the forefront of everybody's mind. So, switching from leadership, then, we mentioned collaboration earlier, can you speak to how you feel about working with other high school teachers, and even college professors at the Reading?

17:54
Participant 7 - I'm going to jump in before Participant 8 starts talking! Anyway, just because she's one of my best friends and I can say that to her. So, actually, to go back to leadership for just one second, Christina, as somebody who never planned to be a leader, being the Question Leader for the DBQ, the past couple of years has completely opened my eyes to, to interesting things of training Table Leaders, to then train Readers is a whole other level. It's a whole other level. I've had to be able to be so crystal clear to be able to explain to a Table Leader to then, so that they feel comfortable, that then they can explain to a Reader what it is. So it's I think what it is, it's that that clarity that we need to have. And that clarity kind of gives in your own classroom, gives you that sense of confidence. So when a student is asking questions, or a parent, because I'm sure we've all had parents that we grade essays, and well, I think this, when you have this experience with the rubric, and with that other kind of part, you can go no, no, not relying on that, hey, I'm a leader here, but you know, this, I've been to the Reading this is what this is, this is how the rubric is applied in this way, gives me a sense of confidence that in myself, which I want to then kind of pass on to those Table Leaders and to those Readers so I just wanted to say that quickly about leadership.

19:35
Researcher - I'm so glad that you did because one of the findings so far is that a leadership role does seem to make a difference in the responses to the survey, and so, it's interesting to be able to talk to you now to dive into why. And Participant 7, I think you really just did a wonderful job of
providing some insight into why that might be. So, thank you. So, again, back to working with other high school teachers, and or college professors, if any of you want to speak to how you found that experience.

20:28
Participant 1 - I really found that the committee, I love committee grading, I love to speak to people when I'm grading, I love to have examples, or at least just someone, I could just like, oh, I'm not really sure. Can you like, can I bounce this idea off of you? I happened to be partnered with a professor, and I did think like, you know, because I'm coming from a ninth and tenth grade classroom compared to his experiences, like he's dealing with 20 year olds or, you know, whatnot. So there was a little bit of a difference there, but I thought like, he had great historical knowledge, like, beyond what maybe I might have known on a particular question. Or I'd be like, oh, wait, is this true? And then he would answer. But across from me, I had other high school teachers from all over the country, some from Seattle, some from New York, some from Texas, and I just thought it was a great experience. And, you know, I'm always an advocate for group grading, because I think it just makes it more consistent. And then just the ability to share ideas with someone right next to you, is just so helpful and it's such a good use of time.

21:43
Participant 4 - For me, that's basically the same thing. I've been scoring online and in person for three years each now and I don't like doing the online one, just because I don't have that person I can immediately bounce back to it. And I've had good leaders that I entire time we were given great support, but it's being able to say immediately, hey, I'm working on this, can you give me some feedback, or vice versa? They're asking me for some support on that too, from other college professors or high school teachers. And then when we do run across things, we have that downtime. We know we can sit there and talk about, hey, how do you teach this in your class period, as opposed to the past few years I'm having to sit on chat and you know, I got one person on chat who's my coworker already so like, we don't have anything new to talk about, so I think that that's really my big thing is being able to share out ideas and give immediate feedback to one another.

22:39
Participant 8 - Well remember back in the day, like the lesson jamboree nights where we would share your best lesson and we'd get up and like, be like, that's so cool, you could do it like this, and like it was just like this group, like, nerd fest of like, these are the best lessons ever. And it was before Facebook and that was a long time ago. People like that's a long time.

23:02
Researcher - Well, then you got the CDs, you could buy them or you could get those lesson jamboree CDs if you contributed.
23:09
Participant 7 - I found one cleaning out my desk like two years ago. And I still have like an original Heidi Roup lesson Jamboree, CD, for those of you that remember that. I still have one. And I keep it. I can't really play it on anything because I don't have a CD player in the computer. But I still have it.

23:29
Participant 3 - Well, so cool, I'm jealous I was after that. That sounds awesome.

23:35
Researcher - But now there's Facebook and the Drive. So, it's just different mediums.

