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ABSTRACT

This mixed methods study of the *American Indian* curriculum in the Municipal School District explored the perceived levels of efficacy and content knowledge of teachers and the relationship of these levels to the enactment of an American Indian curriculum in a district with few American Indian students. Research questions include:

1. How do participants assess their perceived efficacy and content knowledge regarding the *American Indian* curriculum?

2. What is the relationship between the participants’ perceived efficacy, their perceived content knowledge, and the enactment of the *American Indian* curriculum?

Using multiple methods, to include a survey, an efficacy scale, and stimulated recall of video analysis with a follow up interview, this study examined the questions outlined above, in an attempt to shed light on the extent to which teachers perceive themselves to be knowledgeable and able to effectively enact the *American Indian* curriculum.
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Introduction

Introduction

The role of multicultural education has evolved over time, and has mirrored a changing society. Multicultural education was first aimed at subordinate or marginalized groups as a means of empowerment and social change. The civil rights movement of the 1960’s and 70’s broadened the definition of multicultural education and added sexual orientation, age, and ability to the already numerous marginalized groups fighting for recognition. As a result, our role as multicultural educators changed. In today’s society, the role of multicultural educators is to prepare students for a multicultural world wherein students will have the knowledge and tools to promote social change (Labelle & Ward, 1994). This new role includes the need to increase understanding and cooperation of different cultures, as well as to reduce prejudice. Multicultural education now aims to increase pride within students from underrepresented groups, to foster social justice, and to teach all students tools for constructive social change. This means students will need to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills to participate in cross-cultural interactions and in personal, social, and civic actions that will help make our nation more democratic and just (Banks, 1999, pp. ix-x).

Since the civil rights movement of the 1960’s and 1970’s, the modern multicultural education movement has gained momentum in American educational systems; however, the debate continues over what should be taught, as well as how it should be taught. The decisions regarding what, how, and to whom we teach
multicultural content have been largely determined by political forces outside education. The addition of numerous multicultural “groups,” which were more broadly defined in the era of civil rights movement, has given us a better understanding of what we teach with regards to multicultural education. According to the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development:

   The essential goals of multicultural education embrace: (a) recognizing and prizing diversity; (b) developing greater understanding of other cultural patterns; (c) respecting individuals of all cultures; and (d) developing positive and productive interaction among people and among experiences of diverse cultural groups. (ASCD Multicultural Education Commission, 1977, p. 290).

These goals of multicultural education are impacted by changing demographics. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2010), a pattern of annual increases in students enrolled in public schools has, and will continue through the year 2018. Student enrollment was up 26% from 1985-2009, and these record levels will continue. It is estimated that between the years of 2009 and 2018, public school enrollments will increase by 8% (NCES, 2010). Along with increased enrollment, a rapidly shifting racial and ethnic distribution is occurring. NCES reports that from 1988-2008, white student enrollment dropped from 68% to 55%, while other races increased their enrollments. Hispanic student enrollment nearly doubled, and surpassed Black student enrollments. Students of Asian descent also increased enrollment numbers, while American Indian/Alaskan Native students were as low as .06% in 1995, but had risen to .09% in 2008 (NCES, 2010). These demographics have powerful implications for not only students, teachers, and teacher educators, but for society at large. “The way in
which we choose to respond to such diversity is critically important” (Howard, 1999, p. 2). For example, in education, curricular reform and the incorporation of multicultural curricula are means by which educators can change traditional curriculum that has been written from a western perspective, and give voice and perspective to those groups who have been historically marginalized in texts and instructional media.

Numerous academic organizations have pushed for adopting multicultural curricula, though the extent of actualizing a multiethnic approach has been a difficult and treacherous path. For example, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) contends that schools should preserve and extend cultural diversity to all students. In 1972, AACTE developed a statement of multicultural education, which argued that “Multicultural education rejects the view that schools should seek to melt away cultural differences or the view that schools should merely tolerate cultural pluralism” (p. 1). In this sense, diversity is a valuable resource rather than a disadvantage. As a result, terms such as “cultural pluralism” and “diversity” are becoming more well-defined and are affirmed by educational associations who reject the notions of assimilation and separatism, and promote cultural pluralism as an integral part of the educational process at every level (AACTE, 1972, p. 2). The challenge for educators, then, is to become knowledgeable about minority perspectives and to develop curricula that are considered valuable, rather than inconvenient.

Unfortunately, conflict within the multicultural curriculum arises when numerous cultural groups are all vying for a spot in the curriculum without acknowledging the underlying social causes of prejudice, racism, and social justice. Each of society’s groups competes against each other for scarce resources, furthering the advantages of the
dominant group’s social and institutional structures (La Belle & Ward, 1994). It is through this conflict and struggle that multiethnic content integration has occurred. However, the question still exists, “Whose version of history will be taught”? To address this question, racial and ethnic minority group members have examined textbooks and other media that convey distortions or inaccuracies about their history and heritage. Parents and scholars from marginalized groups have also challenged much of what passes for the “truth” and “fact” in the dominant society by establishing how “accepted” ideas are actually the creations of people with particular points of view (Sleeter, 2000). Rethinking and rewriting traditional curriculum to include diverse perspectives is not without controversy; therefore, our challenge as educators is to find those perspectives and present them within the curricula.

**Statement of the Problem**

Curricula about the history of American Indians are as varied as the more than 560 federally recognized tribes in the United States (U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 2010). Within these curricula, there are varying degrees to which they are implemented. For some communities American Indian curriculum is considered imperative while other communities do not view this as necessary. When curriculum is deemed as American Indian focused, we can see repeated themes emerging. For example, Gloria Ladson-Billings (2003), in a review of social studies curricula, states that in curricula relating to the history of American Indians,

We see [American Indians] as welcoming European settlers, joining them in a Thanksgiving celebration, guiding them as they explore the west, being massacred as settlers push westward, and finally being removed and finally subdued by
Andrew Jackson. After the “Trail of Tears” American Indians virtually disappear from our textbooks and curriculum. (p. 3)

As Ladson-Billings illustrates, many curricula about American Indians concentrate on the holiday and traditional aspect of celebrating some sort of historical or cultural event, such as Thanksgiving. This, in itself is problematic enough to warrant concern. However, this is just one example of how education has been used as a tool to depict American Indians in stereotypical ways and to assimilate and acculturate this population.

Throughout history American Indians have endured many battles to preserve and retain their languages and culture. La Belle and Ward (1994) note that “In the late eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth century, the dominant white society maintained that Native American culture would die out in the face of European civilization—either through assimilating or by vanishing” (pp. 12-13). Today, many American Indians are still fighting for a historically accurate and culturally appropriate place in the curriculum. For too long, American Indians have been portrayed in the past tense, misinterpreted, or not recognized for their contributions to society. In other words, many curricula involving American Indians have been historically inaccurate. Furthermore, much of the curricula, including textbooks, lack information regarding contemporary American Indians and issues. Linking these two concerns is the perspective from which history is told. Many books and textbooks regarding American Indians are told not from the perspectives of American Indian people, but from the larger society—those outside American Indian communities.
As a student teaching supervisor in collaboration with a nearby major university and a local school district, the *American Indian*\(^1\) curriculum came to my attention. A review of the curriculum brought stereotypical and historical accuracy issues to life. Working with the curriculum developers in the Municipal School District\(^2\) over an entire year brought small but significant changes to the curriculum. While the district was willing to make changes to the unit, the structure and scope of the curriculum did not change. Teachers in the district who will implement this curriculum are now asking questions about the content of the curriculum. Teachers may or may not possess necessary background knowledge to teach this curriculum.

**Purpose of this Study**

This mixed methods multicase study of the Municipal School District explored how, in a predominantly White school district, the *American Indian* curriculum is taught, through the lens of its teachers. This mixed methods study, defined by Johnson & Onwuegbuzie (2004), as “The class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative or qualitative research techniques, methods, or approaches into a single study” (p. 17), examined teachers’ perceived self-efficacy when teaching the *American Indian* curriculum. Also explored, was the perceived content knowledge they have obtained prior to the start of teaching this unit. This study has relevance for documenting how teachers are prepared to teach this unit, as well as the extent to which the *American Indian* unit is culturally appropriate and relevant in light of the goals of multicultural education. In addition, the forms of quantitative as well as qualitative data collections

\(^1\) This is a pseudonym for the title of the curriculum, masked to protect the identity of the school district
\(^2\) Pseudonym used to protect the identity of the school district
used in this study shed light on the relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy perceptions, content knowledge perceptions, and their enactment of the *American Indian* curriculum.

**Research Questions**

This study quantitatively examined the levels of perceived teacher efficacy (generally defined as a teacher’s belief in his or her skills and abilities to positively impact student achievement) along with the perceived levels of content knowledge (knowledge of the subject and its organizing structures) of the participants. Four cases were then qualitatively examined for their unique classroom practices and enactment of the *American Indian* curriculum. In doing so, this research answered the following questions:

1. How do participants assess their perceived efficacy and perceived content knowledge regarding the *American Indian* curriculum?
2. What is the relationship between the participant’s perceived efficacy, their perceived content knowledge, and the curricular enactment of the *American Indian* curriculum?

**Conceptual Framework**

As outlined in Figure 1 below, the conceptual framework for this study guided the research to be conducted in the Municipal School District. The conceptual framework is based on participants’ perceptions of teacher efficacy and perceived content knowledge. In understanding how teachers feel about teaching this unit, the relationship between their levels of perceived efficacy and perceived content knowledge informed how they enacted
the curriculum. For the purposes of this study, key terms are briefly covered here, although a more thorough interpretation follows in subsequent chapters.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

This conceptual framework lays out the landscape for this case study. Understanding the levels of perceived efficacy and perceived content knowledge of the participants shed light on potential implications for classroom practices. Initial data collection methods along with quantitative data analysis were intended to determine those perceived levels in order to establish which of the participants fit into each of the four categories—high efficacy and high content knowledge, high efficacy and low content knowledge, low efficacy and high content knowledge, and lastly, low efficacy paired with low content knowledge. As we know from the literature (Allinder, 1994; Ashton & Webb, 1986; Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1988, 1989; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Riggs & Enoch, 1990; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998; Wheatley, 2002, 2005; Woolfolk
participants in each of the four categories, have certain characteristic behaviors or actions attributed to the differing levels of efficacy. In addition to the attributes of the perceived efficacy, the perceived content knowledge also played a role in how each participant acted on the American Indian curriculum.

This multicase study chose one participant quantitatively from each of the four quadrants, and videotaped a lesson from the unit. This videotaping and subsequent stimulated recall of the events connected the efficacy, content knowledge and enactment of the curriculum by qualitatively observing the range of activities, the methods of assessment of student learning, and the topics covered by the four participants. In this sense, the final open-ended interview illustrates the relationship between how participants see themselves, their knowledge, and the students enacted within this American Indian curriculum.

**Perceived efficacy**

Teacher efficacy is defined as “the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance” (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 2). It is extremely important, however, to note that efficacy affects much more than the individual teacher. The links between teachers’ belief in their own instructional efficacy and student achievement are numerous. According to Goddard, Hoy, and Woolfolk-Hoy (2004), “Teachers’ sense of efficacy is a significant predictor of productive teaching practices” (p. 4). There are multiple means by which this is revealed and how it relates to classroom practices. The perceived efficacy levels of the participants are related to how long teachers will persist (Bandura, 1977, 1993; Gibson & Dembo, 1984) and to what degree they will enact a particular curriculum (Allinder, 1994; Goddard et al., 2004; Guskey,
The perceived efficacy of the participants in this research was essential to understanding their feelings about their capabilities and the influences of those feelings on their choices of activities, efforts, and student outcomes.

It is not unreasonable to assume that teachers with a good sense of self-efficacy will put forth more effort in planning and teaching, as well as having a wider range of activities, whereas if a teacher feels that a situation or practice is beyond their capabilities or skills, they will avoid those threatening situations. Lower perceived self-efficacy can also foster negative teacher attitudes, which will lessen the amount of innovation in practice and may cause some teachers to avoid certain curricular content altogether (Wheatley, 2005). Research also shows that those with lower perceived efficacy are less organized and spend less time on planning (Allinder, 1994).

Teachers’ levels of perceived efficacy have a direct effect on behavior, activities, and classroom practices. However, teachers’ perceptions of their level of efficacy may become problematic, as psychologists have written, if it reaches a level of “gross overconfidence” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2005, p. 756). In this sense, overly-efficacious teachers feel little need to question or to improve their practice. In these cases of strongly efficacious teachers, we need to look at whether or not it is beneficial, and whether these teachers are learning from failures. In addition to problematic overconfidence, those teachers with lower efficacy, mild uncertainty, or strong doubts, may have “productive doubts” (Wheatley, 2005, p. 15) which can foster their willingness to learn and reflect on teaching and content matter. Therefore, researchers of perceived efficacy (Schunk, 1991; Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Pajares, 1992) have suggested that in order to determine where doubts lie, or how overly-efficacious teachers see their
knowledge, qualitative methods such as case studies are needed. This case study will determine the participants’ levels of perceived efficacy using an efficacy scale adapted (Bandura, 2006) specifically for the American Indian curriculum.

**Perceived content knowledge**

“Content knowledge includes knowledge of the subject matter and its organizing structures” (Grossman, Wilson, & Shulman, 1989; Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987). For the purposes of this study content knowledge is understood as knowledge of teaching overall, including the American Indian curriculum and its structure as a curriculum.

Although pedagogical content knowledge, defined by Shulman as “the distinctive bodies of knowledge for teaching, including an understanding of content and pedagogy” (1987, p. 4), is widely acknowledged as vital to effective teaching, researchers in this area have noted a “missing paradigm”; termed “specialized content knowledge” (Shulman, 1986, p. 391). This study looked at specialized content knowledge as that which is specific to historic and contemporary American Indians. In this sense, although completely separating pedagogical content knowledge from specialized content knowledge is impossible, this study is focused on the specialized content knowledge and its perceived levels according to the participants. “Teachers who do not themselves know a subject well, are not likely to have the knowledge they need to help students learn this content” (Schulman, p. 404).

Where do teachers learn the specialized content knowledge needed to teach this curriculum? Participants in this study may have learned about American Indians during their K-12 educational experience. Unfortunately, these versions of American history taught in public schools are often taught from a Eurocentric male protestant view, starting
from Columbus and continuing with Christian colonization over a century later (Banks, 1993; Ladson-Billings, 2003). Another possible source for learning this specialized content knowledge is during undergraduate studies. “Unfortunately, subject matter courses in teacher preparation programs tend to be academic in both the best and worst senses of the word, scholarly and irrelevant, either way remote from classroom teaching” (Schulman, 2008, p. 404). Specialized content knowledge about American Indians may also be learned from media, such as movies, art, books, and newspapers. Although this information is gained informally, the influence of it is no less than formal teaching.

In addition to this informal learning, life experiences with, or meeting and knowing American Indians is a method of learning. “The ‘contact hypothesis,’ states that close contact between members of different races fosters positive racial attitudes. Conversely, lack of contact leads to prejudice and negative stereotypes” (Tan, Fujioka, & Lucht, 1997, p. 265). The extent to which each of the participants in this study has gained perceived American Indian specific knowledge will vary due to life experiences. It is hypothesized that all participants have had some type of exposure to American Indian issues or people.

It is also reasonable to contend that not all of the perceived content knowledge regarding the American Indian curriculum may be accurate. Cultural information regarding historical and contemporary American Indians has been trivialized and romanticized. This, miseducation, in turn, reinforces stereotypes and misconceptions. Shulman (1986) argues that representations of the subject (in this case American Indians) are also informed by content-specific knowledge and conceptions, and in many cases, misconceptions. Understanding how students comprehend a content domain is crucial in
the work of teaching that content (Shulman, 1986, p. 392). Thus, the perceived content knowledge of the participants will inform how and what is taught within this unit, as well as participants’ assessment of student understanding of the content. This case study included an initial background information survey that determined the levels of perceived content knowledge of the participants.

**Curriculum enactment**

“Curriculum is not only an extraordinary complicated conversation, it is more than that- curriculum is a realm of action” (Wraga, 2002, p. 17). The term curriculum enactment derives from curriculum practice and curriculum implementation, clarified by Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1992) as, “The most promising prospect for improving the educational experiences of children, in which teachers and students collaborate on the conception and realization of educational purposes” (p. 403). It is an approach to curriculum implementation whereby democratic ideals are promoted to enhance student learning. Doyle (1992) views enactment as “patterns of how participants, materials, time, and subject matter come together as sequences of lessons” (p. 492). So not only are teachers “teaching” and students “learning”, but enactment considers the discourse between people, prior knowledge, and new content. To determine the relationship between the teacher, the curriculum and the learning of content by students, this study examined curriculum enactment through three units of analysis - the activities during a lesson, the topics covered (or not covered) in that lesson, and the participant’s assessment of student learning during the lesson.
Significance of this Study

This case study of the Municipal School District is significant in that no literature has been published pertaining to the efficacy of teachers as it relates specifically to an American Indian focused curriculum. By quantitatively and qualitatively examining the efficacy of the teachers, their content knowledge, and their enactment of an American Indian lesson, findings may drive future multicultural curricula in new directions.

Understanding the overall goals, as well as how to enact an American Indian focused curriculum from the perspective of the teachers, has the propensity to first, ensure that teachers are well prepared and confident in their knowledge of the subject matter. Secondly, understanding enactment of this curriculum using engaging student activities, a wide variety of interesting topics, and using assessment methods that connect the learners to the lessons will help the district, its teachers, and the students. Lastly, this curriculum has the propensity to break the cycle of inaccurate or stereotypical information being passed on to students. It is my hope that through this study, participants and the Municipal School district will benefit from the information determined through its analysis.

Summary

This first chapter has outlined the need for a study regarding the perceived efficacy levels and perceived content knowledge of the educators teaching the American Indian unit, and how those levels are related to the curriculum enactment. Although there have been political as well as historical accuracy issues surrounding curricula about American Indians, the Municipal School District has gone above and beyond the mandated curriculum to implement this unit. Unfortunately, with the changing face of
American students, as well as federal mandates to pass standardized testing, multicultural curriculum faces an uphill battle for a place in today’s curriculum.

The second chapter will further develop and clarify the meaning of perceived teacher efficacy and the theoretical background of the studies that have brought teacher efficacy to its current state. Furthermore, looking at the effects of perceived teacher efficacy and content knowledge has broad impacts on curricular enactment, not only for the participants, but for the students in the Municipal School District. The second chapter will also weigh the advantages of multicultural education, its defining role in education, and the political issues that accompany the development, implementation, and enactment of multicultural curriculum, as well as an American Indian focused curriculum.
Chapter Two
Review of Literature

Introduction

This chapter provides a review of literature relevant to this multicase study of American Indian curriculum in the Municipal School District. The review of literature begins broadly before being narrowed to a focus on American Indian curriculum, including the implementation and teaching of an American Indian focused unit. First, an overview of efficacy, its theoretical development, definitions, and relevance is reviewed. Teacher efficacy is further refined, and a discussion is provided regarding issues surrounding measurement of teacher efficacy, the means by which efficacy can be affirmed and altered, and its effects on teachers, students and the implementation of curriculum. This is followed by a discussion of curriculum, from the history of multicultural curriculum, federal policy and the obstacles faced with implementing such a curriculum, to the design and integration of it. This review of curriculum includes design of, and enactment of a curriculum. This discussion, from a theoretical perspective to the pragmatic implementation of curriculum, includes a discussion of how to provide for effective enactment of curriculum.

This review of the literature concludes with a discussion of specific content knowledge in regard to overall curriculum, and then specifically to curriculum about American Indians. This will show the need for research in the area of American Indian content knowledge as well as efficacy in the enactment of the American Indian curriculum in the Municipal School District.
Efficacy

For the purposes of this study, this review of literature will begin broadly with a discussion of self-efficacy and narrow the scope to teacher efficacy as it relates to participants teaching the *American Indian* unit in a selected school district. The seminal research on self-efficacy by Albert Bandura (1977, 1991, 1993, 2006) is reviewed along with successive research that narrows the scope specifically to teacher efficacy, and the accurate assessment of perceived levels of teacher efficacy. When teachers assess their perceived levels of efficacy, it is important to understand the effects those levels have on their practices as well as on their students. Also pertinent is the literature on what can affect those levels of efficacy, and what we can do to help teachers become more efficacious.

**Efficacy overview.** Bandura studied efficacy in the 1970’s, and his theoretical frameworks regarding self-efficacy are still influential today. In his early work, Bandura identified two types of efficacy- outcome expectancy and efficacy expectation. “An outcome expectancy is defined as a person’s estimate that a given behavior will lead to certain outcomes. An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcome” (Bandura, 1977, p. 193). It is important to note that, although closely related, there is a difference between outcome expectations and efficacy expectations.

A person can believe that certain practices and actions will produce certain outcomes (such as repetition leads to mastery), but if that person has serious doubts about whether or not they can adequately perform the practices and actions, then such information will not influence their behavior (Bandura, 1977, p. 193). People who
believe they are capable of achieving intended outcomes, therefore, will persist and cope with difficult situations. However, the opposite is also true; if a person believes situations and practices are beyond their skills to cope with, they will avoid those threatening situations. Within this framework of beliefs and expectations, individuals’ convictions regarding their own effectiveness (perceived self-efficacy) affects the level at which they will try to persist or cope within a given situation.

Self-efficacy, therefore, influences behavior. “Efficacy expectations determine how much effort people will expend and how long they endeavor to persist in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences” (Bandura, 1977, p. 194). The performance of a person dealing with a situation (outcome efficacy), then, is implicated by their feelings about their capabilities (efficacy expectation). For the purpose of this study, the primary focus is on efficacy expectations; it deals with the feelings of capabilities that influence behavior. Bandura (1991) argues that those persons with a stronger perception of self-efficacy will set higher goals, and will also show firmer commitment to achieving those goals. This is observable behavior. Although efficacy expectations are most definitively not implied to be the only influence on behavior, it can be a determining factor in “people’s choice of activities, how much effort they will expend, and how long they will sustain effort in dealing with stressful situations” (Bandura, 1977, p. 194). Cognitively, a person may perform poorly, adequately, or even exceptionally according to what they believe themselves capable of, depending upon their perceptions of self-efficacy.

