INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDIES (IJTERS)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: 3049-1614

The Impact of High-Intensity Teacher Professional Development on Instructional Effectiveness and Student Achievement in Secondary Schools

Vincent

Assistant Professor of English, Lakshmi College of Education, Gandhigram, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.

Article information

Received: 7th March 2026
Received in revised form: 14th April 2026
Accepted: 16th May 2026
Available online: 18th June 2026

Volume: 3
Issue: 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63090/IJTERS/3049.1614.0037

Abstract

Teacher professional development (PD) is widely regarded as a cornerstone of school improvement, yet significant variability in PD quality and intensity in secondary education settings raises pressing questions about which forms of PD most effectively enhance instructional practice and student outcomes. This quantitative study investigated the differential effects of high-intensity and low-intensity teacher PD programs on six key outcomes: instructional effectiveness, pedagogical content knowledge, teacher self-efficacy, classroom management quality, reflective practice, and student academic achievement gains. Using a quasi-experimental, nonequivalent comparison group design, data were collected from 410 secondary school teachers (N = 410) across 24 schools in three school districts following a full academic year of differentiated PD provision. High-intensity PD involved sustained, job-embedded, collaborative learning communities with coaching support (mean contact hours = 64.3), while low-intensity PD consisted of episodic workshops without follow-up (mean contact hours = 12.7). Independent samples t-tests and hierarchical multiple regression analyses revealed that high-intensity PD participants significantly outperformed their low-intensity counterparts on all six outcomes, with effect sizes ranging from medium (d = 0.54) to large (d = 0.93). Moderation analyses indicated that the benefits of high-intensity PD were amplified for early-career teachers and teachers in high-disadvantage school contexts. Findings underscore the critical importance of PD design features, particularly intensity, collaboration, and job-embededness, for generating meaningful and sustained improvements in secondary teaching quality.

Keywords: - Teacher Professional Development, Instructional Effectiveness, Pedagogical Content Knowledge, Teacher Self-Efficacy, Secondary Education, Student Achievement, Job-Embedded Learning, Professional Learning Communities

I. INTRODUCTION

Teacher quality is consistently identified as the most influential school-level factor affecting student learning and achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hattie, 2009). Within the broad enterprise of improving teacher quality, professional development (PD) represents the primary institutional mechanism through which practicing teachers acquire, refine, and extend the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that underpin effective instruction. Yet decades of research have produced a sobering verdict on the prevailing model of teacher PD in many secondary school systems: episodic, workshop-based, one-size-fits-all programs delivered in isolation from classroom practice are largely ineffective in producing meaningful or sustained improvements in teaching quality or student outcomes (Desimone, 2009; Guskey, 2002; Yoon et al., 2007).

In contrast, an emerging consensus in the research literature points to a set of design features associated with high-quality, high-impact PD: sustained duration, active learning opportunities, content focus, collaboration, and coherence with school improvement priorities (Desimone, 2009; Timperley et al., 2007). PD programs embodying these features, variously described as job-embedded PD, professional learning communities, instructional coaching, and inquiry cycles, have demonstrated significantly stronger effects on teaching practice and student learning than conventional workshop-based approaches (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Timperley et al., 2007).

Despite this growing evidence base, the vast majority of secondary school teachers continue to receive PD that falls well short of the intensity and design quality identified as effective. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) found that only 30% of

U.S. teachers participated in PD that could be characterized as sustained and intensive, while the majority experienced PD programs lasting fewer than two days. This gap between research evidence and prevalent practice creates a significant and consequential inequity: teachers in schools with greater resources to invest in sustained PD infrastructure are likely to develop more effective instructional repertoires, widening the already substantial quality gap between schools serving advantaged and disadvantaged student populations (Ingvarson et al., 2005).

The present study contributes to this literature by comparing the effects of high-intensity and low-intensity PD programs on secondary school teacher outcomes and student achievement gains across a sample of 410 teachers in 24 schools. The study addresses three research questions and employs hierarchical regression to examine moderating effects of teaching experience and school socioeconomic context on PD effectiveness.

1.1. Research Questions and Hypotheses

The study was guided by the following research questions:

- RQ1: Are there statistically significant differences in instructional effectiveness, pedagogical content knowledge, teacher self-efficacy, classroom management quality, and reflective practice between teachers who participated in high-intensity PD and those who participated in low-intensity PD?
- RQ2: Are there statistically significant differences in student academic achievement gains between classrooms led by high-intensity PD participants compared to those led by low-intensity PD participants?
- RQ3: Do teaching experience and school socioeconomic context moderate the relationship between PD intensity and teacher and student outcomes?