23:40
Participant 3 - That's what I was going to mention too, is just the idea of like, being in person is so different than virtual. And you know, with Facebook, like sharing lessons on Facebook, I'm sure I miss 95% of the lessons that people share on there. But the best part about being at the Reading is the fact that you have all of your table buddies, you have your Table Leader, and honestly, I learned so much from other people just at lunch and dinner. I just try to sit with as many different people as I can. And I'll just randomly say like, you know, hey, how was your essay going like? Or what are you reading and then you know, the LEQ people, I've only ever graded DBQ but the LEQ people will kind of give me their insight on what's going on with LEQ's and I'll get to talk to the SAQ people and I mean that kind of informal collaboration is the best part for me. I've learned so much that way.

24:38
Participant 2 - I didn't even know there was a Facebook group until I went to the Reading.

24:46
Researcher - So now we're talking about learning content, or rather strategies and pedagogy, lesson ideas. But actually, Participant 1, you mentioned something that I thought was intriguing and triggered a thought here about having a college professor who might have been very knowledgeable in this specific subject. Do you find that there is the ability to improve your content knowledge from the Reading or not as much?

25:17
Participant 1 - Oh, for sure, for sure. I read the DBQ on the Indian Ocean. I learned so much about the Indian Ocean, like Trading Post empires, so forth and so on, like, you know, just you start to talk about it. And similar to what they were saying before just talking to other colleagues about how they like address stuff in the classroom, or what are you reading? Or what
are you finding? For sure, it helps with content, but I mean, it helps with the rubric, but it does help you with what you're trying to do everyday in the classroom. For sure. 10/2/16/5

25:49
Participant 8 - I learned about battles you had no idea about, I mean, our curriculum doesn't go into that. But if, if a book or an author uses that battle, and you don't use that book for that section, when they use those words, like 'trading post empire,' that's not something that's in my text. So I'm like, what are they talking about? Or what was it called? It was something the Great Dying? Wasn't that one of them, right? I'm like who uses the word Great Dying for the indigenous populations being killed off, like what? And I had never heard it before. So you know, those kinds of things. And remember, back in the day, we used to get all of those textbooks too. And so we'd have all the different textbooks sitting behind us and you could look things up. This was before Google or any kind of, I mean, like people, we've been doing this a long time now. And it's like, it seems that the professors, and I'm especially those specialists, like when they would do those talks in the evening, where it's like, oh, hey, this is the Latin Americanist is talking tonight. Let's go see him. Hey, there's free beer. But I mean, like there was more to it than that. We learned stuff.

27:04
Participant 3 - Um, real quick, it's Strayer. Great Dying.

27:11
Participant 8 – See, I don't use Strayer.

27:19
Participant 7 - World History For Us All, which I think is one of Heidi's babies, also uses that term.

27:28
Researcher - So something that seemed to get mixed results, and I'm really intrigued to dig a little deeper into this. There was a question on the survey about duration. Did you find the duration to be beneficial? And there was no way for me to know, well, did people think it was too long or too short? Or just right? I'd really love to hear your thoughts about do you think a seven day period of time, 56 hours, is what's needed? Again, is it too much? Is it too short, just right? What are your thoughts about the duration?

28:07
Participant 5 - I can speak to this one, because last year was my first year doing being a leader. And so I was actually there for two weeks, and they don't give us any break. There's no weekend. And so like, we were all really fresh and doing great in that first week. And by the
middle of the second week, all of us just wanted to go home, like we were, you know, and I think that like you stop being as good as you could be,\textsuperscript{11} when like, I mean, if they would have just given us a day off, like, like some downtime would have been great. And so like, I mean, I by the end of the Read, I can tell you that I think that people get a little more sloppy in their grading. And so I think that that leads to less consistency.\textsuperscript{11,16} I mean, I do SAQs. So it's like real quick, it's like one and done. But I don't think it's as consistent as it should be. And then the fact that we have that seven day read, and then we have like another week of, you know, continued reading like, oh, if you could grade at home a little bit, that would be great. But then, like Participant 2 was saying, like they don't provide Table Leaders,\textsuperscript{7} they don't like I mean, so I don't know there were some issues.