Many researchers (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard et al., 2004; Guskey, 1988; Pajares, 1996; Rubeck & Enochs, 1991; Schunk, 1991) have since conducted further studies to examine teachers and their efficacy as it relates to Bandura’s influential work.
According to Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998), “This new strand of theory grew from Bandura’s work, and identified teacher efficacy as a type of self-efficacy” (p. 203).

**Teacher efficacy.** Teacher efficacy is defined as “the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance”, or as “teachers’ belief or conviction that they can influence how well students can learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated” (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 202). When Bandura’s work is applied to teacher efficacy, outcome expectancy reflects the environmental effects (such as family background) on students, and the extent to which teachers believe they can control those environmental factors. Self-efficacy beliefs include teachers’ evaluation of their abilities to bring about positive student change (Gibson & Dembo, 1984, p. 570). Thus, personal teaching efficacy is directly related to Bandura’s efficacy expectation, and teachers’ feelings about their capabilities will affect their performance in the classroom setting.

Teacher efficacy has its roots in social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 1988, 1989). It has been a growing field of research for the past thirty years. Among the first studies of efficacy conducted by the Rand organization, it was found that “Teachers’ sense of efficacy had a strong positive effect not only on student performance, but on the percentage of project goals achieved, on the amount of teacher change, and on the continued use of project methods and materials after the project ended” (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 204). Successive research (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Bandura, 1977, 1993, 2006; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Riggs & Enochs, 1990; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) has given researchers a more comprehensive and detailed understanding of the influences of environmental and teacher control.
As in Bandura’s work, a person with high persistence and coping behavior will respond and act more assuredly, while a person with lower persistence and coping skills will give up on a task easily. This is also the case with teacher efficacy. According to Gibson and Dembo (1984),

Teachers who believe student learning can be influenced by effective teaching, and who also have confidence in their own teaching abilities, should persist longer, provide a greater academic focus in the classroom, and exhibit different types of feedback than teachers who have lower expectations concerning their ability to influence student learning. (p. 570)

Teachers who perceive themselves to be competent in the content knowledge of the curriculum, therefore, should be more confident and willing to implement curriculum. In order to clarify what teachers with differing efficacy levels may exhibit in their behavior, please see Figure 2.1 below. In this respect, this discussion will turn to the varying levels of confidence.

**Teacher efficacy and self-confidence.** This literature review would not be complete without mention of teacher overconfidence. Teachers’ perceptions of their level of efficacy may become problematic, as psychologists have written, if it reaches a level of “gross overconfidence” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2005, p. 756). Such overconfidence will leave teachers with little or no incentive to change or improve upon either their practices or content matter. In other words, “If teachers have [great] confidence in their teaching, why should they change” (Brodkey, 1993, p. 70)? In relation to this study, if teachers are overconfident regarding the American Indian curriculum,
they will not feel the need to nurture their knowledge base of the content or their practices.

Wheatley (2005) builds upon Bandura’s (1977) theory regarding the magnitude, confidence, and strength of efficacy beliefs (p. 757). He argues that

If teachers have confidence for much more difficult teaching tasks (i.e. magnitude overconfidence) than they can accomplish, or for a much broader range of teaching tasks than they can execute (i.e., generality overconfidence), then these are merely other types of problematic teacher efficacy overconfidence. (Wheatley, p. 757)

In such cases where teachers are strongly efficacious, it needs to be distinguished whether or not it is beneficial, and whether the teacher is learning from his or her failures.

In determining participants’ levels of general and personal teaching efficacy, it is imperative to understand and/or interpret the meanings of those levels. This information is important to expose the underlying causes for high or low efficacious educators. For example, Wheatley (2005) found that, “Mild uncertainty or strong doubts about one’s efficacy regarding the teaching of specific subjects or specific teaching methods can foster negative teacher attitudes” (p. 7). These negative teacher attitudes may reduce the use of new and innovative teaching practices, or possibly cause teachers to avoid certain curricular content areas altogether.

Wheatley, accordingly, suggests that “productive doubts” can be beneficial to curriculum or school reform. Although teachers “may attach little importance to their efficacy doubts if they have negative attitudes towards particular subject matter in question” (p. 15), productive doubts can foster the willingness to learn and reflect on
teaching and content matter. Teachers may seek more certainty in their attachment to teaching goals, topics, and classroom practices, in turn raising their general and personal teaching efficacy. Wheatley also concurs with Hargreaves (1994) that, “The two worst states of knowledge are ignorance and certainty” (p. 246), and that somewhere in between lies the willingness to reflect, experiment, and change.

Although teacher doubts can range from mild uncertainty to profound doubts about their efficacy, challenging that uncertainty “pulls teachers into learning and change” (Wheatley, p. 9), and fosters motivation to improve. Since teacher efficacy levels not only foster new learning but can also affect multiple aspects of the teaching and learning process, this case study aims to identify the underlying causes of both high and low efficacious teachers, and what, if any motivation they have to change. Assessment of efficacy levels should therefore be reviewed.

**Efficacy assessment.** Gibson and Dembo (1984) furthered Bandura’s work in the 1980’s by refining teacher efficacy assessment to reflect personal teaching efficacy (Bandura’s self- efficacy) and general teaching efficacy (from Bandura’s outcome expectancy). Their research further refines the definitions of efficacy and answers the question “Do I have the ability to organize and execute the actions necessary to accomplish a specific task at a desired level?” (self-efficacy), and “If I accomplish the task at that level, what are the likely consequences?” (outcomes).

In a literature review of efficacy, Ross (1994) found that although Gibson and Dembo’s efficacy scales have been “…confirmed in numerous factor analyses with different samples, some concern has been expressed over the ‘overlap’ of some items with regards to efficacy and outcome expectancy” (p. 5). In order to clarify any
confusion within the questions and responses, many others (Huinker & Madison, 1997; Riggs & Enochs, 1990) have applied Bandura’s work to newer, further researched constructs of efficacy scales. In his analysis of self-efficacy literature, Ross (2004) reviewed self-efficacy measurement scales adapted and refined for preservice, science, and chemistry teachers (p. 6). Ross found that many core instruments have been adapted and applied to specific research.

**Efficacy scales.** In conducting the review of literature for this study, efficacy scales were found specifically for teachers of science, chemistry, physical education, and history. Although no articles were directly related to the teaching of American Indian curriculum, the article regarding social studies and history, by Dr. Ali Yilmaz (2009) was the closest to this study of the Municipal School District. In a study specifically designed to measure the self-efficacy of prospective history teachers, Yilmaz constructed an efficacy scale based on the Gibson and Dembo scale and modified for use with the participants in her study. Dr. Yilmaz found that history teachers often describe their students as experiencing difficulty due to lack of understanding and motivation. Also, in his book about the social studies curriculum, Ross (2001) found that, students will often question what the history is, and why they must learn it (p. 45). In response, “teachers should have a high self-efficacy perception for successful teaching against any negative attitudes students may adopt toward the history lesson. Thus, they would be able to convince their students to develop a positive attitude toward history” (Yilmaz, 2009, p. 508). In this light, the efficacy of participants teaching the American Indian curriculum is significant for not only the historical aspect of the curriculum, but also for the contemporary piece that teaches about modern American Indians.
It is important to note that efficacy scales are not without criticism. Pintrich and Schunk (1996) found that the level of specificity is one of the most difficult issues to be resolved in the development of an efficacy scale (p. 79). However, instruments that measure efficacy created for a specific set of participants in a particular context are considered more valid than a general scale such as the Gibson and Dembo scale. For example, Wheatley (2002) found that efficacy beliefs are task-specific and context-specific constructs (p. 6). Pajares (1996) also found that “Because judgments of self-efficacy are task and domain specific, global or inappropriately defined self-efficacy effects weaken effects” (p. 574).

In a similar vein, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2005) found that existing scales yielding global and numerical levels of ‘teacher efficacy,’ do not reveal what teachers’ responses mean, or where they need support from teacher educators” (p. 751). Since teacher efficacy is context and subject-matter specific, a teacher may feel confident in his or her abilities to teach one subject, while feeling less able in another (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2005, p. 790). This was also the finding of Bandura (1977) in that teachers’ sense of self-efficacy is not necessarily uniform across the many different types of tasks teachers are asked to perform, nor across diverse subject matter. Therefore, a teacher who is very comfortable and highly knowledgeable with the mathematics curriculum may or may not be as comfortable with curriculum dealing with social studies, or specifically with an American Indian curriculum.

Given the literature (Bandura, 1977; Pajares, 1996; Pintrich & Schunk, 1996; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2005; Wheatley, 2002) on limited or problematic efficacy scales and the lack of a content-specific scale for teachers of an American Indian
curriculum, constructing what Bandura (2006) calls a “domain-specific” scale was necessary. According to Bandura (2006), there are “situational demands and circumstances” that necessitate an accurate reflection of perceived efficacy within the domain of teaching the American Indian curriculum (p. 307). In his “Guide for Constructing Self-Efficacy Scales” (2006), Bandura suggests that items should be phrased in terms of capability, or “can do” rather than in terms of intention, as in “will do” (p. 308). A constructed scale has more validity if in measures capability, and if it accurately reflects domain-specific functioning. The efficacy scale for this multicase study, therefore, is tailored specifically to measure the perceived capabilities when teaching a specific curriculum, the American Indian curriculum.

Bandura (2006) also argues that “an efficacy scale with the 0-100 response format is a stronger predictor of performance than one with a 5-interval scale” (p. 312). This helps particularly when the questions may be sensitive in that the answers are distributed over a larger range than the smaller 5-interval scale. It is also suggested that the title be considered. A “confidence rating” sounds less evaluative than an “efficacy scale”. Items should be pretested (p. 315) and should include specific instructions that establish the “appropriate mindset” regarding their personal capabilities (p. 312). The scale used in this multicase study has been designed using Bandura’s research to accurately assess perceived efficacy of the participants.

**Efficacy effects.** The links between teachers’ belief in their own instructional efficacy and student achievement are numerous. According to Goddard et al. (2004), “Teachers’ sense of efficacy is a significant predictor of productive teaching practices” (p. 4); therefore, it is logical to assume that teachers with a good sense of self-efficacy
will put forth more effort in planning and teaching, as well as having a wider range of activities. It also follows that efficacious teachers will be more persistent when obstacles arise within the teaching of lessons. Gibson and Dembo (1984), in validating teacher efficacy scales, found through classroom observation, that teacher efficacy also influences patterns of classroom behaviors known to produce student achievement (p. 579). For example, teachers with high self-efficacy worked longer with students who struggled, and exerted more effort to find the root of those struggles. These teachers also persisted longer in finding solutions within their teaching practices to promote student success. “Compared to teachers with lower self-efficacy beliefs, teachers with strong perceptions of self-capability tend to employ classroom strategies that are more organized and better planned” (Allinder, 1994, p. 92).

As Bandura’s (1977) work has been refined and applied to education and teachers, it has been shown that teachers with high efficacy beliefs will set higher goals for themselves and their students (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Following higher goals is a commitment to achieve those goals even if there are setbacks or failures. Teachers who are more efficacious are more willing to accept responsibility for student outcomes, thus failures are ascribed to insufficient effort on their own part, not as a factor beyond their control. According to Ross (1994), one of the most replicated findings is that teachers with high teacher efficacy are more willing and likely to implement new instructional programs. Guskey (1988) also found that high efficacy teachers had more positive attitudes towards curriculum implementation. What follows is a visual representation of the effects efficacy has in relation to the behaviors of teachers with varying levels of efficacy.
As seen in Figure 2.1, levels of efficacy have effects on many different aspects of education. Teacher efficacy is an important facet on many levels. Once a teacher has assessed their efficacy, it is important to review how that level can be altered or modified.

**Efficacy modification.** Bandura (1977) found that, “People process, weigh, and integrate diverse sources of information concerning their capabilities, and they regulate their choice of behavior and effort expenditure accordingly” (p. 212). In his social learning analysis, Bandura (1977) identified four principal sources of information affecting or influencing personal efficacy expectations. The first of these influences on behavior is performance accomplishments, whereby a person is influenced by exposure and successes in performing the desired behavior, thus raising the mastery expectation of
further successes. This form of influence is the most generalizable. The second form of influence is vicarious experience, in which a person is exposed to someone modeling the desired behavior. The third form is verbal persuasion, in which a person is persuaded through verbal or social instruction for the desired behavior. The last form of influence on efficacy is emotional arousal, where stress reactions or moods influence the interpretation of events, and thus the desired behavior. This research was conducted to help us better understand the relationship between cognitive and behavioral change. These forms of information effect levels of efficacy, but can that level influence behavior?

Bandura (1993) also identified four processes that can influence behavior in a regulatory manner. Cognitive processes attribute higher self-efficacy with the adoption of higher goals and the commitment to achieve those goals, and the expectation that these goals will be achieved. Secondly, motivational processes link self-efficacy to attribution theory in which persons with higher self-efficacy will attribute failures not to low ability, but rather to insufficient effort. The affective process deals with coping strategies, whereby persons with higher self-efficacy will resist negative thoughts that lower performance. The fourth process that influences behavior is the selection process, where persons with higher self-efficacy will select activities and environments with more commitment. These processes identified by Bandura, influence the behavior of a person depending upon their perceived efficacy levels.

This literature indicates that a teacher’s sense of efficacy can be influenced and modified. According to Ross (1994), one of the most replicated findings is that teachers with high teacher efficacy are more willing and likely to implement new instructional
programs. Guskey (1988) also found that high efficacy teachers had more positive attitudes towards curriculum implementation. In this multicase study, the methodology is designed to assess the level of general and personal teaching efficacy in relation to the implementation of the revised *American Indian* curriculum. Therefore, a review of the literature on curriculum history, theory, and implementation is essential.

**Curriculum**

This review of literature pertaining to curriculum begins with an overview of curriculum design theory, and moves into multicultural curriculum and content integration. There have been and continue to be obstacles to this type of curriculum, and these also need to be reviewed. In addition, a review of the literature by and regarding American Indians in curriculum is included, as well as what enacted curriculum may look like.

**Curriculum design.** Although there are many theories, frameworks and models regarding curriculum design, it is clear that curriculum needs a purpose in the education of students. Ralph Tyler’s framework (see Figure 2.2 below) for curriculum development uses an approach to key processes in curricula that move across a continuum with regards to school purposes, school experiences, and school evaluation. In his work, Tyler (1949) proposed four questions to be addressed when designing curriculum:

1. “What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?
2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?” (Tyler, as cited in Hlebowitsh, 2005, p. 19).
This well-known framework was “…originally conceived as a strategy to help teachers analyze and develop curricula they developed…” (Hlebowitsh, 2005, p. 19). Although referred to as a continuum, this framework is a circular construct whereby a curriculum development issue can be inserted at any point within the circle.

Each curricular choice needs a well-developed purpose that fits with the district mission. The focus on purpose is integral for the educational experiences that are in the best interests of the students and in society. The purpose needs to be flexible enough to leave room for the teacher to have discretionary space in their practices and instructional methods. A balance between what schools want and need to do is imperative. Developing purpose along with providing the skills, values, and attitudes that are needed for critically thinking students in a democratic society is crucial.

In Tyler’s framework, the experiences of the learners need to be varied and fulfill the purposes set forth within the curriculum. Although curriculum developers need to look at curricula across grade levels and follow state and district guidelines, instructional variety is imperative so that emerging ideas and themes can be explored, even if not explicitly written in the curriculum (Hlebowitsh, 2005, p. 22). Teachers should be able to make instructional and strategic decisions for the fulfillment of the purposes of the curriculum. This is, indeed, the nature of the American Indian curriculum in the Municipal School District, as teachers are given wide latitude in the methods, strategies, and instructional tools they employ.

Also imperative to curriculum studies is the need to examine whether the purposes of the curriculum have been achieved. Tyler (1949) makes it clear that testing is not the only method of evaluating student knowledge, but that student work, portfolios,
or writing samples are also methods of evaluating whether the intended outcomes have been achieved (as cited in Hlebowitsh, 2004, p. 23). This essential element of curriculum development can determine if curricular changes need to be made.

Figure 2.2. Tyler’s Continuum

Tyler’s continuum also addresses “experiences” students gain during a given curriculum. Instructional decisions within curriculum can be problematic if they are left up to the pedagogical concepts of the participants, leaving room for ambiguity within instructional practices. Clear and concise instructions need to be included and embedded within the curriculum. Noddings (2006) argues that schools neglect reflective and critical thinking skills necessary for students to become knowledgeable in a liberal democracy. In this study, critical thinking, “refers not only to the assessment of arguments but also to the diligent and skillful use of reason on matters of moral/social importance – on personal decision making, conduct, and belief” (Noddings, 2006, p. 4). The question then
becomes what level of importance should be placed on curricular content and critical thinking skills? Is one more important than the other?

Should skills or content drive the curriculum? According to Noddings (2005, as cited in Thornton, 2005, p. viii), the answer is “neither”. Thornton (2005) views teachers as curricular “gatekeepers”, and cautions them to be a part of curricular change as well as deciding what content is essential versus that which is incidental. Too often the social studies and history curricula is filled with so broad a range of topics, that the depth is lost. “The proper scope and sequence of social studies is less apparent [than algebra], and it frequently degenerates into a flood of information” (Thornton, 2005, p. 5). If curriculum is too broad, the meanings and perspectives will be lost within the breadth of knowledge to be studied.

Improving subject matter knowledge in isolation will not solve the dilemma of a broad curriculum. Studying the curriculum content as well as the methods employed in classrooms is essential to Thornton’s idea of “gatekeeping.” Teachers, supervisors, administrators, curriculum developers, and providers of pre- and in-service teachers need to be involved in purposeful and meaningful curriculum development (Thornton, 2005, pp. 5-6). If teachers do not understand the underpinnings of “why” they are teaching this unit, they will feel little obligation to teach critical perspectives and the reality of the history and culture they are trying to teach. According to Thornton (2005), “Lack of considered purpose does not necessarily lead to poor practice, but it does commonly lead to indifferent practice, where instruction lacks an adequate compass to guide what is worth teaching at a given time to a given group of students” (p. 6). It is imperative for
curriculum to have a well thought out purpose for the teachers to effectively and purposefully implement, or to enact.

**Curriculum enactment.** The enacted curriculum is “a transactional process, co-constructed by the current situation and histories of teachers, students, the schools, communities, legislation and policy, and curriculum materials” (Nolet & McLaughlin, 2005, p. 112). This review of literature has looked at these intersecting conditions, which, when in action, is curricular enactment. The term enactment is derived curricular practice and implementation, it is “a realm of action” (Wraga, 2002, p. 12). Curricular enactment is a meeting of prior knowledge, current practice, and the addition of new knowledge whereby “teachers and students collaborate on the conception and realization of educational purposes” (Wraga, 2002, p. 18). It is more than just teaching and learning.

Aulls (1998) views curriculum as a process, and within a unit, the teacher and students construct events that form an ever-expanding foundation of shared knowledge (p. 56). In this sense, Doyle (1990) captures enactment as “curriculum in motion” (p. 353), and as a classroom process, rather than a separate and isolated piece of schooling. All of these processes going on at once are the foundation for practices grounded in the realities of school settings. This “operationalization” of the written and intended curriculum will be addressed in this multicase study. How teachers make decisions about activities, topics, and assessment of the written curriculum will indicate enactment of this American Indian curriculum; these patterns of how participants, materials, time, and subject matter come together as sequences of lessons (Doyle, 1992) during the enactment of the curriculum will be studied. In particular, this multicase study will look at the assessment methods teachers use as reference for productive teaching practice. “Research
of teacher planning (Peterson & Clark, 1978) suggest that teachers enhance student achievement when they accurately assess student knowledge and responsively adapt instruction”

Assessment. Educators understand the need for assessment. With the teacher accountability of NCLB, standardized testing measures student learning in comparison with others over a period of time. However, criticisms of standardized tests have grown in proportion to the frequency and purposes for which they are used, or misused (Navarete et al., 1990). Alternative assessment techniques have been suggested to address the problems of standardized tests (Marsten & Magnuson, 1987; Rogers, 1989; Wiggins, 1989; Wolf, 1989).

These alternative measures have many forms, and are classified as either formal or informal. The review of assessment literature does not cover formal assessment in that such techniques are not included in the American Indian curriculum.

Informal methods of student assessment may be in the form of classroom observations, responses to teachers’ questioning, or pertaining to scores on daily assignments (Fuchs & Deno, 1991). These informal assessment techniques can be used at any time, and incorporated into classroom routines and learning activities without interfering in instructional time. Navarete et al. (1990) also delineate between two main types of informal assessment, structured (student work samples, journals) and unstructured (checklists, observations). Although unstructured informal assessment may be more difficult to score and evaluate, what is clear is the fact that in order to be effective, informal assessments must be carefully planned. In addition, the carefully planned assessment needs to match the instructional objectives of the lesson or the
Each informal assessment whether structured or unstructured, needs a scoring procedure or consistent criteria based on expectations. “With appropriate planning, informal assessment can be reliable and valid, and they can serve as diagnostic tools” within and about the curriculum (p. 4). Clear statements of the expectations for student performance in a curriculum and ensuring that teachers apply consistent criteria based on those expectations is crucial to the reliability and validity of any type of informal assessment. If assessment methods are applied consistently and with reliable measurement criteria, teachers will accurately assess student learning of content within the curriculum. However, teachers need to understand the content of the curriculum themselves to accurately assess their students.

**Content Knowledge**

Pedagogical content knowledge includes knowledge of the subject matter and its organizing structures (Grossman, Wilson, & Shulman, 1989; Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987). Teachers need to know more than just the facts and concepts; they need to understand the organizing principles and structures within a given field. Much attention is paid to the knowledge teachers should possess in order to teach effectively. Content knowledge is important, but what constitutes understanding of the content is only loosely defined. In the 1980’s, breakthroughs in this area started a new wave of interest in the conceptualization of teacher content knowledge. Shulman (1986) proposed a special domain of teacher knowledge that provoked the suggestion that there is content knowledge essential to teaching. This subject-matter-specific professional knowledge is specialized. However, after subsequent studies, Shulman (2008) refined, identified and
defined “specialized content knowledge” that is considered essential to effective teaching (p. 391). This “specialized content knowledge” is the focus of this multicase research.