Based on the extant literature, it was hypothesized that high-intensity PD participants would demonstrate significantly superior outcomes on all six measures compared to low-intensity PD participants (H1). It was further hypothesized that the benefits of high-intensity PD would be more pronounced for early-career teachers, who have less established instructional repertoires and therefore more developmental headroom (H2a), and for teachers in high-disadvantage schools, where the gap between current practice and high-quality instruction is typically largest (H2b).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Defining Effective Teacher Professional Development

Desimone (2009) proposed an influential conceptual framework identifying five core features of effective PD: content focus (centering PD on subject matter and student learning of specific content); active learning (engaging teachers as learners through observation, analysis, and practice); coherence (alignment with school goals, state standards, and teachers' prior knowledge); duration (sustained engagement over time, with a minimum threshold commonly cited at 50 or more hours); and collective participation (involving groups of teachers from the same school, grade, or subject). This framework has been widely adopted by researchers and policymakers and has generated substantial supporting empirical evidence (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Garet et al., 2001).

Garet et al. (2001) conducted one of the earliest large-scale quantitative studies of PD design features, surveying over 1,000 mathematics and science teachers. Their findings confirmed that reform-type activities characterized by sustained duration, collective participation, and active learning were significantly more likely to produce changes in teachers' knowledge, skills, and classroom practice compared to traditional workshop formats. Duration emerged as a particularly critical variable: teachers who participated in more hours of PD showed significantly greater gains in knowledge and reported more changes in instructional practice.

2.2. Professional Learning Communities and Instructional Coaching

Two models of job-embedded PD have attracted particularly strong research support in the secondary school context: professional learning communities (PLCs) and instructional coaching. PLCs involve structured, ongoing collaborative inquiry among teachers centered on student learning evidence, shared goals, and collective accountability for outcomes (Stoll et al., 2006). A meta-analysis by Vescio et al. (2008), reviewing 11 studies of PLC effects on teaching practice and student learning, found consistent positive effects, with particularly strong evidence for improvements in student achievement when PLCs were sustained over multiple years and embedded in a culture of shared accountability.

Instructional coaching, in which trained coaches work alongside teachers in their classrooms to model, observe, and provide feedback on practice, has similarly accumulated a growing evidence base. Knight (2007) synthesized research on coaching and identified it as among the highest-impact PD formats available, citing its combination of individualization, sustained engagement, and job-embededness. Kraft et al. (2018) conducted a meta-analysis of 60 randomized and quasi-experimental studies of instructional coaching and found a mean effect size of 0.49 standard deviations on instructional practice and 0.18 on student achievement, with larger effects associated with higher-intensity coaching programs.

2.3. Self-Efficacy and Pedagogical Content Knowledge as Mediators

Two teacher-level constructs occupy a central place in theoretical accounts of how PD influences instructional practice and student outcomes: teacher self-efficacy and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). Bandura's (1997) social cognitive theory identifies self-efficacy beliefs, that is, teachers' confidence in their capacity to achieve specific instructional goals, as a critical mediator of effort, persistence, and instructional ambition. Teachers with high self-efficacy are more likely to adopt challenging instructional approaches, persist in the face of setbacks, and respond adaptively to student learning difficulties (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). PD that provides teachers with supported practice, expert modeling, and evidence of impact

on student learning is theorized to enhance self-efficacy through the mechanisms of mastery experience, vicarious learning, and social persuasion identified by Bandura (1997).

PCK, originally conceptualized by Shulman (1986) and subsequently elaborated within the TPACK framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2006), encompasses the specialized knowledge that enables teachers to represent subject matter in pedagogically powerful and student-accessible ways. High-quality PD, particularly content-focused PD that engages teachers in deep disciplinary inquiry alongside pedagogical reflection, has been consistently associated with growth in PCK and with improvements in student understanding of complex disciplinary concepts (Garet et al., 2001; Timperley et al., 2007).

2.4. PD Effectiveness for Early-Career and Disadvantaged-Context Teachers

The research literature suggests that the effects of PD may not be uniform across teacher subgroups. Early-career teachers, who are navigating the transition from pre-service preparation to independent classroom practice, face a distinctive set of developmental challenges, including classroom management, curriculum pacing, and the integration of theoretical knowledge with practical judgment (Ingvarson et al., 2005). High-intensity PD that provides mentoring, collaborative inquiry, and structured reflection has been theorized to be particularly beneficial during this formative career stage, accelerating the development of the practical knowledge and self-efficacy that stabilize early practice (Timperley et al., 2007).