29:20
Participant 8 - Last year I think was an anomaly people like we've never not finished before. And I think last year, because you didn't see the light at the end of the tunnel, and the numbers kept, like as leadership we kept seeing the numbers go up versus go down\textsuperscript{15}. That was demoralizing. So duration last year, doesn't seem like, I mean we can finish. We finished before when everything's in the alignment of the stars, right, like think of all those years in Fort Collins and in Salt Lake where we're out by morning break or by lunch of that last day and everybody else is working until five because we pushed, and we could land the plane all together. And I think that last year, just man that was that was a hard read only because the numbers never seemed to go down. I'm sure Participant 7 can talk on that just with the DBQ.

30:24
Participant 6 - Participant 8, can I jump in? Because I think there is a difference between when we were all in person. And when we've been split. And when we've been all online.

30:35
Participant 8 - 100 percent.

30:35
Participant 6 - Because I've been in all three positions. And yes, when we're in person, we can land the plane, and we're like, oh, let's go to the mountains. But being online, being hybrid was challenging. And then I think even 2021 was a worse experience, because I, as I've only been a Table Reader, I've only read, I'm not part of leadership, I read for over 80 hours over two weeks. And it was insane. This year, as you pointed, and I can't remember who pointed out, Participant 2 maybe, that we lost leadership, if we were still continuing on. And it was only if you happen to know somebody else who was still reading. And I'm not telling anybody that we talked outside of the chat, but we had to because we had to get clarification from someone.\textsuperscript{7,9} And it would just sit into the nether. Like we didn't know what was going on. So I think it all depends on where we are on that spectrum
Researcher - So taking it back to the on-site only Reading, do you feel though, if you can think back, is there more bang for your buck the first time, or does it continue to improve? Do you feel that having that length of time really did, we keep talking about understanding the rubric, really in having that ingrained, do you think that was necessary to have those seven days, or could you meet the same aim, I'm not talking about finishing score and everything, but from a from a perspective of a Reader learning and getting benefits, could it be done in less time?

Participant 1 - So one of the things I often talk about with my experiences, I read the DBQ in person and I've done other stuff online, but the in person part, I really needed like a full 3,4 days, maybe before I was like, oh my gosh, I see the matrix, I totally understand this. And then after that I felt a lot more comfortable with all the, and I actually sped up. So like those first couple of days, I'm moving slowly. But I really feel like the first time I did it, it really took me three full days before I was like, I feel like I can do this now. And then I sped up and I did it more. If you're talking about like breaks, I would have preferred like maybe a couple more breaks. I mean, they are driving us, like, you know, there's pressure to get it done. But not pressure to get it. They're telling you no but yes. But I understand that. But I really needed that time. And I think the more I spent more time I spent with it, the better it was.

Participant 4 - I mean, I would say probably the same thing about after three to four days not counting like Wednesday when it's all just a giant blur mess and I don't know what's actually happening and all that. But I think knowing the rubric and understanding like how to then apply it to my teaching, I could probably get it done in three to four days. Now, it's great to sit there and keep doing more and more examples, but in terms of just learning the rubric, yeah, I mean, I don't need to spend seven days doing it. In terms of structuring the day, yeah, more breaks would help maybe because those mornings are long that time from like lunch until that next break is always, you know, rough. But I think in terms of figuring out how to apply it now to my teaching. I could probably get it done in three to four days on that.