Specialized content knowledge is a less recognized domain of content knowledge, and Shulman (2008) has identified it as a “missing paradigm” in research on teaching and teacher knowledge (p. 391). He argues that representations of the subject are informed by content-specific knowledge, and in focusing on those student conceptions, and misconceptions, acknowledges that accounting for how students understand a content domain is a key feature of the work of teaching that content. In addition, teachers who do not themselves know a subject well, are not likely to have the knowledge they need to help students learn this content (p. 404).

Shulman has also created a checklist of observable behaviors that can be used for instruction. The headings cover a wide variety of teacher activities from understanding the content through the teaching of the curriculum. The overarching idea here is that teachers process information, and attempt to transform student knowledge through instruction. Evaluation of student learning and reflection on new student understandings are integral parts of the process. In this respect, the topics covered in the classroom will inform some of the content knowledge the teachers possess. The activities in each classroom will further reveal some elements of transformed ideas (learning). The assessment or evaluation of student learning will reveal what was taught, and what concepts need to be revisited. The assessment of student learning is a valued instructional tool to help teachers meet the needs of their students.

Given the ambiguity and breadth within some curricula, it is important to ask the question, “How much is curriculum valued?” Individual teachers do not hold the same
set of values and convictions; therefore, it is important to note that, “Although these convictions may not be articulated or formalized enough to constitute a model coherent to a stranger, they drive a teacher’s pedagogy” (Thornton, 2005, p. 105). In essence, teachers serve as gatekeepers; they define what a particular curriculum means, and how they shape their instructional practices toward perceived outcomes. It is the individual teachers who shape what this curriculum looks like, feels like, how it is taught, and what is taught.

Another aspect that cannot be overlooked in curriculum studies is the availability and usefulness of the materials. According to Thornton (2005), “All teachers are either creators or consumers (or both) of curriculum materials” (p. 101). Selection of the materials is an evaluative act in itself, and the criteria for selecting materials are not always well-founded (Thornton, p. 102). What is often missing from the resource selection is teacher input, another valuable aspect of “gatekeeping”.

Tyler’s third rationale within curriculum development is evaluation. According to Tyler (1949), “Educators evaluate in order to understand whether they have reached the purposes they explicitly sought” (as cited in Hlebowitsh, 2005, p. 23). This evaluation of learning should be evident within the curriculum. It is imperative that when implementing curriculum, curriculum designers understand the purposes of education, the experiences that bring about those purposes, and whether or not the purposes have been attained. To address these questions, Tyler’s continuum of curriculum design is used, as many of the research questions are directly related to this model. The strengths and/or weaknesses of the curriculum design and implementation will be addressed through the analytic lens of Tyler’s continuum and through the ideals set forth by Thornton’s theories
regarding social studies curricula. This review of curriculum design reiterates Tyler’s overview when designing any curriculum. With these broad ideals in mind, the focus on curriculum begins to narrow towards the idea of multicultural curriculum. This review of the literature will include the specific goals of multicultural curriculum, the experiences of those trying to incorporate multicultural ideas into existing curricula, and the obstacles faced when trying to do so.

**Multicultural curriculum.** Incorporating multicultural content into curriculum is often confusing and complicated. There are many facets to creating and implementing any curriculum, but complexity is added when the curriculum is focused on multiculturalism. Teachers often consider multicultural curriculum in terms of racial, ethnic and cultural groups (Banks, 2010, p. 20). This causes problems because teachers who see multicultural content separate from the typical curriculum hesitate to relate it or integrate it into their disciplines. This type of resistance to integration is then deemed a legitimized justification for opposition of integration. Oftentimes teachers will state that multicultural content fits well with social studies or literature, but does not fit into the disciplines of science and math. Banks has developed a guide, or dimensions of multicultural education, to help teachers implement this type of curriculum.

Banks’ (1993) five dimensions, developed to guide teachers in their implementation of multicultural curriculum, are each designed as a guide to construct and enhance the process of implementation. Multicultural content has often been oversimplified or, just as disparaging, teachers have concentrated on one particular dimension with the exclusion of others. In this light, the framework’s components consist of content integration, the knowledge construction process, prejudice reduction, equity
pedagogy, and an empowering school culture and social structure. Although Banks’ framework covers all of the dimensions, knowledge construction process and content integration are the most significant to this study. The integration of content is pertinent to this American Indian curriculum, and constructing knowledge is part of how a curriculum is enacted. These two dimensions will be looked at deeper than the overarching dimensions of prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, and empowering school culture and social structure, though all of the dimensions are imperative for effective implementation of multicultural content.

Knowledge construction is a process teachers use to create knowledge in their classrooms. In this case, the emphasis is on multicultural content, keeping in mind that this process includes, “Ways in which the implicit cultural assumptions, frames of reference, perspectives, and biases within a discipline influence the construction of knowledge” (Banks, 1993, p. 25). Since knowledge is not value-free, the ways in which teachers create knowledge is influenced by race, ethnicity, gender, and social class. Therefore, the value assumptions placed on the process should be identified, discussed, and examined. Banks has framed five different types of knowledge—personal cultural, popular, mainstream academic, transformative, and school knowledge.

Students bring personal concepts, explanations and interpretations from their homes and community cultures, and oftentimes students from diverse cultures experience dissonance from the school and teachers’ cultural knowledge. Teachers will need to use their own cultural knowledge (and that of their students) to enrich the teaching and learning in their classrooms. Popular culture and mass media send messages to students about the values, perceptions, and behavior that may reinforce stereotypes and
misconceptions about racial and ethnic groups. Although popular culture and media can contain more negative than positive images regarding stereotypes, teachers can help students view media from different cultural, ethnic or gender perspectives. Regarding the mainstream academic content knowledge, the western-centric history is considered mainstream. Teachers who look at this history from the perspectives of all of the groups involved would be beneficial to students. Going further, transformative academic knowledge takes routinely accepted mainstream knowledge and seeks to transform, revise and establish mainstream-centric views. All five of these types of knowledge are affected by the manner in which it is presented and discussed in classrooms today.

Prejudice reduction strategies in classroom teaching are used to help students develop more positive racial and ethnic attitudes. Students come from home with these attitudes developed through their families, friends, and communities. Teachers can show students realistic images and the inclusion of numerous racial groups in the curriculum to help in prejudice reduction. Equity pedagogy exists when teachers use techniques and teaching methods that facilitate the academic achievement of all students, including those from diverse racial and ethnic and social class groups. Culturally responsive teaching methods are effective for student diversity, as well as for all students. An empowering school culture and organization empowers, enhances and assures that the school is the change agent when it comes to diversity issues (Banks, 1993, p. 27).

**Multicultural curriculum integration.** Banks (1989) has identified four levels of integration of ethnic and multicultural content into the curriculum. These levels include the contributions approach, the additive approach, the transformation approach, and the social action approach. This categorization clearly defines specific questions that can be
asked to identify which level of approach a particular (multicultural) curriculum may fit within. This should be viewed as a process of curriculum reform and transformation rather than creating an entire unit or curriculum from the beginning.

The contributions approach to multicultural curriculum content is characterized by the insertion of ethnic heroes/heroines and discrete cultural artifacts into the curriculum. These isolated additions are selected using criteria similar to those used to select mainstream heroes/heroines and cultural artifacts. Discrete cultural elements such as food, dances, music and artifacts belonging to ethnic groups are studied, but rarely are the meanings and importance brought to the forefront. The mainstream curriculum is not changed in terms of its structure, goals, or salient characteristics. The heroes/heroines are those who have not challenged the mainstream ideology. This selection of included persons is usually chosen for their success in the mainstream society, rather than from their own ethnic community. When this approach is used, the class studies little or nothing about the ethnic group before or after the special event. The contributions approach allows for teachers to incorporate ethnic lessons into the curriculum quickly and superficially in some shape or form; however these teachers need support and encouragement if they are to learn about ethnic and cultural content. The contribution approach does little to effectively teach the “why” of ethnicity and culture, but rather it trivializes and romanticizes important cultural understandings while reinforcing stereotypes and misconceptions.

The additive approach to content integration incorporates content, concepts, themes, and perspectives into the existing curriculum without changing its basic structure, purposes, or characteristics. With this approach, a book is added or changed, a
unit is added to an existing piece of curriculum, or a course can be added without substantially changing the basic unit of curriculum. This approach will only succeed if students have the background knowledge or attitudinal sophistication to respond fittingly (Banks, 1989). Adding the perspective of a subordinate or marginalized group to the curriculum is an opportunity to increase intergroup understanding if added appropriately. Teachers or districts using the additive approach will add ethnic content to the curriculum without changing the basic structure. Teachers need to ensure that students understand that different cultural, racial, and ethnic groups often have varying and conflicting conceptions and points of view about the same historical events, concepts, issues, and developments (Banks, 1989). According to Banks:

Students need to gain an understanding that the victors and the vanquished have differing views and perspectives on historical events. The history in textbooks is usually written from the point of view of the victors. This history is then institutionalized within schools and mainstream society. The additive approach fails to help students understand these varying perspectives, nor does it help them to understand the ways that the histories and cultures of the nation’s diverse ethnic, racial, cultural, and religious groups are interconnected. (p. 237)

This approach will provide factual information without defining the concepts associated with the facts. The additive approach, however, is still segmented and sporadic. The larger units and histories remain, for the large part, mainstream-centric.

The transformation approach incorporates change to the fundamental goals, structure, and perspectives of the curriculum. The goal in this level is to enable students
to view concepts and issues from more than one perspective. Banks (1989) further states that: “Students need to understand from the point of view of the cultural, ethnic, and racial groups that were the most active participants in, or were most cogently influenced by, the event, issue, or concept being studied” (p. 237).

Although it is neither possible nor advantageous to view all issues involving every U.S. ethnic group, it is important that students understand that our histories are bound together. For example, when White Americans distort African Americans history, they do not learn the truth about their own history because the history of Blacks and Whites in the United States is tightly bound together (Baldwin, 1985). Banks (1989) clearly states that:

This is the same for African American and Indian history. In this level, clearly, it is not an addition of a list of ethnic groups, heroes, or contributors to history; the key issues are to infuse across content areas, the various perspectives, frames of references, and content from diverse racial and ethnic peoples. (p. 236)

The transformation approach will broaden the understandings of the nature, development, and complexity of U.S. society (Banks, 1989, p. 237). Students should learn curriculum that is inclusive of wide-ranging and sometimes conflicting meanings of historical events. Many diverse groups contributed to history, and incorporation of these perspectives gives students an overall picture of events. History, language, music, arts, science, and mathematics are also curricula where this level of purposeful multi-ethnic teaching can be infused. Banks (1989) states that this approach will:
Enable students to understand the complex ways in which diverse racial and cultural groups participated in the formation of U.S. society and culture. This approach also helps reduce racial and ethnic encapsulation, helps to empower victimized racial, ethnic and cultural groups, and gives the students a balanced view of the nature and development of U.S. culture and society. (p. 245)

Teachers at the transformative level have incorporated curriculum with the many different cultural and ethnic teachings that have influenced the history of the U.S. Teachers will teach students the ways art forms (including language) among ethnic groups have influenced and enriched the nation’s artistic and literary traditions. “Writers of color… have not only significantly influenced the development of American literature, but have also provided unique and revealing perspectives on U.S. society and culture” (Banks 1989, p. 237). The implementation of this approach requires substantial revision and professional development training.

The fourth level of multiethnic content integration is the social action approach, which includes the infusion of content in the transformation approach, but also adds components that “…require students to make decisions and take actions related to the concept, issue, or problem being studied in the unit” (Banks, 1989, p. 239). The goal here is to provide students with empowerment “…to help them acquire political efficacy, to educate them for social criticism, to teach them decision-making skills, and to enable them to become reflective and social critics, as well as contributing and participating members for social change” (p. 239). The social action approach is aimed at helping students acquire the knowledge, values, and skills they need to participate in social
change so that “…victimized and excluded ethnic and racial groups can become full participants in U.S. society” (Banks, 1989, pp. 239-240).

Traditionally, students have been socialized to “…accept unquestioningly the existing ideologies, institutions, and practices within the nation-state” (Newman, 1968, as cited in Banks, 1989, p. 239). With the social action approach, students are taught social criticism. They are “…helped to understand the inconsistency between our ideals and our social realities; the work that must be done to close this gap, and how they can, as individuals and groups, influence the social and political systems in U.S. society” (Banks, p. 240). Students learning via this social action approach will improve their thinking, value analysis, decision-making and social action skills. This level of content integration will also improve data collection skills, as well as increase political efficacy and group-work skills.

Unit organization in this approach has the following components:

1) A decision problem or question

2) An inquiry that provides data related to the decision problem.

3) Value inquiry and moral analysis; and

4) Decision making and social action (Banks, p. 240).

As an example, it may be asked, “What actions should we take to reduce prejudice and discrimination at our school”? As an inquiry, the definitions and aspects of the issue would be interdisciplinary and would include readings, data sources, bibliographies, and scientific and statistical data. Students will make a value inquiry into their own values, beliefs, and attitudes related to prejudice and discrimination, and the teacher can provide
case studies, newspaper articles, and other literary sources and data to involve students in role-playing and discussions.

These four approaches are usually blended and mixed in teaching situations. Teachers working with a mainstream-centric curriculum will have a difficult transition directly to a transformation approach, and therefore, the contributions and the additive approaches are “vehicles” to move gradually and cumulatively to the higher levels of multi-ethnic content integration. If teachers have the necessary knowledge, attitudes, and skills, when they encounter racist content in materials or observe racism in the statements and behavior of students, they can use these situations to teach important lessons about the experiences of ethnic groups in the United States (Banks, 1989, p. 243). The teacher is central in creating content that includes the perspectives of racial, ethnic, and cultural peoples, and this takes time and effort to accomplish.

Teachers will need to have knowledge of different ethnic groups in order to teach this effectively. They will also need to be sensitive to their own racial attitudes, behaviors, and statements. Including racial and ethnic groups in a sensitive and positive manner through literature, posters, or calendars confirms to students that you are able to view many perspectives, not just the mainstream-centric view. Multi-ethnic content integration reflects, validates, and celebrates the cultures and perspectives of all students, as well as teaches that our histories are all interconnected. With this knowledge of the levels that multicultural curriculum can be implemented, it is important to look at the structuring of curriculum, a part of curriculum design that cannot be ignored.

If a school or district does have the available resources to integrate multi-ethnic curricula into its core curriculum, it is understood that teachers and their perceptions are
central to curricular integration. There are, however, obstacles to curricular implementation, and they cannot be disentangled from the creation and integration of curriculum.

**Curriculum integration obstacles.** Schools have struggled to incorporate multicultural content into their curricula since the civil rights movement of the 1960’s. This effort has been stifled, in part, due to assimilationist ideology; a mainstream or dominant and Eurocentric view of how United States’ society and culture developed. This ideology focuses on the nation’s British heritage, while diminishing the contributions of other ethnic and cultural groups as not significant by comparison (Banks, 1989). With many conflicting ideas on “why” we teach multicultural education, confusion also exists as to how to teach as well what to teach.

**Mainstream-centric obstacles.** Within the many arguments for multicultural education (Asante, 1991; Asante & Ravitch, 1991; Ravitch, 1990; Schlesinger, 1991; Zinn & Kirschner, 1995) what is often disregarded are the dominant group’s power structures, the Eurocentric role as oppressor of minorities, and the inclusion of subordinate and marginalized voices within curricula. Although the civil rights movement broadened the definitions of multiculturalism, it also defined and revealed that the values of the northern European Protestants still dominate American education and curriculum. Banks (1989) calls this a “mainstream-centric curriculum” that has negative consequences for both mainstream and students of color. For mainstream students, Banks (1989) found that this type of curriculum reinforces a false sense of superiority, giving them a misleading conception of their relationship with other racial and ethnic groups. It also denies them the opportunity to benefit from the knowledge, perspectives,
and frames of reference that can be gained from studying and experiencing other cultures and groups (Banks, 1989, p. 229). In turn, a mainstream-centric curriculum negatively influences students of color by marginalizing their experiences and cultures. Students are more interested in, and motivated by, curriculum that reflects their cultures, experiences, and perspectives (Banks, 1989, p. 230). Understanding others’ perspectives and cultures is important in today’s society, but textbooks and curricula that reflects all students’ cultures and points of view is imperative.

In mainstream-centric curricula, events, themes, concepts, and issues are viewed and taught primarily from the perspective of middle-class Anglo-Americans and Europeans (Banks, 1989). This perpetuates transmission of mainstream culture while neglecting the relevant and important contributions a multi-cultural perspective provides. Teachers and teacher educators who have acquired a multicultural conception of the United States are then able to view and incorporate the experiences and contributions of a wide range of cultural, ethnic, and religious groups into their curricula. This transmits a multicultural view to young students. However, Banks (1989) states that, “Ideological and political resistance, fueled by the opinion that knowledge is power, and that multicultural perspectives on U.S Society challenge the current power system, is justified by, supports, and reinforces the existing social, economic, and political structure” (p. 231). In other words, those in power want to keep it that way, and teaching multicultural curricula threatens the foundations of their power structure.

**Multiculturalist obstacles.** It is important, then, to turn to the obstacles facing the integration of multicultural content and how it affects teachers and students in our social, economic, and political systems. Three major positions in the debate over multicultural
curricula have been identified by Banks (1997, p. 231). These include Western traditionalists, Afrocentric scholars, and multiculturalists. Western traditionalists hold that the major influence of Western civilization and culture should be the focus in curricula. Alternately, Afrocentric scholars contend that the contributions of Africa and African people should receive major emphasis. The multiculturalists argue that, although western influence has had a profound effect on history and culture, it should be re-conceptualized to include and reflect the perspectives of people of color (Banks, 1989, p. 23). Multiculturalists do not limit the curriculum to the inclusion of people of color. They also include the study of other world cultures such as those in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and the Americas, as they were present before the Europeans arrived. Although multiculturalists focus on these other world cultures, they sometimes fail to incorporate the perspectives of American Indians. Meaningful curriculum along with a strong knowledge base for educators is also imperative. In providing these two powerful pieces, efficacious teachers will be better able to promote multicultural curriculum.

**Obstacles with textbooks.** Another barrier to incorporating multicultural content in the curricula is that many educators have a low level of knowledge with respect to the ethnic cultures they teach about. This leads to heavy reliance on textbooks for information. As a result, textbooks are the basis of 70% to 95% of all classroom instruction (Apple, 1985; Davis, Ponder, Burlbaw, Garza-Lubeck & Moss, 1986; Gay, 2000; Tyson-Bernstein, 1988; Tyson-Bernstein & Woodward, 1986, 1989; Wade, 1993; Woodward, 1987). Reliance on the content of textbooks results in the fragmented teaching of ethnic content. The use of textbooks also reinforces the position and power of the dominant group. Unfortunately, most textbooks used in schools are heavily
influenced by the dominant group (European Americans) and confirm its status, culture, and contributions (Gay, 2000). Since textbooks are the main source for teaching, educators need to look critically at the content and perspectives of these books. When giving answers to questions regarding the content, students, defending the validity of their explanations, often respond, “Because the book said so” (Gay, 2000). Consequently, students using these textbooks are receiving a mainstream-centric education. In an effort to counteract this textbook reliance, multiculturalists have been creating and integrating multicultural content into existing frameworks. Connecting historical understandings and the lives of both dominant and subordinate groups is an on-going process through which there are many levels of integration, but shifting educational policy also hinders the creation and implementation of multicultural curriculum into the existing framework, especially in this accountability era.

**Policy obstacles.** Furthermore, teachers’ roles have changed due to the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 and the economy. Given these new demands, it is no wonder teachers are asking why they have to teach curricula outside of the core curriculum. Resources are limited, and teachers must do more work with smaller budgets and tighter resources. Adequate progress of students must be ensured, or consequences will follow. Accountability procedures within NCLB measure student progress from year to year, and those students, schools, and districts failing to show adequate yearly progress through standardized tests face sanctions such as teacher transfers, tutoring, and school restructuring. Schools with low performing students are under pressure to drop or discontinue untested subjects such as history, and the arts.
Therefore, “When asked to implement new curricula, it is likely that teachers who have these psychological experiences in the workplace, and who perceive low levels of support for the innovation, will be most vulnerable to poor implementation quality” (Ransford et al., 2009, p. 510). In effect, the bureaucratization of curriculum by NCLB has caused a loss of teacher autonomy; therefore, teachers asked to implement multicultural curriculum may not feel as willing to put forth the effort on subject matter not covered by standardized tests. Although this is a valid concern, it is important for both teachers and students to learn about the atrocities other groups, including American Indians, have endured at the hand of the U.S. government. It is also important to note that history teachers need not ignore the challenges of presenting varying versions or perspectives of history, but that they present students with materials to draw in those varying perspectives in order to develop a greater understanding of other racial and ethnic groups. By looking at curriculum materials such as textbooks, we can see “what they say and don’t say, and try to figure out why” (Loewen, 1995, p. 16).

**Problematic imbalance of textbooks.** Multicultural curriculum and instructional content is crucial to academic performance, and the most common sources of curriculum content used in classrooms are textbooks (Gay, 2000, p. 112). Unfortunately, textbooks about history continue to be flawed regarding ethnic and cultural content. According to Gay (2000), “There is an imbalance across ethnic groups of color, and when they are present, the content is rather bland, conservative, conformist, and ‘safe’” (p. 114). One of the most troubling aspects of most curriculum and instructional materials is that events and experiences of marginalized people are closely aligned with mainstream European values, beliefs, and standards of behavior. Thus, Gay states that the content tends to
regard harmonious relations and sanitized versions of history over those individuals and
groups that clash with dominant society’s ideals (p. 115). Revisions of current
curriculum and instructional materials also suffer from the unsystematic insertion of
materials.

Oftentimes textbooks will add ethnographic content such as illustrations and
pictures into instructional materials.

However, ‘authentic’ representation needs more than just the ‘setting’. It needs
historical context, one that illuminates the struggle of [peoples] by placing it
within the national story, while also preventing a view of that struggle that
indicates its connection to larger global processes. (La Spina, 2003, p. 673)

Today, although marginalized groups are seeing themselves within many instructional
texts, more often they are also seen as subtly stereotyped. This is one of many issues
facing the integration of multicultural content into the curriculum. The political and
societal forces that drive curriculum standards, textbook publishers, and educational
leaders are also struggling with what needs to be presented to youth to ensure academic
success. The recognition that textbooks are overly ethnocentric and racially uninformed is
a first step in the implementation of multicultural curriculum.