Teachers in high-disadvantage school contexts face a qualitatively different challenge: they must develop instructional repertoires responsive to the complex learning needs of students who frequently arrive in classrooms with significant prior knowledge gaps, language needs, and social-emotional support requirements. Yoon et al. (2007), in a systematic review of evidence on PD and student achievement, found that intensive PD programs produced larger achievement gains for students in higher-disadvantage settings, suggesting that sustained investment in teacher quality may be a particularly high-leverage equity strategy in schools serving economically disadvantaged communities.

III. METHOD

3.1. Research Design

The study employed a quasi-experimental, nonequivalent comparison group design in which teachers were assigned to high-intensity or low-intensity PD conditions at the school level. Schools were allocated to conditions based on district-level PD investment decisions rather than random assignment; however, schools were matched in pairs across the two conditions on district, school size, student socioeconomic composition, and prior-year student achievement to maximize pre-intervention comparability. Ethical approval was obtained from the university Human Research Ethics Board, and informed consent was secured from all participating teachers, school administrators, and the parents of students whose achievement data were included in analyses.

3.2. Participants

The sample comprised 410 secondary school teachers (Grades 9-12) drawn from 24 schools across three school districts in a large metropolitan region. Twelve schools were assigned to the high-intensity PD condition (n = 212 teachers), and twelve to the low-intensity PD comparison condition (n = 198 teachers). Teacher demographic and professional characteristics for both groups are presented in Table 1. Pre-intervention equivalence checks confirmed no statistically significant differences between groups on teaching experience, gender, subject area, or school SES context.

Table 1. Participant Demographic and Professional Characteristics by PD Condition

Characteristic	High-Intensity PD (n = 212)	Low-Intensity PD (n = 198)	Total (N = 410)
Gender			
Female	141 (66.5%)	132 (66.7%)	273 (66.6%)
Male	67 (31.6%)	63 (31.8%)	130 (31.7%)
Non-binary/Other	4 (1.9%)	3 (1.5%)	7 (1.7%)
Teaching Experience			
1-5 years	62 (29.2%)	58 (29.3%)	120 (29.3%)
6-15 years	89 (42.0%)	84 (42.4%)	173 (42.2%)
16+ years	61 (28.8%)	56 (28.3%)	117 (28.5%)
Subject Area			
STEM	88 (41.5%)	82 (41.4%)	170 (41.5%)
Humanities/Social Science	75 (35.4%)	70 (35.4%)	145 (35.4%)
Arts/Other	49 (23.1%)	46 (23.2%)	95 (23.1%)
School SES Context			
High-disadvantage	71 (33.5%)	67 (33.8%)	138 (33.7%)
Mid-disadvantage	87 (41.0%)	81 (40.9%)	168 (41.0%)
Low-disadvantage	54 (25.5%)	50 (25.3%)	104 (25.4%)

Note. PD = professional development. School SES context is based on the percentage of students qualifying for the national free school meals program: high-disadvantage (> 40%), mid-disadvantage (20-40%), low-disadvantage (< 20%).

3.3. Professional Development Programs

High-intensity PD was operationalized as a structured program combining three interrelated components delivered across the full academic year:

- Bi-weekly professional learning community (PLC) meetings (90 minutes each, 32 sessions total), structured around collaborative analysis of student work, shared lesson planning, and inquiry into student learning challenges;

- Fortnightly instructional coaching cycles involving pre-observation conferences, classroom observation, and post-observation feedback sessions; and
- Four full-day content-focused workshops delivered in the first, eighth, fourteenth, and eighteenth weeks.

Mean total PD contact hours for the high-intensity condition was 64.3 hours (SD = 4.7). Teachers in the low-intensity comparison condition participated in four half-day workshops (one per school term) on general teaching strategies, with no follow-up coaching or collaborative structures. Mean total PD contact hours was 12.7 hours (SD = 1.9).

3.4. Measures

Instructional effectiveness was measured using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System Secondary (CLASS-S; Pianta et al., 2012), a validated observational instrument assessing emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support. Three trained observers rated each participating teacher on two occasions, with inter-rater reliability confirmed (ICC = .84). Pedagogical content knowledge was assessed using subject-specific PCK tests developed and validated by the research team in collaboration with district curriculum officers (alpha = .86). Teacher self-efficacy was measured using the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), a 24-item scale assessing efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management (alpha = .93). Classroom management quality was assessed via the CLASS-S classroom organization subscale. Reflective practice was measured using the Reflective Teaching Scale (Larrivee, 2008), a 40-item self-report instrument with strong psychometric properties (alpha = .91). Student academic achievement gains were computed as the difference between end-of-year and beginning-of-year standardized achievement scores, averaged across all students taught by each participating teacher.