Researcher - Participant 4, I think that's a beautiful segue because I'm looking at the time. We're 40 minutes in here and I don't want to keep you too long. I do want to shift to the impact that it does have on your teaching. We've been talking about the structure of the Read. But you just mentioned how you can apply it to your teaching so, are you able to share what you do, and actually some of you already have, if I think back to our earlier conversations, but what you do differently as a result of having attended the Reading to prepare your students for the exam.
Participant 5 - I actually, one of the things, I learned that, I don't think this is a good thing, but the inconsistency of the College Board. So like, you know, with SAQ's, like I did one last year where, like, the rubric was pretty straightforward. Everything was cool. And then I got moved on to another team, where everything that was on the rubric, the College Board had come in at the last minute and been like, well, actually, wait a minute. And they had I mean, if I show you the notes sheet that I have, it is, like, covered with, they will accept this, they won't accept this, they won't accept this, it has to be this way. If they don't have this thing, then it's, and this was for an SAQ, I mean, that's crazy. And so, you know, teaching my own students like I don't care if it says identify, I don't care if it says explain, you're doing the same thing every single time, no matter, because I have twice now had SAQs where it says identify, but if they don't have some explanation, they don't get the point, which, okay, so that informs my teaching in the classroom.

Participant 4 - Yeah, I'll piggyback off that. It's like about structuring my writing. I think we've all probably seen the examples of like, the kids who like will write on the side, this is my thesis, this is my context. This is my evidence, right? And I don't teach them necessarily to do that while they're writing. But like, when we're doing it for our own class purposes, like I'll have them sit there and like, you know, you highlight your thesis, you highlight your context, not because I need to know where it is. But I want you to go back and say, hey, did I actually do this when I was writing regardless of what my feedback was, did you attempt it? So you can go back and look at the rubric and go, well, yeah, of course, I'm not going to score as many points as I thought I was going to because I didn't do half the things that were on the rubric. So, I think that that was something that I kind of just picked up. And it was like, it wasn't something that like I necessarily teach, but I kind of like modified it. And then being consistent with you know, I don't care what the actual rubric is, per se, but like, for SAQs, you're doing it this way, because I know that that's the safe bet to make sure that you're gonna get the points.

Participant 3 - With grading DBQs as being the only thing I've done for six years, I teach DBQs a lot more. The first few years that I taught, I would only have them write one full DBQ. And I'm like, I just didn't know what to do with them once they were written, I'd be like, I don't know this sounds good. I didn't really know how to grade them so I didn't want to have the kids do them because it all felt like a waste of time. So having graded DBQs you know, professionally, I feel so much more comfortable that I work DBQs from week one. And we do DBQs all year long, you know, in bits and pieces, chunks here and chunks there, so that by the end of the first semester realistically, they've already written now in my class, they've already written three full DBQs, and so, I write way, way more DBQs than I ever did before the Read for sure.
Participant 8 - Participant 3, what, what grade do you teach this to?

Participant 3 - 10th grade.

Participant 8 - Because I teach ninth graders, I'm still working on sentence structure.

Participant 1 - So piggybacking with what Participant 3 was saying, I agree with her. Like after the Read, I felt so much, I felt comfortable with actually grading the writing. My kids write so much more now than they did before I went to the Read. I would also note it makes me a more efficient and faster grader also. So then I also know that I can give like this many essays or these many writing assignments, and I'm not going to kill myself grading them because I've actually become very quick and efficient at doing. you either have it or you don't. So then I agree with Participant 3, and Participant 3, same thing, like when I was in my early years doing this I was afraid to give writing assignments because I, like her, was like I don't know what to do with this when it's done. I don't know what comments to make. So yeah.

Researcher - I'm so glad you went there because you know, there's a difference between my question, which you're all answering so deeply, I thank you, but the question was about, what do you do differently to teach, but then the second component of that is how do you assess differently? So you just got into that with I'm quicker, I'm more efficient. I don't know if anyone else wants to continue down that path, if you can share anything you do differently as a result in terms of assessing student work rather than teaching it.

Participant 6 - I live in the one point rubric. Yeah, that's all that they get. I don't give, like 85, what does that mean? An A, what does that mean? They live in a one point rubric? Because you got it or you don't.