The context from which history books are written is still guided by America’s
progress, not by the peoples portrayed. “How the west was won” is an example of this
American context. In this example, history is told from the western perspective rather
than from the perspectives of American Indians who might call it, “How the west was
lost”. The Trail of Tears is often reported in a factual manner; many people were
removed to land in Oklahoma. The information is limited, however, because the “concept” of why these people were forcibly removed from their homelands, is missing.

**American Indians and Curriculum**

There are many obstacles to overcome when creating any curriculum, but there are additional complexities and pitfalls when the curriculum deals with a particular ethnic group. Historically, curricula about American Indians have had numerous concerns. According to Apple (1992), “Curriculum is often the product of often intense conflicts, negotiations, and attempts at rebuilding hegemonic control, of actually incorporating the knowledge and perspectives of the less powerful under the umbrella of the discourse of the dominant groups” (p. 8). This review of literature will address issues and concerns involving American Indian curriculum content, with an emphasis on the continuing question of whose perspective is detailed in curriculum and studies about American Indians. This ethnocentric perspective from which history is taught needs to be addressed in order for multicultural curriculum to be implemented for the benefit of students, and therefore, society at large.

**American Indian perspective.** Multicultural curriculum without the perspective of the people they portray can be misleading and inaccurate. Grande (2000, 2004) argues that there are many Indigenous scholars fighting for their narratives to be placed in a larger market. Deloria (1998) asks who gave “people the right to be spokespersons for Americans?” And, he responds by naming “whitestream America as both patron and peddler of the Hollywood Indian” (p. 79), and furthers that certain “fraudulent Indians represent the intense desire of Whites to create in their own minds the Indian they want to believe in” (p. 79). This narrative is not new, and applies to curriculum as well. Failing to
incorporate Indigenous perspectives and failing to consider American Indians as unique populations are common mistakes. But worse is the manipulation of history to marginalize Indigenous peoples, their scholarly discourse, and their lived experiences. It is no wonder, then, that tensions exist between American Indian identity and the curriculum written about American Indians as a whole. This tension falls into the realm of critical theory; applied in education, it has pedagogical implications and American Indian academics are not silent on the subject (Brayboy & Deyhle, 2000; Brayboy, Castagno & Maughan, 2007; Grande, 2000, 2004).

**Critical Theory and American Indian Curriculum**

Critical theory emerged from the Frankfort School of Social Research in the 1920’s. It focuses on power and domination within an industrialized, modernist age (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997). Furthering the study of power and domination, critical multiculturalists “work in solidarity with subordinate and marginalized groups and attempt to expose the subtle and often hidden educational processes that privilege the already affluent, and undermine the efforts of the poor” (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997, p. 24). Critical theorists, then, adhere to the reflection of the roles that individuals, political opinions, socioeconomic status, gender, and race play in our lives, and that one must understand these roles with the implicit understanding that without trying to change the dominant perspectives, we are “morally empty” (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997, p. 26). This has implications for teachers who need to understand the roles of the “knower” and how one learns from the experience of the knower, and this is the crossroads of critical pedagogy.
“Critical Pedagogy is used to describe what emerges when critical theory encounters education” (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997, p. 24). Using critical theory to explain how a school context can be the tool of resistance or of social transformation, critical pedagogy “… critiques the social, economic, and political barriers to social justice…” (Grande, 2000, pp. 470-471). What is truly needed, states Grande (2000,) is for “whitestream” advocates of critical theory to “ask how their knowledge and practices may have contributed and remained blind to the continued exploitation of indigenous peoples” (p. 469). So who, then, should be the judge of those contributions? Many American Indians agree that the research that contributes to this major question needs to be accurate, reliable, and valid. At the same time, literature should seek to understand the complex multiple perceptions of reality (Brayboy et al., 2007; Innes, 2009; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002; Moll et al., 1992; Swisher, 1996). This “reality” of American Indian issues, whether historical or contemporary, is better known by those within the culture.

The written histories, Grande (2000) says, are the “tragic stories of lost cultures, and quasi-historic accounts of the Native American’s plight”, and are told and retold as an unavoidable consequence of manifest destiny (p. 480). Although it is agreed that truths about American Indians need to be told, these tragic stories need to be in the correct political contexts, and if not, are just exacerbating the already “problematic context of Whitestream consumption of Indian history” (p. 480). As Native Americans, we must be the ones to write our histories. By focusing on the White domination and Indian subjugation, Grande argues, and the propagating of the romantic American Indians, Whitestream publishers are establishing and maintaining the control over available knowledge on American Indians (pp. 480-481). Thus, American Indian intellectualism is
considered a threat to the myths that exist about the history of the dark and long ago past relations between the government and American Indians. Along these same lines, this history is often oversimplified, which makes it easier to blame the “wayward military officer” or the “rogue groups of dogmatic missionaries” for the slow but unavoidable erosion of American Indian cultures and people. Also, by keeping American Indian narratives in the past, it is much easier to avoid the social and cultural issues facing American Indians in the twenty-first century. According to much of the curricula, America’s “Indian problem” has long been solved (p. 481).

It is clear. We (American Indians) need a voice in the literature written about us. In addition, we need to be the researchers who are looking inside our communities and issues, and be able to use our unique perspectives to situate American Indian intellectualism to the forefront, rather than to the edges of this discourse. Historically, much has been done “to us” and “against us”, and in order to station ourselves as unique entities at the intersection of power and identity we need to be at the forefront of the research and academic scholarship.

**American Indian research.** Indigenous knowledge, overlooked so often in favor of what is described as scientific practice, should not be dismissed. Swisher (1996) argues for the primacy of Native scholars in conducting research on Native peoples and issues, attributing to them the benefits of the insider’s view and experiences, enhanced passion and commitment, and the authority to ask new and different questions (p. 93). Many others also advocate for this type of “insider research” (Brayboy & Deyhle, 2000; Brayboy et al., 2007; Hermes, 1998; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002; Moll et al., 1992; Swisher, 1996). In fact, it is argued that “equitable democracy can exist only if we choose
to see color and are attentive to it and conscious of our existence within it” (Brayboy et al., 2007, p. 181). Much of the literature on research about American Indian issues, including curriculum, is related to the insider perspective. What is lacking, however, is literature pertaining to American Indians in public schools. In most cases, what is written is written by non-Native scholars for non-Native consumers.

Our marginalized role within the curriculum “about us,” needs to be expanded to encompass the unique perspective of American Indians. From traditions, to treaty rights, federal recognition to identity appropriation, difficult conversations need to happen. Incorporating Indigenous perspectives into curriculum and working with teachers to connect the living realities of Indian peoples is necessary.

**American Indian content.** An important question that must be addressed is: when curriculum is created and implemented, what does it look like? Unfortunately, the versions of American history taught in public schools are often taught from a Eurocentric male Protestant view, starting from Columbus and continuing with Christian colonization more than a century later (Banks, 1993; Ladson-Billings, 2003). Native Americans, though more prevalent in contemporary text and trade books, are too often presented as one-dimensional, exotic figures frozen in historical times, invisible in contemporary society, or restricted to statistical listings in the demographics of social problems such as crime, poverty, and unemployment (Gay, 2000, p. 122). What results is a brief reference to American Indians within a text that is “… fragmented, and the indigenous presence is set within the progressive pattern of national development” (LaSpina, 2003, p. 674). Oftentimes American Indians are placed within a text almost as an afterthought or passive role in history, if not totally omitted from the context of history (Garcia, 1993).
It is difficult to convince teachers that they should include such instruction in their lessons in this accountability-driven era (Zehr, 2008). Teachers are being evaluated on student performance, pushing non-tested content areas out of the curriculum. According to Journell (2009), “Research on high stakes assessments shows that teachers are more likely to align their instruction with state standards due to mounting pressure to achieve high scores” (p. 18). Fortunately, some states are making Native American history and culture a formal part of what children should learn (Journell, 2009; Zehr, 2008). Although there are wide variations on what is to be included in curricula, some states are mandating rather than inserting American Indian/Alaskan Native content into the curriculum. For example, “Idaho, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, and Montana all require students to be taught about Native American tribes in their states, while North Dakota makes similar mandates part of its teacher training” (Zehr, 2008, p. 1).

Although more states are creating standards to include the history and culture of American Indians, a study of nine states which included American Indian history found that all nine of these states largely depict American Indians as victimized rather than providing examples of societal contributions made by tribes (Journell, 2009, p. 18). This study also found that nearly all of these nine states had curricula that veritably end after the forced relocation policies of the 1830’s, thereby creating a gaping hole in national history (See Figure 2.3). And, those states that require curriculum have little or no American Indian history pertaining to the 19th and 20th centuries. As a result, they are creating learners who believe Native Americans have all perished. This incomplete narrative has shown that “students’ knowledge of American Indian culture plateaus around the fifth grade when curriculum of American history turns to the American
Revolution” (Journell, 2009, p. 20). Once viewed in this historical manner, it is not surprising that students who receive a “less than complete” history of American Indians will carry that lack of knowledge forward with them as they progress through their education.

Oftentimes when content, materials, and issues are sporadically added to the curriculum, “… students lack the concepts, content background, and emotional maturity to understand and deal with issues and problems in this material” (Banks, 1989, p. 237). Also, when curricula about American Indians are added to the existing structure, they appear in isolation; curriculum written in such a way fosters the marginalization of race and culture, and, as a result, they are known as the “other”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>NY</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TX</th>
<th>VA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of land/Death by disease from settlers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of the French and Indian War</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Revolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail of Tears/Forced relocation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Indian Policies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Wars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Distinctions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal/Military contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern American Indian Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3. State Standards for American Indian Curriculum (Journell, 2009, p. 23).
Although isolation is one manner in which we see American Indians in the curriculum, the word “Indian” triggers an array of images for different people. To some, the word provokes the image of a warrior dressed in Native regalia ready for battle, or of a docile, stoic “noble savage” who is wise and one with nature (Broken Nose, 1992; McDonald & Chaney, 2004). Too often we see American Indians depicted as bloodthirsty savages, untamed, warlike, and aggressive (Churchill, Hill, & Hill, 1978; McDonald & Chaney, 2004). The depictions of American Indians tends to be over-sensationalized to typify the past, ignoring the real American Indians of today.

Inaccurate images also are derived from literature, history books, television, and Hollywood movies. American Indians are typically portrayed generically, with no attempt to identify individual tribes or diversity across tribes (Kuipers, 1991). Although these depictions are improving, the images are often biased and distorted, and they misrepresent reality (McDonald & Chaney, 2004; Staurowsky, 2007). Classroom resources and literature should recognize that lumping all Indians together is a mistake. This is sometimes termed “tokenism”, when European notions of physiology are used as norms (Sleeter, 1992). Although superficial, it is relevant that tribes or nations are sovereign entities, and are as different from one another as Italians are from Swedes (Kuipers, 1991).

Another problem often seen is the erroneous use of only the past tense in teaching lessons about Indians; for example, studying “how the Indians lived.” Saying “lived” suggests that there are no more Indians living today. Indian people are very much a part of today, and each tribe has a name and separate culture. There are measures to be taken to start the process of rectifying these inaccuracies. Teachers should always check the
accuracy, authenticity, and objectivity of resources in a curriculum about American Indians (Kuipers, p. 1). Teachers facing the various “isms” - ethnocentrism, elitism, sexism, and lookism, may often ignore them and hope they go away (King, 1991). However, it is understood that these inaccuracies and misconceptions can be overcome with dedication and a willingness to see American Indian people and curriculum content from different perspectives and ideologies.

**Summary**

Teacher efficacy has been defined as “the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance” (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). With higher efficacy, teachers will put forth more effort, have a wider range of activities, and will persist longer in the face of obstacles (Bandura 1977, 1993; Gibson & Dembo, 1984). It is logical to assume then, that some teachers will work harder to teach a subject, content area, or what some call a “domain” (Bandura, 2006; Pajares, 1992; Shulman, 1986). Those teachers, however, who are grossly-overconfident, will not see the need to improve at all. Assessing their levels of perceived efficacy partially answered the research questions posed in this study; however, other factors were also considered in order to fully comprehend what efficacy levels mean.

For example, teachers also need to have some measure of content knowledge when teaching a curriculum. Without knowing the subject matter, how can they effectively teach students? The teaching and learning of inaccurate or misleading information about American Indians is not a new concept, though political and curricular changes that would benefit this marginalized group are slow to occur. This vicious cycle of teachers unintentionally passing on content from their own generally non-Indian
perspective is troubling. This research sought to find solutions to the question of what gets taught in classrooms with an American Indian-focused curriculum. In understanding what is taught in these classrooms, we will inherently have a better understanding of what isn’t taught—those ideas and concepts that are deemed as “too difficult” by those who will write and implement such multicultural content.

The literature has revealed the need for multicultural curricula, specifically an American Indian curriculum that includes history, culture, and issues in a culturally sensitive manner, from the perspective of American Indians. There have been issues with the accuracy and portrayal of American Indians when, “The invention and dissemination of distortions and accuracies occurred because they proved useful in advancing various goals of colonizing nations” (Tippeconnic & Swisher, 1999, p. 4). Although there are obstacles on many levels, there is also hope that this type of curriculum can be effectively created and enacted. Teachers will need to understand the concepts covered in such a curriculum. Such knowledge and understanding of the content is imperative to students learning to be socially conscious and action-oriented in society. When teachers and students collaborate in the enactment of curriculum, wonderful patterns of learning emerge. The discourse between people, prior knowledge, and new content converge in an explosion of learning for all involved. In envisioning this idyllic context, it is hoped that we strive to have this type of enactment with the American Indian curriculum.
Chapter Three
Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine perceived teacher efficacy and content knowledge in enacting an American Indian-focused curriculum. This research aimed to provide benefits to teachers as well as teacher educators through “Increased understanding of the curriculum content, commitment to a variety of teaching methods, confidence in one’s own ability, and willingness to listen to and to learn from students and others” (Bullough & Gitlin, 1995, p. 1033). The enactment of the American Indian curriculum is quite complex. Each teacher is unique, situated, and sometimes interrelated with others. This bounded system of individual teachers is conducive to a multicase study. According to Stake (2006), “A researcher may jointly study a number of cases in order to investigate a phenomenon, a population, or a general condition” (p. 138). This chapter will address the underlying reasons for selecting the research design, explicate the contexts for the cases presented in this study, and offer information regarding the data collection tools, methods, and analysis.

Research Design

Using a mixed methods research design, this study aimed to examine the perceived efficacy and content knowledge of teachers within the Municipal School District while enacting the American Indian curriculum. “Mixed methods research is an attempt to legitimize the use of multiple approaches in answering research questions, rather than restricting or constraining researcher’s choices” (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie,
2004, p. 17). For this multicase study, qualitative data were converted to quantitative information in order to accurately assess and analyze the levels of perceived efficacy and content knowledge of initial participants. This conversion of data, or “quanticizing” (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006, p. 53), qualitative data to a numerical form, was used to narrow the four cases for the purpose of “seeking elaboration, illustration, and clarification” of the gathered data (p. 54). This method optimized the sample of participants in that it “ensured that each participant selected is appropriate for inclusion in this multicase study” (p. 54). The small, purposeful sample defined using quanticized data has defined and enriched the cases selected.

Traditionally, quantitative data focuses on deduction and confirmation through statistical analysis. In this multicase study, final participants have been identified through quantitative data independent of the researcher (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Quantitative (quanticized) data informed the four cases, and qualitative data then was employed to discover the intricacies of each of the cases in regards to the American Indian curriculum. Qualitative research entails a process of “piecing together data, of making the invisible obvious, of recognizing the significant from the insignificant, of linking seemingly unrelated facts logically, of fitting categories one with another, and of attributing consequences to antecedents” (Morse, 1994, p. 25). The design of this study enabled the “understanding of human activity within the context of the situation, and from the perspective of participants” (Borko, Whitcomb, & Byrnes, 2008, p.1029). This research regarding the American Indian curriculum was designed to “investigate a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context” (Yin, 1994, p. 13). The contexts
for teaching this curriculum are unique to each of the participants; thus, qualitative design is essential in answering the following research questions:

1) To what extent do participants assess their perceived efficacy and content knowledge regarding the American Indian curriculum?

2) What is the relationship between the participants’ perceived efficacy, their perceived content knowledge, and their curricular enactment of the American Indian curriculum?

According to Merriam (1998), “A case study is an examination of a specific phenomenon, such as a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution, or a social group” (p. 9). In examining the efficacy of the participants teaching the American Indian curriculum, this study intended to answer the “how” and the “why” questions regarding perceived efficacy and knowledge of the content, and then to link it with the teacher circumstances and practices that accompany the context of the lessons. “As a research method, the case is used in many situations, to contribute to our knowledge of individual, organizational, social, political, and related phenomenon” (Yin, 2009, p. 4). This study investigated the specific context of the Municipal School District, and analyzed the enactment of the American Indian curriculum from the unique perspective of participants.

Case studies, as Lichtman (2011) states, are focused on interpreting a particular phenomenon (p. 111). Specifically, when looking at curriculum through the lens of its teachers, it is imperative to understand the curriculum is not singular, but rather “comprised of the written, the enacted, and the received curriculum” (Lichtman, p. 112). The written curriculum is the official or adopted curriculum of the Municipal School District. “The enacted curriculum is the operationalization of the intended curriculum,
and the received curriculum is that which students actually learn as a result of being in
the classroom and interacting with the intended and taught curriculum” (Nolet &
McLaughlin, 2005 p.17). In this sense, enactment is investigated from the curricular
activities, topics, and assessments in the classrooms of the four participants. The case
study method used in this research on American Indian curriculum is directly linked in
that it is a transactional process, co-constructed by the current situation and linked to the
histories of teachers, students, the schools, communities, legislation and policy, and
curriculum materials (Lichtman, p. 112). In other words, the history of the participants’
content knowledge of American Indians is directly related to what and how they teach
this unit.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine where teachers’ confidence and doubts
lie, what they mean, or if they are even a problem. In response, Schunk (1991) and
Brookhart and Freeman (1992) suggest that, although quantitative methods typically have
been used in studying efficacy beliefs, qualitative methods, such as case studies, are
needed to gain additional insights (as cited in Pajares, 1992, p. 327). In an effort to
enhance the information obtained from a domain specific efficacy scale, and in an effort
to understand the magnitude, confidence, and strength of the participants’ efficacy,
qualitative interviews were conducted as part of this study.

This research utilized the case study framework put forth by Stake (2006). The
intent was to gain “insight and understanding of a particular situation or phenomenon”
(Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 550). In order to learn from each of the participants
comprehensively, this study used a cross-case analysis (Stake, 2006). The participants
came to the table with very different understandings of the American Indian curriculum,
and each, therefore, needed to have the complexity of their situations fully examined. “Each case to be studied is a complex entity located in its own situation, with special contexts and backgrounds” (Stake, 2006, p. 12). Although the case of the curriculum is singular, it has subsections, groups, occasions, and dimensions particular to each of the participants (p. 12). The contexts and experiential knowledge of each of the participants are unique and essential for understanding the curriculum as it is enacted in each classroom.

Stake uses the term “multiple case” study or “multicase study” when more than one case is being examined. “A researcher may jointly study a number of cases in order to investigate a phenomenon, population, or general condition, otherwise known as the collective case study” (Stake, 2003, p. 138). So, although this case is meant to examine the enactment of the curriculum, there are four individual and unique cases that contribute to this enactment. According to Stake (2003), “Ultimately, we may be interested in a general phenomenon or a population of cases more than in the individual case. And we cannot understand this case without knowing about the other cases” (p. 136). Each case may be similar or dissimilar, but both redundancy and variety are important. These cases were chosen because it is believed that understanding them will lead to better comprehension, perhaps better theorizing, about a still larger collection of cases” (Stake, 2003, p. 138). This is a case of the enactment of the American Indian curriculum in the Municipal School District; each participant is teaching the same curriculum. This commonality is what Stake calls the “quintain” (p. 4).

According to Stake (2006), the quintain is the arena, the holding company, or the umbrella for the cases to be studied (p. 6). The quintain for this multiple case study is the
American Indian curriculum in the Municipal School District. “An important reason for doing the multicase study is to examine how the program or phenomenon performs in different environments” (Stake, 2006, p. 23). In this sense, the diversity across contexts and participants is striking. Their rich backgrounds, knowledge, and histories are woven throughout their curricular enactment. Each participant’s activities are influenced by their contexts, such as their years of teaching experience, their relationships with the district and building personnel, and the economic contexts of budget and programmatic cuts.

Although multi-case researchers seek the ordinary happenings for each case, they also investigate the settings and the distinctions of each case (Stake, 2006). Though generalizability is thought to be in direct conflict with the particularity in a case, Stake (2003) argues generalizability is the responsibility of the reader who, from reading the case as a narrative story, is able to generalize to his or her own life (p. 140). Thus, using a narrative style of analysis, the case researcher needs to “provide grounds for validating both the observation and generalization” (p. 147). As each of the participants or cases is brought forward, their unique and individual complexities and contexts will demonstrate the enactment of the American Indian curriculum.

Case Context

Municipal School District (MSD) is located in a small city in the northeastern United States. This district encompasses a 150 square mile area that includes many surrounding townships. There are 10 elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school in the district. Total enrollment for the district for the 2009 school year was approximately 7,200. There are 1,400 teachers and administrators working in the
schools. Each of the elementary and middle schools has been making adequate yearly progress (AYP) each year. There are no scores reported for any of the racial sub-categories of Black, Latino/Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, or multi-racial/ethnic in MSD.

The Municipal School District was chosen for this study because of its K-6 Social Studies curriculum, which entails bi-annual thematic units. This study focuses on the intermediate division (3rd & 4th grades) and the unit entitled the “American Indian” curriculum. The accompanying unit, *Travelers and Traders*\(^3\), follows up the second half of the school year with a unit that studies explorers and their impact on what is now the United States of America. The American Indian unit begins at the start of the school year, and is designed as a 14-week regional study of four geographic areas and the American Indian people who live in each region. This curriculum was brought to my attention through my work as an educator, and through collaboration with district representatives (Curriculum Support Teachers) who worked specifically with curriculum writing and implementation.