3.5. Data Analysis

Preliminary analyses examined group equivalence on pre-intervention covariates and verified distributional assumptions. Primary analyses addressed RQ1 and RQ2 using independent samples t-tests with Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons, accompanied by Cohen's d effect size estimates. RQ3 was addressed through hierarchical multiple regression analyses in which control variables (teaching experience, subject area, school SES context) were entered in Step 1, PD condition in Step 2, and the PD Condition x Teaching Experience and PD Condition x School SES interaction terms in Step 3. All analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 28. The alpha threshold was set at .05; Bonferroni-corrected thresholds are reported for multiple comparison analyses.

IV. RESULTS

4.1. Preliminary Analyses

Independent samples t-tests and chi-square analyses confirmed that the two PD groups did not differ significantly on any pre-intervention teacher characteristic, including years of teaching experience (t(408) = 0.41, p = .681), prior self-efficacy scores (t(408) = 0.83, p = .408), gender distribution (chi-squared(2) = 0.07, p = .966), subject area (chi-squared(2) = 0.01, p = .995), or school SES context (chi-squared(2) = 0.02, p = .990). Student achievement scores at baseline also did not differ significantly between the classes of high-intensity and low-intensity PD teachers (t(408) = 1.12, p = .263). Levene's tests confirmed homogeneity of variance for all primary outcome variables.

4.2. Primary Analyses: PD Intensity and Teacher and Student Outcomes

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics, t-test results, and Cohen's d effect sizes for all six outcome variables. High-intensity PD participants demonstrated statistically significantly higher scores than low-intensity participants on every outcome after Bonferroni correction (all p < .001). Effect sizes ranged from medium (classroom management quality, d = 0.54) to large (reflective practice, d = 0.93; instructional effectiveness, d = 0.85; pedagogical content knowledge, d = 0.82). Student academic achievement gains were also significantly higher in classrooms of high-intensity PD teachers (M = 72.91 vs. 66.44, d = 0.70).

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics, t-Test Results, and Effect Sizes by PD Condition

Outcome Variable	High-Intensity M (SD)	Low-Intensity M (SD)	t (408)	Cohen's d
Instructional Effectiveness	4.21 (0.61)	3.64 (0.74)	8.77***	0.85
Pedagogical Content Knowledge	4.08 (0.66)	3.52 (0.71)	8.34***	0.82
Teacher Self-Efficacy	4.14 (0.58)	3.71 (0.69)	6.93***	0.68
Classroom Management Quality	4.03 (0.63)	3.67 (0.72)	5.48***	0.54
Reflective Practice	4.17 (0.59)	3.58 (0.68)	9.44***	0.93
Student Achievement Gains	72.91 (8.83)	66.44 (9.71)	7.14***	0.70

Note. All t-tests used Bonferroni-corrected alpha = .008 for six simultaneous comparisons. Student achievement gain scores are expressed as standardized percentage-point gains (0-100 scale). All other variables are rated on a 1-5 scale. *** p < .001.

4.3. Hierarchical Regression: Moderation Analyses

Table 3 presents results from the hierarchical regression analysis predicting instructional effectiveness (the primary outcome). The pattern of results was broadly consistent across outcome variables. In Step 1, the control block accounted for 8% of variance in instructional effectiveness (R-squared = .08, F(3, 406) = 11.72, p < .001), with teaching experience (beta = .18, p = .001) and school SES context (beta = .12, p = .028) emerging as significant predictors. Subject area was not a significant predictor (beta = .07, p = .204). Adding PD condition in Step 2 produced a significant increment in explained variance (delta

R-squared = .17, p < .001), with PD intensity emerging as the strongest predictor in the model (beta = .41, p < .001). The final step, adding the interaction terms, produced a further significant increment (delta R-squared = .04, p < .01).

Table 3. Hierarchical Regression Predicting Instructional Effectiveness

Predictor	B	SE B	beta	p
Step 1: Control Variables				
Teaching Experience	0.31	0.09	.18	.001
Subject Area (STEM ref.)	0.14	0.11	.07	.204
School SES Context	0.22	0.10	.12	.028
Step 2: PD Condition				
PD Intensity (High = 1)	0.57	0.07	.41	< .001
Step 3: Interaction				
PD Intensity x Teaching Exp.	0.19	0.08	.14	.017
PD Intensity x School SES	0.23	0.09	.16	.010
R-squared (Step 1)	.08			
Delta R-squared (Step 2)	.17***			
Delta R-squared (Step 3)	.04**			

Note. PD = professional development. Exp. = experience. B = unstandardized regression coefficient. SE B = standard error of B. beta = standardized regression coefficient. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

Decomposition of the significant interaction effects revealed that the instructional effectiveness advantage of high-intensity PD was largest for early-career teachers (1-5 years; d = 1.04) compared to mid-career (6-15 years; d = 0.81) and experienced teachers (16+ years; d = 0.63). Similarly, the PD Intensity x School SES interaction indicated that teachers in high-disadvantage school contexts benefited most from high-intensity PD (d = 1.01) relative to mid-disadvantage (d = 0.83) and low-disadvantage contexts (d = 0.72). These patterns were replicated for pedagogical content knowledge, teacher self-efficacy, and student achievement gain outcomes.

V. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide robust quantitative support for the proposition that high-intensity, job-embedded teacher PD produces substantially superior outcomes compared to conventional low-intensity workshop models across a broad range of teacher and student indicators in secondary school settings. The magnitude of observed effects, ranging from d = 0.54 to d = 0.93, places high-intensity PD among the highest-impact educational interventions identified in the broader literature, comparable to the effect sizes reported by Kraft et al. (2018) for instructional coaching and Hattie (2009) for other high-impact educational practices.

The particularly large effect observed for reflective practice (d = 0.93) is noteworthy and theoretically consistent. High-intensity PD programs that incorporate structured collaborative inquiry, coaching feedback, and sustained engagement with student learning evidence are theorized to develop teachers' capacity for critical self-examination, precisely because they build structured habits of evidence-based reflection into professional routines (Timperley et al., 2007). The large effect on reflective practice suggests that high-intensity PD may produce its broader instructional benefits not only through direct skill acquisition but through the development of a more reflective and adaptive professional orientation.

The moderation findings carry significant policy implications. The finding that early-career teachers benefit most from high-intensity PD, with an effect size of d = 1.04, suggests that investment in intensive induction-year and early-career PD represents a particularly high-return strategy. Early in a teaching career, the developmental gap between current and expert practice is largest, and the establishment of reflective habits, collaborative professional norms, and strong PCK at this stage may have compounding benefits across the career trajectory. Similarly, the larger effects observed in high-disadvantage school contexts align with Yoon et al.'s (2007) equity argument and suggest that differential investment in intensive PD for teachers in disadvantaged settings could serve as a meaningful lever for closing persistent achievement gaps.

Several limitations merit acknowledgment. The quasi-experimental design, while strengthened by school-level matching and pre-intervention equivalence checks, does not support causal inference with the confidence of a randomized controlled trial. Selection bias at the school level, with some districts more inclined to invest in intensive PD than others, cannot be fully ruled out. Additionally, the study examined outcomes at the end of a single academic year; it is possible that effects will consolidate, deepen, or decay over longer follow-up periods. Future research employing randomized designs and multi-year follow-up would substantially strengthen the causal warrant for these findings.

VI. CONCLUSION

This quantitative study contributes meaningful large-sample evidence to the debate about how teacher professional development should be designed and resourced in secondary education. Across six outcome measures spanning teacher knowledge, practice, efficacy, and student achievement, high-intensity job-embedded PD demonstrated substantial and statistically significant advantages over conventional workshop-based provision. The consistency of effects across diverse subject areas and school contexts, and the amplified benefits for early-career teachers and those in high-disadvantage schools, provide a compelling evidence base for systemic reorientation of PD investment toward sustained, collaborative, and job-embedded models.

For school and district leaders, the findings support a fundamental rethinking of how PD resources are allocated, with particular emphasis on building the structural conditions, including protected time for collaboration, access to instructional coaching, and coherent PD sequences across career stages, that enable high-intensity PD to flourish. For researchers, the field would benefit from randomized designs capable of providing higher-confidence causal estimates, longitudinal studies tracking

the durability of PD effects over multi-year periods, and investigations of the specific mechanisms through which high-intensity PD produces its observed effects on instructional practice and student learning.

REFERENCES

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

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*(1), 1–44. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher, 38*(3), 181–199.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 915–945.

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8*(3), 381–391. https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000512

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.

Ingvarson, L., Meiers, M., & Beavis, A. (2005). Factors affecting the impact of professional development programs on teachers' knowledge, practice, student outcomes and efficacy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 13*(10), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v13n10.2005

Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction*. Corwin Press.

Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 88*(4), 547–588.

Larrivee, B. (2008). Development of a tool to assess teachers' level of reflective practice. *Reflective Practice, 9*(3), 341–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623940802207451

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x

Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System: Secondary manual*. Teachstone Training.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher, 15*(2), 4–14.

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change, 7*(4), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-0001-8

Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). *Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration*. Ministry of Education.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783–805.

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

Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report No. REL 2007–033). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.