Participant 8 - Yeah, well, in SAQ I mean like, one of the things that I took from the Reading is I'm going to grade all the A's first. We're going to standardize, here's what I need to have in my brain, this is what they need to have. And now I'm going through and I'm grading all 160 of them. Ace, right? I mean, I don't give 160 of the same essay people, please. I mean, and that's the other thing is that I'm able to give each class two or three different essays, because, you know, again, fast, efficient on standard.
then go to b, b, b and then c and I'm done. And it's just like, oh, yeah, well, that was no big deal. So, but back in the day when SAQs first started, that was a big deal. Right? Like, when we changed from like comparison writing to just LEQ writing, LEQ was such a big deal. DBQ such a big deal. But now it's just, ya know, we can\textsuperscript{8}...I mean my kids last year wrote eight DBQ, full DBQs,\textsuperscript{5} and I graded two of them, they peer graded two of them, and then they sat on six of them. Like the first two were just for their notebook. And then their other four those, they chose their best one to give me for that feedback, right? So it was just how much have you developed in this skill. So I mean, it was all paced out. But again, I would never have done that. I would never have given that much class time to do that before doing this, you know, like to me that, now I never send writing home, this is in front of me,\textsuperscript{5} I need to know you're doing it with fidelity and doing it with your own and not your mother writing it or whatever, you know, I want to watch you do it so that I can come over and if you're struggling, we can guide you through it in real time. And that's different. If I wouldn't have done the Reading, I would have never have been that comfortable doing that.\textsuperscript{8}

42:29
Participant 5 - I think I became a little bit easier in my in my grading\textsuperscript{12} because of the Read. Because like reading things and being like are you kidding, they're going to give a point to that. I've always been a very hard grader. So like, I remember my first year teaching AP World History and in the middle of the year my boss was like, so how do you think they're going to do on the exam? And you know, I was the only AP World History teacher in the school, I had nobody to guide me,\textsuperscript{3} and I was like, well, I think at least half of them are going to fail it. And then like, they didn't, they did much better than that. So then after going to the Read and seeing what's acceptable,\textsuperscript{6} I'd be like, good enough. And so, that's kind of become the motto even in my classroom of like, you know, we're not going for perfect here, we're going for good enough. And so that gives the kids a little more confidence,\textsuperscript{13} but also allows me to be like, no, I mean, is this beautiful writing? No, but you're going to get the point.\textsuperscript{12}/\textsuperscript{6}

43:30
Researcher - So in speaking of the impact on students’ scores, that's really the last section of this, then I know Participant 4 had to bail to put his kids to bed, but have you noticed changes in student scores? And some of you have been Reading for so long that this might be hard to reflect back. From the survey, a lot of people are saying, I'm not sure, I don't know. But it's an interesting thought, have you seen changes in your students’ scores as a result of you attending the Reading?

44:14
Participant 8 - There's less ones.\textsuperscript{13} I mean, I consider that a win. I don't consider you know, I'll never get teaching a 14 year old, I'll never get 100% pass rate.\textsuperscript{13} I'll be lucky to get close to 90, right. So I'm not worried about past rate. I'm worried about did you learn a skill that's going to
transfer to your next AP class? Did you, is there a gain? Did you grow as a thinker because of this class? That's my evaluation of it. And yeah, there are less ones than there were years ago. And I'm, I mean, and that's always the goal, right, is to move like the ones and twos to that next level, no matter where you're getting to. So, but more.

45:07
Participant 3 - In my experience, I'm 100%, like, I definitely have seen a change in overall results. Since I've become a Reader, I have, my pass rate has increased every single year, and I keep on waiting, thinking I'm never going to get this lucky again. And then it happens again. And last year, I mean that DBQ definitely helped me out with that, I mean on the DBQ specific. But no matter how you look at it, everything has gotten better consistently, in my world, and I know that's not the case for everybody, but less ones, more fives. This last year, I had more fives than I had ones, which is like, huge for me. And, you know, pass rate overall, I mean, I've crossed a threshold now to where I have, you know, 75%. And that's, I'm at a title one school in a rural county and teaching kids who, you know, you wouldn't expect 75% from. It's just I owe it, a lot of it, at least to the Reading. I, they are able to pass the exam, because I have taught them the specifics about the exam, and there's so much that I know is unknown to a lot of teachers, you know, and not necessarily inaccessible, but just, if you don't go to the Reading, I mean, how many people are going to jump on the College Board website and read the scoring rubrics and read all of the extra notes? I mean, it's just not realistic for most teachers. So being there, and being in person and seeing the, you know, the first day with Readers and going through all the documents, I keep on coming back to DBQ stuff. I'm sorry, but specifically for me just being able to go through the documents all together, and then going back to your table and reading the documents individually. And, you know, that whole process has 100% benefited my students like definitely no doubt about it.