As an external consultant for MSD, I worked for one school year alongside the Curriculum Support Teachers (CSTs) to revise the *American Indian* curriculum, with the following specific goals:

1. To make this curriculum historically accurate,
2. To make this curriculum non-prejudicial, and
3. To weave a contemporary thread throughout its entirety.

\(^3\) *Travelers and Traders* is a pseudonym for the curricular unit that follows the *American Indian* unit. This pseudonym is used to protect the identity of the school district and its curriculum.
In clarifying our goals, the curriculum team made many changes to what had previously been regarded as a high-quality curriculum. Our interactions were labor-intensive and consisted of many meetings and resource checking throughout the process. There were no financial resources contributed to the revision other than for literacy sources pertaining to this unit.

The *American Indian* segment of the Social Studies unit focuses on three key learning concepts:

1. The homelands of Native People have influenced their food, clothing, and shelter.
2. The stories and arts of Native People were and are an expression of a culture and a way of passing on values.
3. Early trade was a way of exchanging both goods and ideas.

The study of geography, history, and culture are combined in ways that intend to promote children’s understanding of time, place, and events. Food, clothing, and shelter are established as essential for survival, and students investigate how time and place influence people’s food clothing, and shelters, as well as other aspects of their culture. This unit is divided into a 14-week study designed around the initiating weeks (two weeks, which includes community building, and a peek at four geographic regions through mapping activities), regional studies (10 weeks) designed for students to study four different regions of the United States and the people who lived and still live there), and the National Geographic Native American Theme Set (a two week conclusion which focuses on a theme set of books).

Although progress was made in the updating of this unit, it is clear that the resulting curriculum used what Banks (1989) refers to as the “additive approach” to
multicultural curriculum implementation. The additive approach to content integration incorporates content, concepts, themes, and perspectives into the existing curriculum without changing its basic structure, purposes, or characteristics. This approach will only succeed if students have the background knowledge or attitudinal sophistication to respond fittingly (Banks, 1989).

The additive approach is often used by educators with limited resources and time. Training and rethinking of the purposes, nature, and goals of the curriculum is not evident in this level. Adding the perspective of a subordinate or marginalized group to the curriculum is an opportunity to increase intergroup understanding if added appropriately. Several stereotypical lessons were removed, and in their stead, information on individual Tribes, authentic resources, and contemporary aspects were included.

The Municipal School District’s additive approach introduced emotion-laden and complex materials *in isolation*, and with the additions, problems arose. Some of the teachers view the addition as being too controversial or too confusing. As Banks (1989) argues, teachers need to ensure that students understand that different cultural, racial, and ethnic groups often have varying and conflicting conceptions and points of view about the same historical events, concepts, issues, and developments. Although the additions that were made to the American Indian curriculum did not change the basic structure of the unit, some teachers were concerned about the lack of information given in response to their questions about the unit. In the end, after a year of additive revisions, the curriculum remains problematic.

The rationale and overview for this unit is
Intended to provide direct and practical support for teachers as they share with students a respect and sensitivity of Native Americans. This unit provides opportunities to learn:

- About Native Americans, both contemporarily and historically.
- The fair and rightful place in history of the Native American people.
- To become sensitive to the contemporary needs and concerns of an often dominated, frequently displaced, and threatened people.
- To develop a respect for Native American people.
- To gain an appreciation for the significant contributions of Native Americans.
- That Native American people have no stereotypes; they are different both inter and intra-tribally.
- That racism and ethnocentrism played a role in our history and our understanding of others.
- That to imitate the sacred customs of Native Americans is to show disrespect to those cultures. (*American Indian curriculum*, p. 3).

These are the stated purposes for this curriculum. In reviewing Tyler’s (1949) purposes of curricula, the mission of the district is imperative to the goals set forth in the curriculum. The mission of the Municipal School District is “To prepare students for lifelong success through excellence in education.” This mission, in addition to the stated goals of the curriculum, seems clear at first glance, however, neither is defined nor explained fully. For example, when the objective of the curriculum is to understand “The fair and rightful place in history of the Native American people”, but that “fair” and “rightful” place is undefined, it is no wonder teachers find it difficult to teach content on this concept. In this respect, teachers have goals that are not clearly defined, and thus can be confused as to what to teach their students.
Tyler’s (1949) continuum also addresses “experiences” students gain during a given curriculum. Instructional decisions within this *American Indian* curriculum are left up to the pedagogical concepts of the participants, leaving room for ambiguity within instructional practices. There are limited numbers of lesson designs, with little attention to instructional strategies. Noddings (2006) argues that schools neglect reflective and critical thinking skills necessary for students to become knowledgeable in a liberal democracy. In this study, critical thinking, “refers not only to the assessment of arguments but also to the diligent and skillful use of reason on matters of moral/social importance – on personal decision making, conduct, and belief” (p. 4). Student learning, however, was not the focus of this mixed-methods multicase study, though student learning cannot be divorced from teachers nor their practices.

The method for assessing student learning is also vague. The curriculum states that scrapbooks and portfolios provide a way for students to show evidence of what has been learned in each region.

The scrapbooks can be constructed by putting together construction paper (a different color for each region) and using tag board as a cover. They can be tied with a ribbon, spiral bound, or sewn. In each region, we have provided suggestions that can become a scrapbook page within the region. These are merely suggestions, not all of them need to be done. *Do as many as time allows.* We encourage you to be mindful of time and select activities for the scrapbook accordingly. (*American Indian* curriculum, p. 20).

Although teachers are reminded that the “scrapbooks/portfolios should include a representation of both contemporary and traditional Native American culture:
informational writing, contemporary homes, contemporary/traditional clothing, contemporary/traditional sports, and contemporary/traditional food” (Regional Study, p. 20), there are no explicit guidelines or rubrics for teachers to assess student learning. It is through this critical thinking lens that the multica case study will examine the numerous goals of this American Indian curriculum, to observe whether teachers are open to exploration and critical analysis of the aforementioned opportunities of learning.

Also during this unit, students are asked to develop an on-going investigation chart to present learned information to others. An example of an investigation chart is a “KWL” chart. “A traditional KWL chart records what the students already Know about a topic, what students Want to learn about a topic, and, after explorations, what students Learned about the topic” (Hershberger, Zembal-Saul, & Starr, 2006, pp. 50-51). In this sense a KWL chart can be used as either a formative or summative assessment, or both. Within the American Indian curriculum, however, assessment of the portfolio and investigation chart is informal, and instructions for student assessments are vague. The district formally evaluates the broad concept of Social Studies on its report cards. Under the heading Social Studies there are subheadings which include: understands the concept, developing map skills, completing assignments on time, and vocabulary pertaining to the unit. These same subheadings are used across all social studies units.

Working with the CSTs for the year also entailed finding resources for teachers. Included with this unit is American Indians: Background Information⁴, a separate book of literature to be used as an information guide. This literature review was created to help teachers “broaden their perspectives on American Indian people” (Background

⁴ A Pseudonym to protect the anonymity of the School District and its curriculum
Information, 2008, p. 1). It cautions that, “It is important that we avail ourselves of current information as we learn about a culture of which most of us are not a part” (Background Information, 2008, p. 1). The purpose of this separate guide is to help teachers understand more about teaching Native American content.

The background guide is comprised of several articles authored by American Indians. The largest and most comprehensive of these articles is the “Manual for American Indian Education”, which was developed for a broad range of educators, both Indian and non-Indian, engaged in the process of teaching others about American Indian concepts and issues across the curriculum. It is not intended to be used as a text for any specific area of American Indian or Native American Studies, except perhaps as supplementary or complementary material for a methods course for classroom educators. (Reinhardt & Maday, 2006, p. 3)

This manual contains a wide variety of information from a Native perspective, including the “how”, “why” and “what” of teaching about Native Americans. This manual was obtained, with permission from Educational Options, specifically for use in the Municipal School District. It is designed for teachers of American Indian curriculum to include major points for consideration, and to state what are the most relevant, serious, and sometimes contentious aspects of teaching American Indian content.

Since the inception of this study, economic situations have arisen that have eliminated the positions of the Curriculum Support Teachers. This is important to note.

---

5 The Manual for American Indian Education is also a pseudonym for the title of the teacher manual. It is masked to protect the anonymity of the curriculum and school district.
because their work not only entailed writing of the curriculum, but also included a workshop at the beginning of each school year to cover topics and questions within the American Indian unit. Each year the CSTs sat down with the teachers to cover the scope and sequence of this unit as well as to answer questions teachers had regarding the curriculum. Teachers would then collaborate across grades and schools to plan the unit for the year. These meetings took place before the beginning of the school year, and included the receiving of resources provided by the district for this unit in particular. The elimination of these positions also eliminated the planning time for this unit across schools. Now, if teachers choose to meet, it will be on their own time, and not during district hours nor with pay. Schools, in essence, are now disconnected, and the third and fourth grade teachers are disenfranchised from collaborating with each other regarding the American Indian and other curricula. The Municipal School District, in its efforts to streamline positions, will create “Curriculum Coordinator” positions at both the elementary and secondary levels; however, neither position is in place as of yet.

**Participant Selection**

Four elementary schools taught the American Indian unit during the data collection period. Participant selection was limited to those teaching the American Indian curriculum in the third and fourth grades. Each individual in the participant pool is unique in their history, context, and knowledge base. These participants became the cases for this study. It is with this in mind that the aim of this multicase study is to examine the broader purpose, the quintain of the American Indian curriculum. Individual cases, or participants, were initially identified in the following schools, as presented in Table 3.1 below.
Table 3.1

Participant Pool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade 3 Teachers</th>
<th>Grade 4 Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn Elementary</td>
<td>2.5(^7)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was estimated that 24 teachers would initially participate in this study. It was hypothesized that this small sample size would allow understanding of participants’ valuation and abilities to bring about positive student change, and/or, learning of the curriculum in an accurate and meaningful manner.

Each of the 24 teachers in the participant pool was given a folder with an overview of this study, an Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved Informed Consent Form (see Appendix A), and instructions on how to return the forms. Principals in each of the four schools were also given a folder containing the same information, as well as the Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval page (see Appendix B) and the School District Approval letter from the Superintendent of the district (see Appendix C). The

\(^6\) These are pseudonyms for the school names. They are used to protect the anonymity of the school district.

\(^7\) Hawthorn Elementary has one combined third and fourth grade class.
principals were also given the data collection instruments used in this study. It was my hope that by including all this information the principals would feel at ease with my conducting this research in their schools.

After receiving consent from eight participants, coordination with each commenced, in order to furnish them with an initial participant survey (see Appendix D) and a confidence rating scale (see Appendix E). Both of these indicators will be thoroughly explained in the next section of this chapter (Data Collection and Analysis). Both of these tools enabled me to choose the final four participants, according to how they assessed their content knowledge of the curriculum and their confidence (efficacy) in teaching the American Indian unit.

Data Collection/Methods Analysis

Both Penn State’s IRB and the Municipal School District have guidelines for research conducted within their boundaries. The IRB approved this study and determined it to be exempt as outlined below:

45 CFR 46.101(b)(1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as

(i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or
(ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods (see Appendix B).

The proposed study was also reviewed by the Superintendent or his/her designee, and approval was granted by the acting superintendent (see Appendix C). It was then that this research started with the initial participant pool, resulting in signed consent from eight individuals. It should also be noted that one of the schools had no participants at all, and
no explanation was given for the denial. With no protestation from the principals with the first and second rounds of data collections, the research proceeded with those eight initial participants.

The initial survey (see Appendix D) included 17 questions or areas for comments. It was designed to understand the teaching history and background knowledge of the teachers of the American Indian unit. The first three questions dealt directly with the length of the participants’ teaching careers and the frequency of teaching this unit. Seven of the questions were designed to understand the teachers’ background and knowledge base concerning the unit. No quantitative measurement for knowledge of the content within the American Indian curriculum exists. Any such “test” would need to address the specific context of this curriculum as written for the Municipal School District. Although there are historical fact tests in existence, none would come close to the specificity of this American Indian curriculum. Self-reporting on their experiences with classes or professional development pertaining to American Indians was used as a measure to assess their content knowledge levels.

In addition, randomly placed within these questions were three structurally differing questions regarding the value teachers placed on this curriculum. Participants were also asked (in three different places) about the outcomes for this unit, and if they felt they had achieved them. The last space was provided for participants to communicate any other comments they had regarding the American Indian curriculum. The answers provided by participants were analyzed in regards to the research question: “How do participants assess their perceived content knowledge regarding the American Indian curriculum?”
This survey was designed with four levels of answers for each question, with no neutral point. According to Trochim (2006), respondents then must declare either agreement or disagreement, importance level, or frequency. After designing the scaled answers, defining the focus of the questions came to light. By having fellow peers in the local college rate the items, those items and questions, which were unclear, were reworded for clarity.

Each of the initial respondents was assigned a letter (for school context) and a four digit number (grade and room number) to protect their identity. Scores were evaluated using these codes and by tallying the numbers in an Excel spreadsheet system. The items were designed for agreement, frequency, importance, or quality. Each answer was given a base 10 numerical value, which was utilized to better visualize the range of the responses. The lowest level of response was given a null, or zero value, with each of the three higher values doubling with each level (See Appendix G). Questions 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, and 14 all asked about levels of content knowledge. Responses were quanticized and combined to come up with a total score indicating how initial participants rated themselves on content knowledge regarding the American Indian curriculum. Mean and standard deviation were calculated, and participants were ranked according to scores. This list was then color coded into upper and lower perceived content knowledge levels. The scores ranged from 70 to 160, with the average being 128.

The second data collection instrument was a teacher efficacy scale (also known as the “Confidence Rating Scale”, see Appendix E) following the guidelines of Bandura (2006). This scale was designed to specifically address the self-efficacy of the participants teaching the American Indian curriculum. Bandura (2006) notes that there
are “domains” of efficacy, which explains why a teacher may be efficacious about teaching math, but not as efficacious about teaching reading. When creating an efficacy scale, the scale must not be divorced from the proper domain, thus creating a specific scale to match the “situational demands and circumstances (p. 307). The efficacy scale has been tailored to the specific domain of teaching the American Indian curriculum.

The numeric scale of this document is from 0 to 100. Pajares et al. (2001) argue that an efficacy scale with the 0 to 100 response format is a stronger predictor of performance than one with a 5-interval scale (p. 312). In addition, “The standard procedure for measuring beliefs of personal efficacy includes a number of safeguards to minimize any potential motivational effects of self-assessment (Bandura, 2006, p. 314). In order to minimize response bias, the efficacy rating instrument was not labeled as a “Perceived Efficacy Scale”, but rather as the “American Indian Curriculum Confidence Ratings” scale. Also, each Confidence Rating Scale was identified only by a letter/number code. This was done to encourage frank answers and to minimize any bias towards issues of confidentiality. In order for the participants not to feel as if the scale was evaluative, the scale could be filled out by the participants wherever they chose. Respondents were able to place finished data collection tools in a folder held by the secretary at the individual sites.

As the numeric scale for this data collection was on a 1 to 100 scale, sums were used to assess levels of perceived efficacy (See Appendix H). Participant scores ranged from 450 to 1140, and average efficacy level was found to be 800. Choosing four cases from the participants was accomplished after the scores of all eight respondents were charted (See Appendix I). Four of the respondents assessed their efficacy levels to be
above the average of 800, and of those four, one each was chosen for the accompanying indicators of high content knowledge score and low content knowledge score. The same was accomplished for those with lower efficacy scores matched with either high or low content knowledge level indicators. Those four participants’ efficacy scores, in coordination with their content knowledge level indicators, were chosen as the final cases to be studied, each with their unique intricacies and contexts.

**Individual Cases**

As stated earlier, the first research question involved the participants indicating their perceived content knowledge levels, and their perceived efficacy levels. The first two data collection tools were designed to obtain this information. From their indices, four participants were selected according to their reported levels of efficacy and content knowledge. The final four participants were as follows:

![Figure 3.2. Final Four Participant Matrix](image)

What does curriculum enactment look like?
During the first round of data collection, Dawn’s score on the efficacy scale was 950, which indicates high efficacy. Dawn’s score on content knowledge was 160, the highest among initial participants. Lisa, on the other hand, scored a 950 on efficacy. She scored below the mean, with a 120 on content knowledge. So, although both scored well above average on their efficacy levels, their content knowledge levels are strikingly different.

Both Karen and Maryanna scored below the average for efficacy, however, Karen scored higher on content knowledge, which classifies her as low efficacy, high content knowledge. Maryanna scored lower on both efficacy and content knowledge, placing her directly in the lower right-hand quadrant, (Low Efficacy, Low Content Knowledge). After the first two data collections assessed scores in both efficacy and content knowledge, these four individual cases were used to relate teacher efficacy to observable behavior, and to obtain multiple sources of evidence.

I had originally planned for one lesson to be videotaped for each of the cases. It was also planned that following the lesson, participants would view and analyze the videotapes. This introspection process, in which videotaped passages of behavior are replayed to individuals to stimulate recall of their concurrent cognitive activity, is a procedure named stimulated recall (SR) (Lyle, 2003, p. 861). This method is particularly valuable for analyzing cognitive behavior by participants, and for studying the relationships of perceived efficacy and content knowledge with the enactment of the American Indian curriculum. The videotape is used to aid a teacher’s recall of his or her interactive thoughts at the time of the lesson and to stimulate teachers to “relive” their
lesson (Calderhead, 1981). This method of data collection examines the relationship of classroom interaction and behavior to the aims, goals and objectives of what the teacher is thinking *during* the lesson.

Although videos from classroom events give us the ability to re-visit lessons, there are some limitations to the extent of their use. First, it can be “Highly stressful” for teachers to see themselves on videotape, and therefore the stress can colour the extent to which they reported on their recall of the lesson (Pirie, 1996, p. 3). A second problem, related by Calderhead (1981), explains that teachers’ tacit knowledge (knowledge that has been built up through experience) may not be readily available for spontaneous verbalization. Stimulated recall is designed to access introspective awareness, however participants may tell the researcher what they *ought* to be thinking, to impose “a degree of post-hoc rationality upon their behavior” (Pirie, p. 4). With this procedure, it is imperative that the recall be as vivid in the participants’ memory as possible. Thus, recall should take place directly after the lesson taught, preferably at the end of the school day.

While scheduling the videotaping at Hawthorn Elementary an email was received from the principal stating that no videotaping in her school would be allowed, and that she would forward the email to the other principals where the *American Indian* curriculum was being taught. Fortunately, this principal was amenable to me audio taping lessons in her school. To overcome the challenge of not being able to videotape these lessons, a piece of scotch tape was placed over the lens of the video camera, which allowed me to audiotape the lessons. This data gathering technique, adapted stimulated recall, enabled the observation of the relationship between the participants’ responses to
the survey and the efficacy scale, and the actions and behaviors of the participants in the classroom. This process stimulated reactivity and verbalization of aspects in the lesson, which were of importance to the participant, thus the observable behavior of the teacher in conjunction with the first two data collections could be compared and analyzed. This adapted stimulated recall enabled observational data to be written in the field notes as well.

The audio-taped lesson took approximately one hour. Participants then listened to the audio recording the same school day and were asked to analyze their audio in relation to the curriculum. They were also asked to comment on their feelings regarding their ability to teach the American Indian focused lesson (i.e. their efficacy). This process of open-ended stimulated recall brought much individuality to light, as the lesson was analyzed by participants in order to establish their feelings and ideas regarding the lesson. In actuality, thoughts regarding the lessons brought further ideas regarding the enactment of the American Indian curriculum to the forefront.

The last data collection method was an open-ended interview, whereby participants answered questions regarding their sense of efficacy and the curriculum in order to clarify what would help them (and in turn the district and their students) to feel more confident in teaching this American Indian unit. Questions were designed to follow up with items each of the four participants thought were significant from the videotaped lesson and subsequent stimulated recall analysis. The final question in the interview was designed to allow the participants to open up to whatever they felt was important about the curriculum or how they taught it.
Intertwined in the stimulated recall, and in conjunction with observation, analysis of transcripts, and field notes were employed (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Field notes included researcher observations from the lesson taught, the stimulated recall, and the interview. Observation can lead to deeper understandings than interviews alone, because it provides knowledge of the context in which events occur, and may enable the researcher to see things that participants themselves are not aware of, or that they are unwilling to discuss (Patton, 1990).

The resulting videos, along with participant commentaries and field notes, were qualitatively analyzed through viewing, describing, and transcribing the process and context of the lesson for each of the four cases. This process was also followed up with questions during the open-ended interview. Each interview was also transcribed and coded. Each transcription was individually coded using color and context (see appendix J). Post-it notes were arranged according to the emergent themes, and with that, the ordinariness as well as the individualities of the cases was shown. The synopsis contained a wealth of information needed to answer inquiries regarding efficacy and practice. In addition, the codes were then thematically identified using Stake’s (2006) graphic design worksheets.⁸

These recordings and field notes (descriptions of settings, people, activities, and sounds) were transcribed to identify themes, and to triangulate the data already collected from the initial teacher survey, the efficacy scale, and the videotaped lesson in conjunction with the stimulated recall. Triangulation is a validity procedure where

---

researchers search for convergence among multiple and different sources of information to identify themes or categories (Cresswell & Miller, 2000). In this sense, all of the data collected were validated by systematically sorting and looking for themes and codes to corroborate findings. Using Stake’s (1995, 2006) data organizational tools and narrative writing, the final report was then drafted, as a means of accurately capturing the setting. Validation was also member checked for each of the cases, as narratives were sent, read, and approved by all participants.

**Statement of Privilege**

In conducting this study, it is important to acknowledge the role that my own heritage as an American Indian woman and researcher plays in the research process. Although many researchers use the term “bias”, I prefer the term privilege, as I believe bias inherently implies a deficit of some type. I believe my ethnicity and life experiences *enhance* rather than *detract* from my lens as a researcher.

As a member of a federally recognized Tribe (The Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa) I have benefitted from my cultural and ethnic identity. I am fully aware that as a researcher, the lens through which I view my research on American Indian curriculum and teacher efficacy is both culturally and ethnically based. I fully disclose that I have benefitted from my reservation, urban, and other ties to numerous and varied American Indian communities within the United States and Canada.