47:14
Participant 7 - You should go back and read those things that were put on the website, because I wrote the DBQ. And so anyway, like Participant 8, for my kids, it's been, I go back to kind of what I was saying to Christina earlier, it's a confidence builder. Because you've got a bunch of kids, I teach all 10th grade, most of them, it's their first AP, and a few had Human Geo and didn't really have the greatest experience, sorry, but at my school, that's true. And so they come to me with this lack of confidence. And like Participant 8, I really focus on them with my number of ones. And then I also teach AP Euro. So those are kids that come back to me when they're seniors, and they're really nerdy history kids and they want to, you know, to be with me again, and to do that again. That's where I see the growth. Not necessarily in the same school year always, but you know those kids that come back after APUSH, and then they come back into me in AP Euro, and they have those skills, and they built on those skills. So for me personally, I see that growth in later years. In how kids, you can see that their confidence level and how they write and what they write, especially when they're starting with them so young. So maybe not
necessarily my, you know, my pass rate when I have them as sophomores, but I see that growth in those skills in later years. And that's, like I said, it's that confidence builder part for those kids.

48:50
Participant 6 - We teach after APUSH. So they've had exposure and I know that we are a reverse school from so many others. In terms of my scoring rate, my IPRs have always shown better than global mean. But I look at it, I do have more ones now. But I had exceptional scores my first year, and probably my first two or three years. And I don't know whether it's, was it the Reading and me becoming a better Reader and therefore instructor, or was it we've now had seven curriculum changes. I've told my supervisor I'm like, I'm going to teach it how I teach it. I mean College Board can do what they want, but in six years I can retire and I'm doing what I do. And he's kind of like okay, but I am still getting those ones and twos but they're gaining in confidence in other areas. So I don't always look at that final score. I'm digging into the IPRs.

50:18
Participant 2 - I was just going to say, in my case, I'm sorry, I have to take kids places, and then I'll have to get off, but I was going to say, in my case, we just get, you know, a million thank yous. I mean, I do and then AP Euro and AP World at my school are both electives, and they're just sophomore year electives. And then also, for seniors who are like, kind of like you said, like, oh, I'll just come back and do the other one because now I know how to do it and I've done APUSH. But I would say, the junior class is APUSH and that's where the teachers are just so appreciative, because there's such a vast difference between the kids who took one of them as a sophomore, and their ability to write. And so even if my kids get a two for me, you know, those same kids might get the four or the five, the very following year. And that's definitely been huge for our APUSH teachers, and we try to be very vertically aligned, and like using the same acronyms, like if they use ACE, or we use whatever, just so that kids have the same, you know, verbiage. And that I think has been super beneficial as well. But in my own personal scores, yes, I have definitely seen an increase. And I think that has to do with the fact that I have done, I did DBQ, obviously, in 2020, but, and then SAQ and I feel like the biggest increase I saw was after SAQs, because I think I thought they were easier than they were. And so my score, I was like, what happened? Why are they so low, kids should be able to just respond to a prompt. And so I think when I did I SAQs, that was probably the biggest increase I saw.

51:52
Researcher - Well, Participant 5, that kind of goes back to what you were saying, and the discussion that you see time and time again, do you have to do ACE? And people say no, just identify, but like, no, sometimes you do need to do more than that. So yeah, thank you. I know a lot of people are, it's nearing the hour mark, so I have kind of one more big question before we open it up to anything else you want to share. And this one came about as a result of again, looking at some of the data from the survey. So for those of you who have attended the Reading
more than once, and I guess the hard part here in this discussion is again, separating on-site from virtual because they are two such different entities. But if we can keep in mind the on-site Reading, for those of you who attended the on-site Reading more than once, did the experience or the perception of your impact of the Reading vary from year to year?

52:46
Participant 8 - Well, when we finished, we had a sense of accomplishment. There was much more pride in the work that we had gulaged through, that this year, face to face. When we I mean, there was no pride, there was no, there was no sense of accomplishment.

53:13
Researcher - But again, that's a matter of finishing. But if we can take it back to a learner's perspective, do you feel that the first year as a Reader it was like, you know, quite a few of you have used that a-ha moment, right, that the clarity that you had, do you find that the first year there were a lot of those a-ha moments and not as many years after, or just the opposite?

53:41
Participant 6 - I think I'm going to borrow from the CD, it intensified. Like, all of that intensified. My first year, it was eye opening. And it just became more clear each year. And we made connections with others, on-site readers. We made connections with the college professors, we make connections with other instructors in other different and similar schools around the country. It just was more. And I have an incredible network. And a lot of you are sitting here. I have an incredible network of colleagues that I don't have in my own personal school.

54:26
Participant 8 - Yeah, me too.

54:26
Participant 6 - But I have here. And I can bounce all these ideas off of and say what do you think about this? And they do the same thing to me. And having the college connection that I can say, you know what, let me call Sharika up because we just saw her on her OER video and what's going on, and it's great to have that connection.

54:48
Participant 8 - It's so good. Like, I agree with that statement of intensity.

54:54
Participant 3 - I was going to mention that, I feel like the first year, I was a Reader, it was very eye opening, like you said, like, it was honestly kind of a shock to see the expansiveness of it
all and, you know, the process of it all, it was a lot to take in. And so that first year, I feel like it was almost a different experience. Since then, since I'm comfortable with it, and I understand you know, how the process works, it's pretty much been the same since then I would say like, year two forward. I don't think it's what you're really looking for asking for here. I would say I honestly feel like, um, because my first two years on site were in Salt Lake, and I do feel like that was a different experience than it is in Kansas City. A better experience. It does go back to, you know, food and that kind of thing, and I mean, the convention center is so spread out and all of that stuff factors into it, but I do feel like, it might just be education in general, it might be Kansas City, but I do feel like morale has decreased over time. And I don't think that's all just, you know, the Reading or College Board, changing things over and over and over again. But just kind of like, coming together, you know.

56:20
Participant 8- I'm going to say that last redesign kind of, you know, really hurt. So that's that shift from Salt Lake to Kansas City. So people, I mean, we may have harbored some bitter resentment towards that redesign, that, I mean, I'm not sure we properly grieved until we got to the Reading about what was cut from us. And so I mean, that's definitely part of it. It's like, come on College Board, we've given you our blood, sweat, and tears, like, stop messing with us.

57:03
Participant 3 - Definitely.

57:04
Participant 8 - But I don't think the experience of your Read, like I feel like not just the intensity, but I feel like every year, there's something that we're tuning in on, like, you know, okay, so if my IPR said that I was weak, or this part was weak, I go intentionally trying to find the trend to have my kids avoid, and try. I mean, like, I go with a goal of like, alright, they were really weak in sourcing, let's just really zone in on sourcing and try to figure out, or they're really weak on context, you know, whatever it was that year, and I try to like come up, while I'm sitting there with a lesson that's going to make it so that I can use what I'm being trained on back in my classroom immediately, the next year, and it's effective, every time.