As a child, I was raised both in urban and reservation communities. As a result, cultural and ethnic learning took place throughout my childhood. As an undergraduate student I studied elementary education as well as American Indian Studies. This educational benefit was furthered by my teaching in an American Indian Magnet School.
Through my undergraduate and graduate studies I have also been a part of American Indian educational organizations at both the state and national levels, which I believe have privileged me with information that may not be common knowledge to those outside of Native communities. The ethnic and cultural knowledge I have gained through my associations may not have been available to non-Indians; therefore, my cultural and ethnic privilege will have an impact on this case study of the American Indian curriculum in the Municipal School District.

In addition, I disclose that I had a working knowledge of this *American Indian* curriculum before I started this research. After reviewing and collaborating to improve it, I had extensive knowledge about what was contained in it, and what I felt *should* have been a part of it. This curriculum is not optimal, but it continues to be in use in the context of the Municipal School District. It is my hope that the *American Indian* curriculum will be continually reviewed and enhanced to provide the best possible content in the context of this case.

Although I possess knowledge of American Indian cultures, I am by no means an expert on all geographic and cultural areas of Native life. It is through my lens as a researcher, that I actively pursued knowledge of the landscape of the American Indian curriculum through the participants’ knowledge and ideas concerning this curriculum. It is my hope that this case study will enhance the current *American Indian* curriculum with valuable insights and references to help implement such curriculum in public school districts.
Summary

To better understand teacher efficacy as it relates to the teaching of an American Indian focused curriculum, multiple methods of data collection and analysis were employed, including a survey and an efficacy scale, which indicated four distinctive cases to pursue. This multicase mixed methodology was designed to study the complexity and situational uniqueness of each case in relation to the quintain, enacting the American Indian curriculum in the Municipal School District. This study will inform future practices of curriculum integration, teacher efficacy, and instructional practices at the elementary level.

The next chapter will review the information from the individual case studies. The four cases are narrated from the perspectives of the participants, each with their own voices, word choices, and phrases. These narratives provide us with rich data from which implications will be drawn in the fifth chapter of this multicase study.
Chapter Four

Individual Case Findings

Introduction

This chapter reports the analysis and indices of the final four cases and their unique contexts. This “mosaic” as Stake (2006) calls it, allows for the special circumstances of the cases, their uniformity and disparity (p. 40). The four cases of Karen, Dawn, Lisa, and Maryanna have features that are context-bound, such as their school sites and their number of years working with the quintain, the enactment of the American Indian curriculum. The contextual realities of each are translated here in chapter four using Stakes (2006) cross-case analysis.

Each of the four cases was chosen for cross-case analysis because of their indices in perceived efficacy and content knowledge. The first two data collections helped to narrow the focus of the first research question:

1. How do participants assess their perceived efficacy and perceived content knowledge regarding the American Indian curriculum?

The narrowing down of these cases was also thought to benefit the answering of the second research question:

2. What is the relationship between the participants’ perceived efficacy, their perceived content knowledge, and the curricular enactment of the American Indian curriculum?

Chapter four provides rich data from the perspective of the participants; their knowledge, contexts, and experiences offer a wealth of information and understanding. Each case was purposefully selected from perceived efficacy and content knowledge
indices to provide information regarding the degree to which they will enact the

American Indian curriculum. This chapter examines these data from three themes:
choices of activities, topics taught, and the assessment of student learning.

Each case contains information revealed in a combination of the various data
collections. As Stake (2006) argues, “The researcher decides what and how the (case)
story is told: More will be pursued than was volunteered. Less will be reported than was
learned” (p. 144). Written within each of the cases are the external forces as well as the
internal understandings of efficacy and content knowledge that drive each of these
teachers to enact the curriculum from their personal perspectives. According to Stake
(1995), "Case study reporting is not simply storytelling” (p. 127). More important than
the story of each case is the fact I, the researcher, am transferring knowledge to the
reader, “Arranging for what educationists call discovery learning, the researcher provides
material for readers to learn, on their own, things the teacher does not know as well as
those he or she does know” (Stake, 1995, p. 145). Thus, each of these cases is insightful
for answering the research questions posed above. For reference purposes, see Figure 3.2
below. Each case is essential to the quintain of the enactment of the American Indian
curriculum.
Low Efficacy, High Content Knowledge Level

Karen’s Narrative

“First off, let me start by saying what a fabulous and amazing curriculum this is! I really love teaching my students this unit and watching the children making connections with artifacts and history. Putting the bigger ideas into some sort of perspective for them in a realistic way is really fun for me. I am really comfortable knowing that I can trigger learning in my classroom. I have been doing this for over ten years, and teaching this particular curriculum six times. I am realistic about what I know and don’t know; what I am comfortable with, and so forth. I teach some things better than others.

I know my students well enough to know who to put into the reading groups so that there is a breadth to the reading levels, but also a nice variety of students who will
make those connections between the literature and the ‘big ideas’ in this curriculum. The unit is divided into four different regions, and although I haven’t taught the Northwest region yet, I am looking forward to the creation story and folk tales of that region. I like to ‘hook’ my students in by having a ‘Discovery Box’ of items that get them thinking about the American Indian Tribes and Nations from each of the regions.

When I start each region, I use my own creation, the discovery box. Just watching the kids’ faces as I slowly open up this box of ‘treasures’ from a region is really exciting. And for them well, it really just gets them thinking about so much. Some of the things they know and are familiar with, some of them they’ve never seen before. My favorite is the southwest region. I started by having the artifacts in the box. I had a turquoise rock shaped like an egg, a little clear container of water, a plastic representation of a rock formation, a cactus, a brick, a mortar and pestle, and a woven drink coaster. So my kids knew what most of them were for, and each day we just talked about, we discussed what they were used for by the people of the southwest. They absolutely loved it! The questions they came up with were amazing! And this is my favorite of the four regions too. Like in this region there are a lot of traditions and languages that are still upheld; not like the other regions, and that’s cool.

Before I get too excited about the discovery boxes, I should let you know right up front that I am really comfortable with how this unit is laid out. The four geographic regions make it really clear how to progress through to the end. Another thing I like is how the unit has the integrated aspect of social studies and reading in it. I can mix American Indian facts in with my morning meeting or read one of the non-fiction books for my leveled reading groups. Working with the natural resources aspect of the regions
is really a big deal to me and my students; we can learn so much, and make so many connections to each other with that! Yeah, I really love the discovery box idea, it’s the biggest thing that I do in this unit; I don’t feel like I use a lot from the unit, to be honest.

I guess I should say, though I’m a little worried about it, though because I don’t think I know enough about the modern day, or should I say modern people…I’m a little confused over which labels to use for the people of today. Should I say ‘Tribe’ or ‘Nation’? Well, either way, the people that are here ‘still today’ are important, and I wish I knew more about them. I wish the unit had more resources on people and the nation names. I read a lot for this unit, and I also go online to find modern stuff for it. I always check for a publication date on the materials just to make sure; I don’t want my kids to have any misunderstandings. For example, I have a friend who works at the hearts museum, or is it the Hearst museum? No I don’t really remember, but I went there and since she works there and knows so much, she told me that you’re not supposed to say ‘Anasazi’ anymore, you’re supposed to say ‘Ancestral Pueblo’, so I started saying ‘Ancestral Pueblo’ to my kids, like I said, I don’t want them to have any misunderstandings. I try really hard.

So I buy a lot of the resources I use in the classroom, because there just isn’t enough in the unit. Not enough on the modern day people anyways. I bought stuff at the museum too. But I get where the unit is coming from, although I don’t really follow the curriculum like it says to; I’m a little embarrassed to say. I do a lot of worrying about teaching the right information, but even if we only have eight books to share between the classrooms, it’s the discussion that really helps us to initiate changes in the way the kids think. I wish I could teach it all, but my heart and soul goes into my teaching, and I need
a lot more information and a lot more time to get it right. I worry about that. I get nervous about that. I mean, I am really good at teaching about the geography, but I need help with the modern day stuff, and there just doesn’t seem to be enough information.

As the unit goes on, we read books during reading and social studies about the people of the Southwest region. We look at how the geography and climate have an effect on the kinds of homes people had. We looked at pueblos, and hogans, and adobe, and the history part of it. We talked about the Navajo, the Zuni, and the Pueblo people. I must admit, I got a little confused over the names of people and things. It’s a little confusing, you know. Do the Pueblo people live only in pueblos? And who lives in hogans then? So I worried a bit about that, and my kids had a few misunderstanding about it too, like they thought adobe isn’t real anymore, that there are just regular bricks.

To try and teach them about the contemporary part, I taught a lesson about ‘then’ and ‘now’. I didn’t really know how to label them, so I said titles in more than one way. I used the terms ‘modern Pueblo’, ‘contemporary Pueblo people’, ‘still today’, and ‘now’ as one of the piles that kids could put the objects into. The other was ‘only in history’ or the ‘then’ pile. So I had them try to put things in a pile that would show them that all of the items eventually would end up in the “still today” pile, because all of those items are still used today. So I think the bigger the pile, the bigger the deal for the kids. I’m still worried over the labels, and it might have confused them a bit. But we had some good discussions that day.

In that sorting lesson, the kids worked in groups to look at a modern aspect of the Southwest peoples, and then we came back together to “share”. Each group had a little blurb on some contemporary aspect of life. I had a resource from the Plains Indians that I
adjusted for the Southwest People, and I put it into ‘kid-friendly’ language. An example, so you know what I mean, this is what I wrote for them on modern day food for the ‘still today’ people of the Southwest:

**Food**

While the Navajo and Pueblo people enjoy hamburgers, French fries, and ice cream, they continue to eat corn, beans, and chile. Some of this food is homegrown, but most is bought at a grocery store. Corn is not often ground by hand with a mano and metate, but many families make Indian bread, piki bread, or Navajo fry bread. Some families are able to raise their own meat, like beef, pork, or mutton (sheep meat). A report in 1993 stated that one in every three elderly Native Americans reported not having enough food to eat every month.

Each group wrote down one take away idea from this information, one new or interesting fact, and one question for further understanding. When we got back together to report findings, this group reported the interesting fact that the Navajo and Pueblo people like the same food as regular people. The take away message was that they make piki bread, while the question they had was about why the elderly people did not have enough food.

So I’d like to say that first of all, any discussion of these topics is good. I try really hard to make sure there are no misunderstandings, but when there are, it’s the discussions we have about them that are so cool. That’s how we learn, with artifacts and ideas about them! The kids have such fascinating ideas. In this case, I questioned them
why they thought the elderly (had to explain that term) didn’t have enough food, and the answers were totally cool. Their ‘hypothesis’ (how cool that my kids actually used that term?) was that perhaps they were hungry because nobody liked them, or that they are still so much into their ancestral ways. How insightful was that? My kids showed me how much thinking was going on in the classroom, and that, in itself, is really interesting. I did make sure to say that perhaps the American Indians don’t have enough food for the same reasons that people in our culture don’t have enough food. So there’s a little snippet of a lesson that I think gives you a better idea of the really neat things I do in our classroom with a limited amount of resources, and not enough information on modern Tribes or Nations; on Modern people. I know I wonder, and I’m not sure about a lot of this, but I keep learning. Mostly I look online, but over Christmas break I went to Arizona, and I bought a bunch of resources, and I even went to go visit a real Apache reservation. My friend who works at a museum set it up, and the people on the reservation, I don’t remember the name, but they just like people to come visit! So, the weird thing for me was that we got up early that day and met in the parking lot of this huge grocery store right on the reservation. I mean, I don’t really know what I expected, I’m a little embarrassed to say, but they even had a bank by the grocery store. It was a great experience, and I mostly just listened to other people talk. They had a ceremony going on; it must’ve been religious because they weren’t comfortable letting us watch it, but it was really cool, just having that eye-opening experience.

So that’s my big deal. I don’t just want my kids to look at the readings; I don’t want them to focus on just how things used to be. I want them to make those connections and to have discussions on the bigger ideas. I don’t know that much, but I know some
injustices happened, but I wonder; I don’t really feel comfortable talking with kids about it until I learn more. I think using the artifacts in the discovery box really gets the conversation started. Even though this is the kind of information I don’t formally test, I do look at the discussions and see who is participating and such. Even though it’s informal, I think this curriculum is great. I know some of the other teachers do scrap booking or cooking, that’s not my thing. I like the discussions with the kids because I can tell how they progress in their thinking.”

**Case particulars.** Karen has been working in the district for more than ten years, and has taught this curriculum more than six times. Her score on the efficacy scale was the lowest of all participants, though she rated her content knowledge in the middle range because she felt she knew a lot about the historical and geographic pieces, but knew little about the modern piece of this curriculum which was recently added. Karen was not shy about her limited knowledge; rather she faced it head-on, asking questions of me as data were collected.

**Activities.** Karen acknowledged her apprehensive nature when it comes to modern American Indians, and asked particular questions about what is the correct terminology and specifically about pronunciation. This was evident in her lesson activities. Karen specifically chose a lesson about “Modern Day Indians” for this research in order to face her apprehension about terminology and perceived lack of knowledge in this area. What made Karen’s lesson distinctive was that she connected the familiar regional geographic and climate references to the difficult part, modern day Natives. In this respect, Karen did what was easy for her. However, this lesson is not sanctioned in the curriculum, and the first half of the lesson had nothing to do with American Indians. Here again, her
creation of the “discovery box” ignored the curriculum and in doing so, also ignored the very people this curriculum is about. Natural resources are not specific to American Indian tribes or nations. For Karen, this was the comfortable, less challenging way of encouraging new learning, not only for her students, but for herself. Karen continually strives to learn more about the areas she feels weakest in.

Karen’s lesson contained a variety of curricular activities. The class was grouped around a blanket to discuss the “artifacts”, and then students worked in groups to read and write down information. The class then came back together to share their ideas and discuss the larger ideas of what is considered “now” or modern, versus what is “only in the past”. Looking at and classifying rocks, plants, and water provided Karen with a means to connect the past to the present, though this first half of the lesson had absolutely nothing to do with past or present day American Indians.

Karen’s ability to provide an array of activities was noteworthy. Her efforts to connect what is difficult for her to teach about (modern American Indians) to what is comfortable for her (geography and natural resources) were apparent in the separated lesson activities. What was initially striking was that the start of the lesson had no references to Native Americans, avoiding the topic altogether. The “artifacts” from the discovery box all referenced the southwest region either though climate or natural resources. This was Karen’s way of easing into the more difficult part of the lesson for her, the contemporary piece.

Contemporary or modern American Indians are difficult for Karen to teach about. Karen’s low efficacy in this area was clearly evidenced by the many ideas contained in the “rewritten” statement about food that she handed out to students. This evidence is
problematic on many levels. Her level of specialized content knowledge was apparent in the language of the text. This essentialism, whereby she assigned certain traits to all present day American Indian people in the Southwest is astounding. This is further evidenced by the term “piki bread”, which is distinctly Hopi; though that nation or people were not mentioned. She is trying to gain experience in this content area, though, as evidenced by her recent trip to Arizona where she visited a reservation. Although surprised by its modernity, Karen is gaining valuable life experiences by asking questions and looking for new information on the Internet, in multimedia resources, and with her friends.

Topics. Karen’s lesson topic was very broad, and attempted to connect the well known (geography) with the complex (contemporary). Karen feels she knows the most about the Southwest, and spends a longer time on this region than the others. She ended up skipping another region, as she ran out of time in teaching the other three. Karen tries not to avoid any topics, but she has particular difficulties bringing the struggles of American Indians to her students. This is evidenced by the following text presented to her class: “A report in 1993 stated that one in every three elderly Native Americans reported not having enough food to eat every month”. The arbitrariness of this fact, presented with no connection to prior knowledge or content, may end up confounding students’ feelings about American Indians. Confirmation of this follows in the students’ conversations as to why so many elderly Native Americans do not have enough to eat. Unfortunately, Karen’s fear that she might misrepresent Native peoples has become a reality.
Beyond her fear of misrepresenting Native peoples, Karen has omitted American Indians from parts of her lesson. Karen’s use of the “Discovery Box” is not a part of the written curriculum, and Karen agrees that she chooses items and artifacts according to what she thinks are important to each region. In this sense, Karen is opening the regional study with the familiar, the natural resources and climate of the area. This method is what Karen feels is the most important aspect of getting the students interested in each region. She feels quite comfortable in using geography and natural resources in the American Indian unit. What is deficient in Karen’s teaching is accurate information, connections to prior learning, and the inclusion of specific tribal names within her lessons. Karen also feels the unit lacks resources, and uses this as a crutch for not being able to teach the unit well. Although the Background Information section of the unit clearly states the need to use specific tribal names, and includes information that will help Karen teach about American Indians, she chooses to refer to her own sources rather than the written curriculum.

Karen has developed “student language” to fit the Southwest region. Ironically, the information she uses comes from a resource book on the Plains people. Although well intentioned, the adapted language is quite unfocused and contains spelling errors. In spite of Karen’s efforts to adapt this lesson to include contemporary aspects of American Indians, her use of complicated and unrelated facts muddled her intent. Karen wishes there was more information on contemporary issues and people, and thinks that perhaps it would be easier to focus on just one tribe or nation in each region. This comment is indicative of the lack of persistence as shown in the literature regarding efficacy.
Assessment. Karen uses a K-W-L Chart at the beginning of each region to gain an understanding of what her students understand. She then develops the discovery box for the region, which really gets the students interested. Although Karen recognizes that she does not follow the written curriculum, and that some of the other teachers use tests and such to assess students, she relies more on discussions and in particular questions from students to gain an understanding of what they have learned. She can see when students have that “aha” moment, and assesses more in that manner.

Karen admitted that she didn’t return to the K-W-L chart after the first use. She qualified what students knew, but did not summatively assess their formal learning when the region was finished. She also acknowledged that for her, it is more important for her students to get the “bigger ideas”, the bigger picture that she has in her mind. In this sense, Karen verbally assesses her students in order to know where to start the next lesson in a region. Karen teaches lesson to lesson, without much regard to the overall objectives or assessment methods of this American Indian unit.

High Efficacy, High Content Knowledge

Dawn’s Narrative

“I’d like to start off by saying that I am outraged by what this district has done. Really, what they failed to do, with this unit. I know this unit was written by experts including the researcher. I know this because I made the effort to get to know the American Indian community here in this town. I am lucky that way. I am fortunate to be able to know real people in this community. Working for the Powwow committee for the past few years has been really great. But our district has changed so much. I’ve been working here for more than 10 years, plus the 13 years I taught before even getting here.
And so it’s especially difficult; it’s a real loss that we do not have the structures in place like we used to. It’s increasingly hard to see the changes that have really ripped some things apart.

This unit is so coordinated. It actually works as a reading and a social studies unit, so that’s important, that coordination. And I am thankful that it is done that way so I can sequence the geography and the reading concepts together. And I am also lucky to have been teaching this unit long enough that I know some of the learning enrichment that used to happen. I remember when the district used to sponsor guest speakers, and once it was this Oneida woman, and I remember her humor…and it was in somebody’s living room! And to get to meet real people, and to have not just students, but other teachers to get to meet them, well that’s amazing. Once we were all mesmerized by this little two-year-old guy dancing to the beat of Powwow music, and then to be able to see how he was included with the family, it was just incredible. And then I got to see this little kid at the Powwow the next year, and he was dancing right on the beat and he was even drumming! Incredible!

But, yeah, it used to be a regular thing that we had people coming in to teach us and to meet with us. The one woman and her daughter even hoop danced for us. But the kids got to see the dancing, they got to understand it, and recognize the different kinds, and we all came back to school with a glow. And this year there was nothing like that, and you can’t replace that. Growing through knowing real people, and educating kids and adults at the same time is incredible. And it’s a real loss, and it has really been a year of flux, well, a couple of years of flux because we’ve had such upheaval and uproar. When
the district had professional development, we had the opportunities to participate in things.

This year, we had seven of us on our team, and one woman is on maternity leave, and another is new to the unit, so everything is completely new to them, and without that piece from the district and the designated unit planning time, we are on our own. There used to be structure. We had division chairs, division meetings once a week. We were responsible for the resources of this unit, the timing of the lessons, and the scope and sequencing of how it worked. We checked in with all of our teachers weekly, and made sure that they understood the unit, understood the big ideas as well as checking how far we were getting, and if we wanted to have special events, we arranged those things. We also had the Curriculum Support Teachers working for us, and they would have that ongoing look at resources and materials that we don’t have time for anymore. They had the time to find the experienced people, the experienced teacher or the experienced curriculum. We don’t have that ongoing experience anymore. Now we just attempt….

I definitely think what works for me is books. I love it when the kids make connections, predictions, or ask questions because it keeps them really involved in the book. And the connections they make with the characters in the books are so important. They know Danny BigTree really well. They go through his bullying with him. They get to know his grandfather who talks to him; walks him through the bullying in a traditional way. These kids really care about what happens to Danny. Kids will say things, write them down, say things that are really deep, and not have to be led to it.

This book doesn’t have actual photographs, but it has up-to-date drawings in there. I know photos are better, and that’s why we look at a photo map rather than a map
with political lines on it. They still don’t get continent and the state very well so without those political divisions, it's tough for them. And that’s why I told them that Pennsylvania wasn’t even a word that was thought of back at that time. It was just like this revelation. I think I am just a little bit lucky in that I grew up in a Slovak town where that wasn't the majority and that whole minority thing was going on, and then, being a woman, there's a difference, and you could see that, there's a difference, in the representation of the wealthy and the poor. Who has power, and who gets the books written their way. And so it comes back to the books.

Kids can pick up a lot. They especially pick up a lot from books; even those that have up-do-date drawings. I also use some of the old outdated books to teach my students about stereotypes. Maybe it’s unrelated, but a few years ago I found some little, old, prizes; kind of like little Gumby characters, only they were cowboys, Indians, and little animals dressed up like Indians. And I ask them what they can tell anything from these racist toys and books. Can you tell anything about their families? Can you tell how they treat their women? And what about the little tomahawk; what does this mean? And it’s really like the opposite of what I want them doing, but it’s an effective lesson for fighting stereotypes and racism. Ha ha, the last time I did this, I asked what a parent should do if a child wanted this toy; like, what should a parent say to the kid? It’s funny, because the kids thought up a number of ways to talk their parents into buying it for them rather than how to respond as a parent. I had to tell them that the toys are not appropriate and that they don’t teach you anything about real people. So sometimes it takes more than once for these more difficult concepts.
So to help with some of the book lessons, we listened to the audiotapes that go with them. I think the books are absolutely great, but first of all, there’s a lot kids can pick up in books. But there’s a distance between you and the book. There’s a distance between the characters and the kid. However much you like the characters in a book, they’re still at a distance, but that connection between sight and sound is important. We listened to the Joe Bruchac tape and I swear we must have listened to it six times. Because it’s real in a way that a book isn’t; just can’t be. Every time we had a few extra minutes, the kids wanted to hear more of the tape, or to hear it again. And it makes the connection that when they see that character in a book, the character becomes even more real. These kids need to know that there are real Native Americans living in society.