58:00
Researcher - Thanks. So, I mean, the last part is really if anybody wants to share something we didn't talk about in terms of like you haven't mentioned this, but I feel like this is the greatest strength of the Reading or quite the opposite. This is the greatest weakness, you know, and you don't have to. If there's nothing more, that's fine, too. Again, no, no pressure to come up with something. I just wanted to have it a little more open ended for a moment.
Participant 7 - I think there was a major shift in even at the in-person Reading this year, we're reading on a computer. And I think that that had a major effect on people. And I think that's, I don't know how you talk about that or deal with that, Christina, when you're doing what you're doing, but I do think, you know, because, you know we love the booklets and passing things around, there was nothing better than finishing a folder and putting it down and clearing a table at the end of the day. At the in-person Read that we don't have that same sense of going back to what Participant 8 said, kind of accomplishment in that kind of stuff when there's always more every time you click. And it's open. So I do think the in-person Read, this year being the first that the in-person Read was on a computer I think that had, there was a little bit different of an impact. And I don't know this was the first year that it was in-person was on a computer but I do feel like that shift towards, even the past two years even before that pandemic, reading on the computer is a different feeling and a different experience, and there's just something different about it. So I just, that's something that hadn't come up yet that I just thought, you know, since it was we were there and doing that on a computer, I think that was really different. And then to just one last thing, and then I'll be quiet, to add on to what Participant 6 was saying, the fact that we're all sitting here and I'm looking at Participant 8, who is one of my very best friends, like, you know, I'm not saying we haven't been texting while we're having this conversation, but you know, I'm surrounded by these people, the same that Participant 6 said that are my friends, that are like, if I'm struggling, here, here's a lesson on this I would be the first to vouch for Participant 8 emails all the time - what do you think about this? What about this? And it's very easy to say, to tell my students, I have friends that are college professors, this is what they are saying about in college, these are the types of experiences you are going to have, these are the things that you are going to experience and that sense of accomplishment and those friendships. I'm the only one that teaches AP World at my school. I'm one of two people in the district, and the other person in the district, I've tried to help and is not interested and just does their own thing. So many of us are an island.

1:01:08
Participant 8 - Yeah.

1:01:09
Participant 7 - And we just feel so excited when we get to be together. And we get to be with our people. And that's the part of it, that's that, yes, it's going to have an impact on our students. But it's going to have an impact on us as teachers. What do we say, you know, teachers that are happy and confident, that's going to rub off on kids.

1:01:34
Participant 5 - One thing I wish was different, and I'm newer to the in-person read. I've only been to the in-person read once, and one of the things that I really wish, though, is that they would ask us our preference for like, what type of essay we'd like to work on. Because I've only been put on
SAQ and I'm like, good. I got it. I really want to be put on a different essay, you know, but I don't get really a say in that. So that would be very helpful to me all around.

1:02:03
Participant 8 - Yeah. But once you're pegged as someone who can read them all, then you're trained in like 11 different questions during the Read. And it's actually keeps the Read flowing when that happens. I absolutely love that. And I dread only being on one question the whole time.

1:02:23
Participant 5 - Participant 7, adopt me I want to do the DBQ!

1:02:29
Participant 7 - I'll push Craig for it, Participant 5. I'll push on. Oh, I'll work on it.

1:02:38
Researcher - See, look at all the benefits of participating tonight!

1:02:40
Participant 6 - As soon as you get retrained on another question, it's really helpful because it just gives you more tools in the toolkit for your next year. Yeah, I have been fortunate that I've been retrained every year. And I've trained now on every single type of question.

1:03:14
Participant 6 - I will say that the challenge, I think between the on-site and the virtual, in terms of leadership to Reader, there's a big difference between somebody coming back from your super-secret meetings, behind the curtains and giving thumbs up. Or the little slips of paper that you used to get passed around, like, we're on pace, we're on pace, just keep doing what you're doing, and this is where you get your T-shirt, as opposed to the little bar with the stars. And it's like, oh, oh, I read that one, and I scored it wrong, again, because I need to get up and walk around. And it's just a different feedback loop to the Reader.

1:03:58
Participant 8 - That personal feedback is key.

1:04:04
Researcher - Alright, well, I thank you so much for your time. I mean, honestly, you're going to probably have a million thank you emails and texts from me in the coming weeks as I keep analyzing this and more. And I will be following up with you also to allow you to see the feedback, or rather to provide feedback on the draft just to make sure that I did transcribe your
words correctly. You're under no obligation to read it and respond, but it's just I want to provide
the opportunity for you to verify the accuracy of your words. That I just feel like again, because
as I mentioned earlier, I'm deep in this, I'm one of you, and I really want to try to minimize my
researcher bias. So again, there's no pressure on your part, but I do just want to put that out there.
And as I mentioned earlier to I will certainly share the results of the study when it's done with all
of you. So, again, thank you so very much for your time.