There’s more to reading though. I definitely think that the things that we do with the books are important. We do a reading log. We make those connections, those predictions, and we ask questions. It keeps them really involved it the book, and then writing about it and talking; the kids say some things that are really deep. The activities that we do that go along with the books are really laid out. And even the way they talk is cool. We have a new math curriculum, and they have this ‘Math Talk” where they have to repeat what was said without putting their own ideas in there, and I hear math talk happening with this unit too. And I will admit that I do avoid some of the books. I know other people use them, but some of the topics; I just can’t make that personal connection. I just can’t do it….yeah.

They have specific assignments that we do to make sure they have understanding and connections, and one of the sets of books has an assessment in there that used to a certain extent. Some teachers will do a project or make a booklet; a scrapbook of some
type, but to me the reading assignments and discussions are key. It’s interesting because on the report cards it’s listed as social Studies and reading, and there are four boxes in the subheading for understanding the concepts, developing map skills, completing assignments, and vocabulary. So science and social studies have the same four subheadings. But sometimes I miss some of the stuff in history because I want to make sure to get to the modern day people.

It depends a lot upon the kids. Some years they want to know more about the Carlisle School and boarding schools, so we’ll take longer on that. One year it was the Trail of Tears and the Removal era. It just depends on how much the students ate in touch with the culture. Lately, I can tell that my students are having a better understanding. We are lucky enough to have students who have their parents telling them about their heritage. Of course I trust it more when I have a Tribe or a Nation name to go with a particular nation or whatever. I make sure to check on it more when they say ‘Indian Princess’, but one parent even brought in his son’s ancestor tree, and there was a Cherokee ancestor in it! I even had a kid who said he was related to Custer, so it’s just being more aware of this stuff nowadays.

And the maturity level of these kids is a factor too. When they’re just starting third grade, it’s hard for them to read some of these books and to get that connection. In “Sing Down the Moon”, the girl gets kidnapped, and that’s harder for a third grader to understand, you know? And if you don’t have a grip on the culture yet, well then you’re not going to make that connection with the book. Some of the topics don’t come across so easily, so I don’t use them so much. Here’s an example; in the unit on Africa, there’s a book about this family who goes to the market and their little son gets lost. Well I
checked, and people said that that would never happen at a local market because
eybody would know that family and the little boy, and they’d know where the boy
belonged. So I check these things with the books I use. And then I can make those
connections, and so will my students.

So when I look at the bigger picture of what we’re supposed to be doing here, it
gets difficult for me. What this district has been dealing with for the last few years has
had an impact on this. We have a new Superintendent here, and I he’s a young guy who
has two of his own kids at schools here. And we did have meetings this year, and I’m
hopeful. And they’re restructuring somewhat too. One guy who’s been a teacher, a CST,
and a principal here is now in charge of the K-8 curriculum overall. People have a very
high opinion of him already, so hopefully things will improve. I hear we may have a
little bit more money, too, so that’ll help. Our principals have been having more
meetings, and we think they represent us well. We need that overall guidance. When we
had the overall guiding structure, we had more communication.

I am on the diversity committee for our building, and it used to be a big deal. We
used to do so much more and have so many more programs and such. We used to share
among classrooms, buildings, and with the whole district. This year it was really poorly
attended. Now, we’re lucky if we can get a ‘Google Doc’ together of what is going on in
our buildings. We are missing out on so much, like the Martin Luther King Jr. in-service
day. We used to have such great programming and service project presentations! Now
we have a day of student contact because the scheduling committee and the calendar
people decided we needed an extra day of student contact. And that was the day they
chose, so we are missing out again. That was where we got a lot of our enrichment. That
was where I got to learn about American Indians’ representation in children’s literature. And the really sad thing is that teachers now, new teachers, don’t even realize that they’re missing out. There was nothing, so they don’t even know!

But then again, this is what makes me feel lucky- That I did get to see these things, and to know these great people. I am really fortunate like that, and it helps me to understand the cultures better and teach this really cool unit to the kids. Teaching about all of the stuff, but teaching about inequalities and unfairness is cool, but teaching about it when it affects them or a character that they feel they know is cool. I want them to move into seeing that, and to grow up to be better people because of it.”

**Case particulars.** Dawn has been teaching for more than 20 years, and was in this district when the *American Indian* unit was first introduced. Dawn has purposefully looked for and found the Native American population in town, and collaborates with and participates in cultural events in the community. Dawn’s efficacy score was very high in relation to other cases in this study, and she assessed that her content knowledge level was high. Dawn is confident enough to seek out and find people and resources to include to the enactment of the *American Indian* curriculum.

**Activities.** Dawn’s activities for this lesson covered many areas. Her students read non-fiction books in preparation for this lesson, and the grouping of students reflected the reading levels of both her students and that of the various books. This lesson encompassed four tribes, one from each of the regions from the unit. Karen started by assessing students’ prior knowledge regarding the information in the books, and how one can check its accuracy. Each student was then grouped with three others who had
read different books. In this sense, each student group had four different tribes represented, and a worksheet was filled out to share information across the four regions.

As the groups came back together to share information, students noticed many similarities and differences across their tribes. Dawn then wrapped up this lesson by checking for understanding. The students shared maps and engaged in sharing their newfound knowledge with each other. The lesson was extended for 15 minutes while Dawn engaged in a student-led discussion on maps and political lines that didn’t exist long ago. Dawn shared the worksheets with me to show what the students had learned.

**Topics.** Dawn thinks the unit is a complete entity, and she has been teaching it long enough to teach lessons from each of the four regions. She is confident in her ability to teach students about modern day American Indians, sometimes at the expense of history. Although each class “has its own flavor”, she understands that all of the issues are important, but that some classes are more inclined towards certain subjects.

Dawn often feels more of a connection with certain books and objects, and gravitates to those resources before some of the others. She sometimes avoids a book with a theme that seems too mature for her students, but will manifest the same “issue” in another way; one that is more comfortable for her. This is apparent in her avoidance of a book from the unit dealing with stereotypes and discrimination, and her compensation by adding to the curriculum with the stereotypical figurines. Dawn has used the figurines for several years, and feels this is a good way to teach about such a serious topic. I question whether this is the best method in teaching about stereotyping. One would not teach how to do a math problem wrong in order to demonstrate the wrongness before making it correct. The themes in this unit are interwoven in Dawn’s teaching. Her
knowledge of American Indians, and even other cultures, is broader due to her concerted efforts to find and use resources. As mentioned in chapter one, “The ‘contact hypothesis,’ states that close contact between members of different races fosters positive racial attitudes” (Tan et al., 1997, p. 265). Dawn has worked with the Native American population in town, and her teaching and topics are evidence of her friendly attitudes towards Native Americans and this American Indian curriculum.

**Assessments.** Student knowledge is assessed through specific assignments in reading. Dawn is able to integrate the American Indian curriculum throughout the overall curriculum in her classroom. Primarily, Dawn is able to identify learning through what her students’ say, what questions they ask, and by using an adapted K-W-L chart shaped as a circle. She returns to the “circle” to ask students what they have learned.

Dawn is the only teacher to note that the report cards have a social studies space to write the unit title, and whether or not students have learned the vocabulary and shown progress in learning about the unit. Dawn acknowledges that some teachers use portfolios and scrapbooks, but neither of those methods work well for her. Short quizzes in some of the books exist, but again, she would rather verbally check in with students as a means of assessing their learning.

**High Efficacy, Low Content Knowledge**

**Lisa’s Narrative**

“We had so much fun, didn’t we? We tried to give them a more authentic experience, and we did. In past years it didn’t work out so well, but this year, our feast went great; they really loved the frybread, didn’t they? It was such a great way to
culminate. And you know we worked together a lot to do this, and it turned out better than last year. What an authentic experience in learning about the culture!

You know, the other teacher and I came together to do this, but even though I know there’s definitely some things we still need to learn and improve on, we work on this all the time. She’s a veteran here, and we work together. And we used to, but we don’t have that anymore, either, like when we used to walk through the unit together. That was really helpful when we looked at what we wanted students to get from each lesson. That’s a bummer, but we had a good start, so now we just make it better each year, working together and building on what works.

So I think we did all the major outcomes, and even some of the smaller ones. I know we combined some of the lessons and we shortened some of those beginning ones. We had to skip a lesson just trying to fit it all in. We went through December right into January, and I wish we could’ve covered more. It is just too hard to fit it all in. We didn’t get to go in depth with all of it, but we covered at least three lessons in each of the four regions, so I feel like we did the major outcomes. We did make a little booklet of activities, but we didn’t formally assess them.

We didn’t really formally assess them, and there’s a little quiz in one of the National Geographic books, but we didn’t use it this year. But we talk about things a lot. We talk on what we want them to learn, and what we can improve on. And so a lot of it is informal through discussions and questions. If it’s something I felt was really important then we talked about it. And if I really wanted them to get it I would grade some of their papers.
And I am most familiar with the geography and climate parts of the unit. It’s crazy when the students don’t know much about other places and the geography and climates. I am most familiar with that, and since they don’t know it, that’s what I teach about. Covering that part is easy for me. Yeah, I do think that is what I know best. And I know which students can lead the others in discussions and such, but we still need to talk about, making sure that, I’m doing this right, because it’s important to learn about their cultures and traditions.

We use a lot of the books and read-alouds. We do, and we integrate. I used some of the books in my reading group, and I probably could with Sara’s class too. And even into writing too. But the most interesting part for us is when we have an outside speaker come in. They love it! We had a person come to our school in period costume to talk about the French and Indian War. My students remember everything he shared! Having outside people come in is cool.

I guess what is important is that the students explore a little bit about a different culture, and to respect and appreciate another culture’s values and beliefs. And in this case it’s American Indians. And then within that, there are little goals we want them to learn. We want them to learn the homeland and the geography influence, the types of food and shelter and clothes they wear. And, yeah, we want them to learn a little about the traditions and how they pass them down from generation to generation; the similarities and differences, that sort of thing. But the geography of the region is really important, so they understand the different areas. How the climate affects lifestyle, that’s a biggie. So exposing them to geography is important in this.”
**Case particulars.** Lisa is the youngest and newest of the four teachers (cases) in this study. Lisa is very confident in her teaching of this unit, and scored nearly highest of the four cases. She feels she is somewhat knowledgeable of the content, but also understands that there is always more to be learned. Lisa also feels that although the information provided with the American Indian curriculum is beneficial, she needs more resources in order to be more effective with this unit. She is most thankful that her school has rotating student groups to help integrate this curriculum, and thinks this helps her concentrate on what she needs to within the unit, but also wishes she knew more. Lisa teaches the geography and maps portion of the curriculum, and therefore is efficacious about that part of her teaching the curriculum. She unfortunately falls in to what Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2005) call a level of “gross-overconfidence”. She is able to concentrate on the geography aspect of the curriculum, therefore, she feels quite confident that she does a good job teaching it. However, she relies on other teachers in her school to teach the rest of the content contained within the unit. She does understand that this unit is important for students; she wants them to gain an accurate understanding of American Indians, and to change their perspectives and stereotypes. This part of the curriculum, however, she leaves to others.

**Activities.** Lisa’s lesson included a power point presentation on a large screen at the front of her classroom. To culminate the entire American Indian unit, classes rotated through Lisa’s room to sample ground buffalo chili. Lisa shared that the buffalo came from the Plains region, and her lesson included facts about what buffalo eat (grass), as well as the recipe for the chili. One slide showed many parts of a buffalo and what they were used for. What was painfully obvious in this lesson was that Native Americans
were not mentioned. Although this was the culminating event for the entire curriculum, no tribe or nation was mentioned; though geography, climate, and buffalo were.

Lisa thought this was a fun culminating event for the unit, and said that she had learned from and enhanced the lesson from the first time she taught it. The first time she worked with the “Culmination Feast”, the students were all in the cafeteria, and behavior management was an issue. Again, the lesson did not have American Indians in the name. It was more of a celebration of the unit being “done”. After being ‘done’ she reflects on her own learning and understands that each time she teaches this unit she will learn from it, and acknowledges that although her school had surpassed the time allotted for this curriculum, they had decided to extend the unit. She admits that she could have covered some of the topics in more depth, and she only got to the geography part of the Pacific Northwest.

**Topics.** The easiest part of the curriculum to cover for Lisa is the geography. She states that geography is what she is most comfortable with, so that’s what she teaches. She covered the geography for all four regions, but knows there is more to it than that. She readily admits that some of the initial lessons in the unit, the introduction lessons, were skipped, combined, or shortened to save time. Sharing the teaching of the unit with the other teachers was helpful to her.

Lisa also admits that her school didn’t get to the final National Geographic “wrap-up” of the unit; they had the feast instead, which seemed more fun. And some of the books from the unit were placed on the bookshelf rather than used in a reading group or as read-alouds in class. What really worked for Lisa were the outside guests who came in to talk about Native Americans. One, whom Lisa says is a very engaging guest, comes in
period costume and works with the French and Indian war re-enactments. This is the type of offering she wished was more prevalent within the curriculum and the district.

**Assessment.** Lisa informally assesses student learning through discussions. She uses verbal responses to questions, and the discussion topics, as a means by which students understand the unit outcomes. She does believe that she has achieved the intended outcomes. Of course, Lisa only had to work with the geography outcome, how the homelands of Native People have influenced their food, clothing, and shelter. Lisa acknowledges that the written curriculum has other forms of assessments embedded, but does not use them. If there is a topic she really thinks is important, she might grade some of the student papers, but otherwise she assesses informally.

**Low Efficacy, Low Content Knowledge**

**Maryanna’s Narrative**

“So I’ve been teaching for awhile now, and part of that time I got to work with folks from the college here, and in that sense, I, well, it changed my way of thinking, you know? I still have those experts in my head. I still hear pieces of Steve, the social studies guru in my brain, because there is so much more to social studies than just…you know, it’s more global. And I know that I’m not supposed to just test these kids on the continents or state names, but I end up doing it anyways. Because by fourth grade they should know the compass rose and they should be able to look at a map and know the directions, and they should know what the continents are, and that the United States is a country and not a state! But from working with the college people, I got to know that it’s about geography, it’s about culture, it’s about everything, and we teachers can use this unit as a vehicle, but we still need to do some basics.
And what’s next? Do they study this again? Because I work hard to get all the facts straight; I look at all this new information we got (which I think is great), but that still doesn’t help me with figuring out which words are politically correct! Like, is it American Indian or Native American? Because I have these conversations with friends and stuff, but one person says one thing, and another person says another. So, yeah, it’s just fascinating to me. If I could, I’d go back and I’d be a secondary history teacher; I think that would be my thing. I would love it because I’m totally into it. I’m excited about it. But I worry now, that someone outside education or that somebody will hear me talk about all these historical dealings, and they’ll be like, ‘Um, that’s not true’. So maybe, if anything, I wonder if I go too far the other direction. I feel like I’m slanting it the other way too much.

And I think things have changed over the years, too. Not just with the curriculum, but with how the books now say that the Sioux people might still live on their own reservations or they might be in the city or they might be in your neighborhood. Like, with our generation, we thought that they were all killed off, but that was because of stupid stereotypes. But I don’t think students still leave with that stereotype today. It’s interesting because they always used to draw pictures of Natives with feathers in their hair, or in a tipi, or whatever, but now they draw a kid playing basketball or someone doing photography. I mean, they know that they’re journalists and they’re baseball players and famous ballerinas and things. They’re like anybody else! I feel a lot of kids will come up and say their parents are part Cherokee, so I can tell that now, they know more about themselves. More than we ever did, anyways- my grandfather was part Cherokee and I never knew that my whole life growing up.
And that knowing helps with the curriculum. Even though I have a level of uncomfortableness with not being an expert, I can relate our other activities about bullying and what-not. I really genuinely believe that when you build the community in your classroom and all that; if you treat kids with respect, and if you show them you care about them, then they start caring about each other. My heart would break if I would ever hear stereotyping in my classroom. My kids do know about stereotyping, and they do know about discrimination, and although it wasn’t as uncomfortable 20 years ago, it is so incredibly uncomfortable today. I’m sure it happens, but not here. I’m not naïve, but I really, genuinely believe that.

So in the unit there’s a video that has this kid, Danny BigTree, who gets discriminated against, and he talks about it, and that’s where I start to get a little uncomfortable, because I think my kids wouldn’t even know to do that, and so am I putting ideas into their heads, then? I may be a bit out of line for saying this, but I feel like my kids would not have ever done that to Danny. So I’m sure it happens in some places, and so I connect that type of thing to other parts of the curriculum like Scholastic News™. And that’s another big part of this unit is being able to talk about those things, those words, and how their connected to bullying. I totally adore Scholastic News™ for just that reason. There are lots of issues about stuff like that in there; sticky situations and debates- stuff like that.

Teaching the unit this year went beyond the twelve weeks. But once I got started I wanted to do each region justice. What I really wanted was to have more experts come in and teach us. We had a few, but our main goal was to give them a sense of what people and how people used the land when they originally came here, how they survived, and
how they lived off the land. Really, how they cared for and respected the land after they came across the land bridge, the Bering Strait. More or less giving them a sense of who our country was founded by. Maybe Columbus got some credit for it, but was he the first one? No. Was he the first European? Maybe. I don’t know, maybe Leif Erikson? I don’t know. So the kids need to know that for reasons of exploration. And that helps with going into the next unit about explorers.

And on a scale from one through ten, I would say this year’s class got a seven or an eight. Most people got it. Maybe some kids would get a five or six, but I can keep referring back to it because now we’re working on the next unit that talks more about Columbus. And every year I fine-tune it. Like the feast this year and the Pueblo Pumpkin bread. It was a lot more connected to the unit and the regions this year. I got heavily involved in the native craft thing last time, but this time it was more about reading and map work. I think the literature definitely compliments the unit, but the way we rotate classes here really integrates it all. For the geography part we had a scrapbook, and we talked a lot about the homes and the food. And we got note-taking skills from watching the videos; that helped.

I still have this element of uncomfortableness when I’m not an expert on the subject. But it’s tough. It’s really tough, so we ask them questions about their perspectives, or about what they’re thinking. Has your perspective changed? We do a lot of that type of thing. And we sometimes use the quizzes for the region, like ‘Can you name the states in that region?’ or “What is the climate like in that region?” ‘Has it changed much?’ But now we definitely have that modern part in there too. I think on average we try to get five lessons in. We read a little bit about the Trail of Tears; and I
think it’s important - the kids benefitted from that, even though they’re hard to read about because there’s a lot of sensitivity issues and things like that. But I think we set the stage for fifth grade and the Civil war. I think the major idea of them getting a little bit about the history of our country is good.”

**Case particulars.** Maryanna has been teaching in this district for more than ten years. She is comfortable teaching, and has also had some experiences outside the classroom in the broader field of education. Although she is comfortable with her role as a teacher in general, she feels very uncomfortable with her level of content knowledge and efficacy when teaching this particular unit. Part of what she calls her “uncomfortableness” comes from her larger understanding of the pedagogies of social studies. She is acutely aware of the need for this *American Indian* curriculum, but would rather have an expert come in to teach her, and to teach about Native Americans. Although it is admirable that Maryanna *knows* she needs to learn more about American Indians, she feels that it is easier left to what she calls “experts” like me to do this kind of teaching. She says that some of the best lessons in this unit are from experts who have visited her classroom. She also hasn’t looked at the curriculum too much to find the updated resources included in the curricular revision. With all the other things she has to do, sometimes there just isn’t enough time. She often described the American Indian curriculum as being pushed out in terms of students learning the “basics” in the classroom. She did not take ownership of what happened with this curriculum, but was quick to point out how the district has failed students with the limited resources put towards teaching the *American Indian* curriculum.
Activities. Maryanna’s lesson contained information on a slideshow. A map illustrated the Southwest United States. Another slide related to corn, and the fact that there are more than 40 different ways to prepare corn; some of them were listed on this slide. Slide three progressed to manners about eating food, and to try a “polite bite” so as to have good manners. The last slide contained the recipe for the food the students were about to eat, “Pueblo Pumpkin Bread”. Ironically, pumpkin bread is not particular to Pueblo people. This lesson was more about manners than about anything related specifically to the Pueblo peoples or any other American Indians. This made the lesson confusing. For example, I thought this activity was representing a region at one point, but I found it to be otherwise as I walked with the students through a rotation of “polite bites” of food in different rooms.

Topics. This lesson was also used as part of a “feast” which culminated the American Indian unit. Many teachers, teacher aides, and parents were utilized in its planning and implementation. Maryanna’s pumpkin bread was just one of five stops for a quick lesson and food tasting. This “feast” was not in the written curriculum, but it is one of the many ways Maryanna leads the teachers in this unit. One of the classrooms had “Three Sister Stir-fry”, also not necessarily an American Indian food, and definitely not attributed to a specific tribe or region. One classroom had “Navajo Frybread”, another food that was attributed only to Navajo people, though every culture in the world has some type of bread. The last of the rooms contained the biggest surprise - sushi. A parent prepared and handed out different kinds of sushi to the class. He was very animated, and the students were captivated with his flashy antics. Regardless of how fun
this food stop was there was no evidence of a connection to any American Indian tribe or region.

Although she knows she can’t possibly teach everything in this unit, Maryanna is quick to say that she completely understands that this American Indian unit is a springboard to other units. The next unit, *Travelers and Traders*, contains history of explorers that go back as far as the 1300’s. Maryanna knows that the *American Indian* curriculum is, historically speaking, the “end-result” of the next unit about explorers. Maryanna clarified by explaining how history was a continuum, sort of like a timeline, and although the curricula didn’t necessarily follow the historical timeline, she tries to make it relevant for her students. I found Maryanna’s comments on Christopher Columbus especially interesting. She wondered aloud if Columbus was the first one here. Then she wondered if it was Leif Erikson. What was fascinating to me was that there was a timeline on the wall directly behind her head that clearly showed that Leif Erikson arrived before Columbus, however, the timeline made no mention of American Indians.

One of the unique things about Maryanna is that she makes these connections to the subsequent “Trappers and Traders” unit long before and long after this unit is actually taught. She also looks more broadly at the concepts (tradition, culture, discrimination) contained in this curriculum, and teaches them across content and curricular areas. Although Maryanna focuses on the broad concepts, it appears that she does not get to the specifics of the *American Indian* curriculum.

Assessment. Maryanna knows that assessment in the social studies is difficult. She looks at some written pieces that have questions that students answer in relation to
their knowledge, but primarily she informally assesses using discussion. In the past she has used quizzes, but she didn’t his year. Her quizzes used questions such as, “Has your perspective changed?”, “Can you name some states in the region?”, or “What is the climate like in that region?”

Basic geography and map concepts are important areas to assess with students because Maryanna knows that these are the foundations for later learning. Other cultural units in this district also build on this unit, and she hopes that learning about Native Americans doesn’t stop here in third or fourth grade. She understands that things have changed since she was in school, and she knows students are more aware of issues because she said they, along with their parents, are more aware of Native heritage in their family backgrounds. Maryanna talks at length about broad topics, and how curricula are related, but never mentions the specifics of the American Indian curriculum. She avoids talking about what she thinks is “tough”.

**Assertions Derived from these Four Cases**

Each of these cases is unique. Embedded in each case are the details that help us understand how efficacy levels relate to curricular enactment, especially when it comes to the *American Indian* curriculum in the Municipal School District. On the basis of observations and other data, Stake (1995) argues that researchers draw their own conclusions, called assertions, a form of generalization or interpretation (p. 9). Assertions go beyond observation; they are drawn from understandings within us, a mix of personal experience, scholarship, and assertions of other researchers (p. 12). The variety of themes, what Stake refers to as “assertions”, that emerge from these cases, are important, but the opportunity to learn from them is most important (p. 6). Understanding the
particulars of each of these cases will inform us of what teachers, teacher educators, and the education community can do to effectively enact this type of multicultural curricula.

**Efficacy.** Although each case is unique in its perceived levels of efficacy and content knowledge, collectively the four cases tell us many things. Those with higher efficacy levels, Dawn and Lisa, are efficacious for very different reasons. Dawn has persisted in her research, and has gotten to know American Indian community members, often working with them on cultural events in town. This facilitates her higher efficacy levels immensely, as she feels comfortable and is able to ask questions of American Indians, and uses this information for the benefit of her students. Lisa, however, although scoring herself high when teaching this American Indian curriculum, falls into the category of possible gross overconfidence (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2005). While Lisa believes she is enacting this curriculum well, the reality is that she is only teaching one portion of the curriculum, the geography of the United States. Lisa relies heavily on her peers to enact the rest of the curriculum, and thus believes that she is achieving her goals for the curriculum.

Although both Lisa and Dawn have rated themselves as highly efficacious, they are clearly separated by their years of teaching experience. Lisa is teaching this unit for only the second time, while Dawn has taught it since its inception. Dawn has had many years of commitment to teaching this entire curriculum, whereas Lisa has only taught one small part of this unit. It is the geography that Lisa can handle, and therefore, it is the geography that she teaches and feels efficacious about. Although geography is only one part of the larger American Indian curriculum, Lisa views herself as highly efficacious in her ability to achieve the intended outcomes for the entire unit. Ironically, Lisa mentioned
numerous times that she would like to know more about the topics covered in this unit; however, she clearly avoided talking about specific details included in her lesson and in the curriculum.

Karen and Maryanna both indicated low levels of efficacy. Although both teachers are veterans, Karen is more confident in her content knowledge regarding the historical aspects of the American Indian curriculum. Maryanna has some experience with the broader world of teacher education, and therefore has more knowledge of the theoretical background of teaching social studies. Rather than boosting her efficacy and content knowledge levels, Maryanna feels as if there is much more to learn; both of these teachers have what Wheatley (2005) calls “productive doubts”. Karen and Maryanna both feel negative towards the way the school district has handled curriculum implementation, and disparage the lack of time for planning with others and across the district. In this manner, it is easier for them to blame the district for their less productive teaching of this American Indian curriculum.

**Enactment.** A previously defined in chapters one and two, curricular enactment is the process of combining the current situation and the histories of teachers, students, the school, community, legislation, and curriculum materials to action in the classroom. Each of the cases provided much evidence for this multicase study. Overall, it was apparent in most of the cases, that there are certain topics and areas that were not covered. What was especially enlightening was the aspect that many of the lessons were only peripherally about American Indians. This marginalization of American Indian content was especially evident in the “Culmination Feast” lessons, where the lesson content was secondary to both the “culmination” and the “feast”. The tangential
reference to “Pueblo” in one of the classrooms was the only reference to American Indians at all. What was important here was the “celebration” of the conclusion, the culmination of the unit rather than specific tribes, their contributions to society, or any of the specified learning concepts within the curriculum.

Also apparent in Karen’s lesson were the discrete and almost disconnected facts that distracted the students and their thought processes. Karen, though, understands that she needs to further develop this lesson in particular, and is willing to try to do so. It is this kind of commitment to learning that is wonderful to see in teachers. Not all teachers have these productive doubts, or the commitment level to learn new ideas. All of the cases in this study mentioned some curricular topics that they did not cover, whether it was for lack of time or from feeling uncomfortable with the difficulty in discussing these topics. Most of the difficulties had to do with social aspects of American Indian culture. The reasons given for the avoidance of these topics were generally attributed to the district not having planning time across teachers and schools; however, this was also attributed to not having enough content knowledge about the subject area to begin with. As Shulman (1986) states, “Teachers who do not themselves know a subject well, are not likely to have the knowledge they need to help students learn this content” (p. 404). This facet of understanding the content of the American Indian curriculum is especially apparent from the discussions with the participants in this study. Unfortunately, it is the students who are most affected. Teachers trying to enact the curriculum without the necessary content knowledge in turn pass inaccurate or misleading knowledge to students. Part of the dynamics of enacting a curriculum is assessment of student learning.
Although this research does not explore student learning in depth within this study, the relationship between efficacy levels, productive teacher practices and student outcomes is clear. What is problematic with the enactment of the American Indian curriculum is that each case teaches specific parts of the curriculum to the exclusion of others. Although it is understood that individuality plays a part in curricular enactment, the magnitude of the variations within this particular curriculum are vast. For example, none of the cases presented a lesson directly from the written curriculum. This is perhaps the direct result of the ambiguity of the written curriculum, but more importantly a direct result of the efficacy and content knowledge of the individual participants. Each has gained knowledge from different places and perspectives and is striving to find more information. Although all participants indicated that they thought this curriculum was very valuable to both the district and the students they teach, none of them assessed student learning in the manner that is put forth within the curriculum.

The ways in which each of these cases enacted this curriculum is distinct in the topics covered, the difficult issues avoided or taught, and the assessment techniques used. However, the fact that these participants reveal their students are assessed on verbal responses or questioning alone is problematic at best. Popham (1999) shows the critical need for rubrics or scoring guides in any assessment technique; even oral communication needs to have evaluative criteria, such as delivery, organization, content, and language. (p. 188). Additionally, no single form of assessment is adequate in developing a comprehensive profile of the student’s learning (Popham, 1999, p. 180). Each participant also listed many of the ways student learning could be assessed, but none utilized these strategies. Most agreed that it was particularly difficult to assess learning in this unit due
to the ambiguity in the *American Indian* curriculum instructions. They indicated that something similar to a K-W-L chart is useful. However, only Dawn returned to the summative K-W-L method of assessing student learning at the end of the regional studies. Even the most efficacious teacher in this multicase study, the only participant to actually mention how the report card is used in the overall social studies arena, used informal measures to assess learning. Informal assessment has its rightful place in curriculum, but should not be used in isolation and to the exclusion of all other measures, especially without an accompanying rubric. The lack of formal assessment makes it difficult for these teachers to fully understand what their students have learned. Although the district formerly had professional development specifically for this unit, teachers are now left on their own to decide how best to enact the *American Indian* curriculum.

**Summary**

Each of these cases was selected for a particular reason Therefore, in answering the first research question:

1) How do participants assess their perceived efficacy and content knowledge regarding the *American Indian* curriculum?

the four cases were selected exclusively because of their scores on two indicators, perceived efficacy and perceived content knowledge. This selection process also ensured that each case would represent and provide evidence for answering the second research question:

2) What is the relationship between the participant’s perceived efficacy, their perceived content knowledge, and the curricular enactment of the *American Indian* curriculum?
Each of the four teachers described in these cases demonstrate distinctive characteristics while enacting the *American Indian* curriculum. Although each believes they work very diligently to enact this curriculum, the most crucial factor for enacting the curriculum is content knowledge and *how* it was acquired. Learning about American Indians has been overlooked for far too long.

In sum, this multicase study of what teachers perceive as their levels of content knowledge was distinctive for each of the participants. Each case is unique, but embedded in each case are the details that help us understand how efficacy levels and more importantly perceived content knowledge levels relate to curricular enactment, especially when it comes to the *American Indian* curriculum in the Municipal School District. Understanding the particulars of each of these cases will inform us about what teachers, teacher educators, and the education community can do to effectively enact this type of multicultural curriculum. Fortunately, there are a number of measures that can be taken to strengthen teacher efficacy and content knowledge in order to assist teachers in effectively enacting an *American Indian* curriculum. These measures will be presented in chapter five. Chapter five will also discuss the implications of this study for current and future educators working to implement American Indian focused curricula.
Chapter Five

Discussion and Implications

The multicase study of the American Indian curriculum in the Municipal School District is multidimensional. This chapter aims to further the assertions derived from this study, as well as acknowledge the limitations of this study. This study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. How do participants assess their perceived efficacy and perceived content knowledge regarding the American Indian curriculum?
2. What is the relationship between the participants’ perceived efficacy, their perceived content knowledge, and the curricular enactment of the American Indian curriculum?

Research on teacher efficacy indicates that highly efficacious teachers will have higher goals, more commitment to these goals, and will resist negative thoughts more readily (Bandura, 1993; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard et al., 2004). In answering the first research question regarding teachers’ perceived efficacy, a domain-specific scale was constructed using Bandura’s (2006) framework. These efficacy levels were then combined with the teachers’ perceived content knowledge levels. This screening method identified four unique cases, each with differing levels of efficacy and content knowledge. In addition, the use of adapted stimulated recall was designed to aid a teacher’s recall of his or her interactive thoughts at the time of the lesson and to stimulate teachers to “relive” their lesson (Calderhead, 1981). The recall and analysis of data was
implemented to understand what Meijer, Beijaard, and Verloop (2002) describe as a teacher’s split second thoughts, tied to the specific content of the lesson and the knowledge and beliefs of the teacher in relation to their classroom practice. Fundamentally, stimulated recall was used to connect the teachers’ perceptions of their cognitive processes with their classroom behavior.

**Implications**

The four teachers (cases) in this study each taught a lesson and engaged in the process of stimulated recall to identify what they thought was important in the lesson. This adapted stimulated recall and subsequent line-by-line analysis of the transcripts was essentially, a “think-aloud” of the four participants. Each collective narrative was then sent to the participants to be checked for accuracy. Interviews and member checking helped to clarify the relationship between perceived efficacy levels, perceived content knowledge, and the curricular enactment of the curriculum. Each case of enactment was individual, though some unique assertions can be made for the Municipal School District.

**Teacher implications.** Teachers are the gatekeepers (Thornton, 2005), and as such, they define what a particular curriculum means and how they shape their instructional practices towards curricular goals. In the quintain of the *American Indian* curriculum, the variety of lessons taught in each case was immense, most of them having little or nothing to do with specific American Indian tribes. The particular manner in which each of the cases implemented the curriculum is so broad as to suggest there is no common experience among teachers. The goals are listed in the curriculum. Each teacher has the same resources as the others; however, the breadth of variety is beyond that of the written curriculum in most cases.
Most of the cases agreed that they didn’t follow the curriculum closely, and none assessed student learning by using formal means. Informal and unstructured assessment can be rigorous, though sometimes more difficult to score and evaluate, but all forms of assessment must have some criterion or scoring structure (NCCA, 2004). Teachers have no uniform criterion or rubrics that measure student learning for this American Indian curriculum. The use of portfolios is suggested within the curriculum, but here again, none of the cases followed the unit guidelines which stated, “Please remember that the scrapbooks/portfolios should include a representation of both contemporary and traditional Native American culture: informational writing, contemporary homes, contemporary/traditional clothing, contemporary/traditional sports, and contemporary/traditional foods” (Regional Study p. 20).

In reviewing these data, it was also noted that teachers implementing this unit need to be aware of their positionality when it comes to race. As reviewed in chapter two, if members of different racial groups possess “some innate and invariant set of characteristics that set them apart from each other as well as form whites, this legitimizes the structure of colonialist absorption” (McCarty & Crichlow, 1993, p. xviii). Rather than situate themselves as “regular people” which inherently implies that American Indians are the “other”, it is imperative that teachers engage in some self reflection. “They need to realize that what they think they know about Indian people may be stereotypical, biased, and inaccurate” (Background Information, p. 35). Self-reflection is beneficial, but so is discussing and planning the unit, its objectives, lessons, and assessment techniques with other teachers.
Teachers who did establish collaborative planning time did so at their own expense, and then tailored the *American Indian* curriculum to fit their own needs, at the expense of the curriculum. In this manner, veteran teachers took over more of the responsibility of the curricular concepts, while novice teachers taught the broad concepts of geography and climate. This collaboration of veteran and novice teachers indicates that it can be helpful in the implementation of the curriculum, but that there must be a sharing of content knowledge and experiences among peers.

**School implications.** Three of these four cases indicated the need for more common planning time and school-level support. Only one of the cases voiced feeling fully supported by her principal, and even had extra resources, such as Scholastic News™, allocated for the teaching of this unit. The purchase of Scholastic News™, however, has no relevancy to this curriculum, except the occasional article referring to American Indians. The teacher who received this resource did not share the News with her peers teaching the *American Indian* curriculum. Principals also did not offer specific planning time for this unit.

Effective professional development is needed at the school level. Penuel et al. (2007) argue that for professional development to be effective, it needs to provide support for the implementation of curricula, and it needs to be aimed at some type of reform, such as student inquiry. In addition, programs supporting curriculum need to be “localized”, to the context of the particular curriculum (p. 952). In this multicase study of the *American Indian* curriculum, fostering content knowledge about historic and contemporary American Indian Tribes in this geographic area will contribute to teachers feeling more prepared to implement this curriculum.
Guidance and support for teachers is essential, especially to fulfill the district mission, “To prepare students for lifelong learning through excellence in education”. If cooperation did occur, it was not the principals’ initiative. Principals need to allocate planning time for the American Indian curriculum in order for it to be purposefully and effectively implemented. Improving subject matter knowledge in isolation will not solve the dilemma of a broad curriculum. Teachers, supervisors, administrators, and pre-service teachers need to be involved in the development of curriculum, and understand “why” they teach it.

**District implications.** The Municipal School District (MSD) deserves accolades for implementing this American Indian curriculum. With the many obstacles facing those trying to implement multicultural curricula, MSD has made efforts to create a historically accurate and culturally sensitive learning experience for its third and fourth grades. This effort is noteworthy and deserves praise. That being said, it is important that we remember Tyler’s (1949) framework for developing curricula requires that the following questions be addressed:

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?
2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized”; and
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? (Tyler, as cited in Hlebowitch, 2005, p. 19).

Tyler’s framework (see figure 2.2) examines the nature of the educational situation. This framework is constructed as a circle to show that it is a continuum, rather than a linear
form of curriculum implementation. Therefore, by reviewing this *American Indian* curriculum, understanding its strong and weak points, and being able to adjust by making strategic instructional decisions, the district will better serve its students. Municipal School District no longer has the Curriculum Support Teachers (CST’s) to support and continually assess this curriculum. This invaluable position was cut due to funding issues, to the detriment of this *American Indian* curriculum, as well as the teachers and students in the MSD.

Three of the four cases mentioned that the CSTs were imperative to the enactment of this curriculum. The time spent on keeping the resources current, as well as the professional development sessions and the collaboration in planning the unit each year was essential. Penuel et al. (2007) state that

The following core features also contributed to enhanced knowledge and skills and changes in teaching practice: a focus on content knowledge, active or inquiry-oriented learning approaches in the professional development experience, and a high level of coherence with other reform activities and standards in the teachers’ local school contexts (p. 924).

However, with these positions no longer in place, MSD has left teachers to their own devices, and this has in turn individualized the curriculum to the experiences of solitary teachers. It is understood that the curriculum needs to be flexible enough to leave room for the teacher to have discretionary space in their practices and instructional methods (Tyler, 1949), but teaching in isolation with no support structure in place leads to ambiguity and isolation of the curriculum.
Fortunately, the Municipal School District is planning to designate curriculum supervisors for both the elementary/middle school and high school levels, and it is hoped that this will alleviate some of the isolation of teachers of this *American Indian* curriculum. These positions should be explicitly designed to support this curriculum, especially in relation to the core curriculum; making sure to accurately define the purpose and expected educational experience of the *American Indian* curriculum.

In addition, the *American Indian* curriculum needs a method of evaluation, not only for teachers and students, but *from* them. The assessment measures within this curriculum are ambiguous, and provide no structure for assessment of instructional goals. In turn, teachers are not assessing the instructional goals. As a result, there is no evidence of student learning other than the unstructured and informal measures of conversations in the classroom. Unstructured assessments of student learning include writing samples, logs, journals, games, debates, storytelling, or anecdotal records (NCCA, 2004). As previously identified in chapter two, it is important to note that no single form of assessment will provide a comprehensive profile of student learning, but even oral communications need to have some type of evaluative criteria (Popham, 1999). Therefore, this criterion for evaluation of student learning needs to be developed further. The goals are clearly listed in the curriculum, but are not aligned with a measurable assessment (qualifiers, not quantified). Even though the objectives are clearly identified in the curriculum, there is no alignment with measurable assessment of student outcomes.

Evaluations of the curriculum are also necessary. Popham (1999) argues that formative assessment gives the curriculum a way of negotiating changes and to appraise emerging problems, deficiencies, and strengths (p. 185). Unfortunately, at this point in
the MSD, there is no curricular evaluation occurring; therefore, teachers are teaching this curriculum according to their content knowledge and efficacy levels. This experiential teaching isolates teachers in their classrooms, and leaves them to their own devices.

Summative curricular evaluations can also occur as a logical conclusion to the unit, and the summative nature provides for feedback on the curriculum experience (Popham, 1999). As we saw with the “culmination feast”, efforts were made to incorporate some type of conclusion; however, there were no evaluative criteria for those involved in teaching or experiencing this American Indian unit. This unit needs some type of structured assessment technique that is applicable to the activities contained in the unit.

Limitations

In conducting this study, a number of limitations were identified. First, it is important to note that efficacy is multifaceted and difficult to conceptualize. Efficacy measurements, and in particular, constructs, are equally complicated. This multicase study of the American Indian curriculum in the Municipal School District was aimed at finding the levels of perceived efficacy of its participants. As much as it was achieved, a more delineated view of the types of efficacy is needed. Further, this bounded study did not address nor measure the type of efficacy other than the domain-specific efficacy in enacting the American Indian curriculum.

This multicase study was also bounded by its context, and therefore is not generalizable to contexts dissimilar to this one, a small rural district in the northeastern United States. A bounded case ensures the study remains reasonable in scope (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 547). Although the MSD is to be commended for creating and
implementing this curriculum, it is not the norm. This school district has only a small population of American Indian students; in fact there are less than ten. Many schools choose to teach core curriculum that will be assessed with standardized tests. Therefore, although there are some irrefutable facts pertaining to the need for learning specialized content knowledge about American Indians, much of the context is unique to the district.

One of the most difficult limitations is that student learning of the content was not assessed. This case was bounded by the participants, the teachers. Their stories tell us much about the relationships between efficacy, content knowledge, and how curriculum is enacted, but the story of the students needs to be told as well. In understanding what students have learned from the participants in this multicase study, we would have a better idea of what teachers need to effectively enact the curriculum. In particular, this mixed method multicase study was a snapshot of the curriculum. Although it is narrated mainly through the perspective of the teachers, the quintain of the curriculum needs to be examined in a more longitudinal approach, focusing on a variety of lessons rather than just one.

Although stimulated recall involves video-analysis, I was restricted in this, and pursued audio-recall. This may be somewhat of a limitation in that teachers were perhaps not as visually stimulated into thought processes during the analysis. Another limitation of stimulated recall using video is that participants viewing videotapes of their lessons are perceiving the lesson again from a different perspective and tend to be distracted, at least initially, by their own physical characteristics (Calderhead, 1981, p. 213). Fortunately, this particular issue can be, and was, overcome by using audiotape rather than a sharp, clear picture from a video camera.
The last aspect that limited this study was the curriculum itself. As stated earlier, I applaud the MSD for including it alongside their core curriculum. However, the additions and revisions to the curriculum were only small isolated pieces that were intended to add contemporary aspects to the existing curriculum. Unfortunately, multicultural curriculum implementation approaches used by Banks (1989) illustrate how this American Indian curriculum is one that has used the additive approach to implementation, and therefore we could be doing more. In addition, given the historical perspective of many American Indian intellectuals and researchers (Brayboy & Deyhle, 2000; Brayboy et al., 2007; Carstarphen & Sanchez, 2012; Castagno, 2008; Deloria, 1989; Deyhle & Swisher, 1997; Grande, 2000; Innes, 2009; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002) it is clear that American Indians need to have their rightful and accurate place in the curriculum.

**Implications for Future Research**

This study began with the idea that teachers’ perceived efficacy and content knowledge play a role in how they implement the American Indian curriculum. Emphasis was on perceived teacher efficacy; however, the findings indicate that further study is needed to examine the specialized content knowledge teachers need to have in order to effectively enact a curriculum about American Indians. Each of the participants in this multicase study learned about American Indians in different ways, and the manner of that learning was far more influential on enactment than their perceived teaching efficacy. What is unknown is: How do teachers learn content about American Indians? Are those learning experiences positive or negative and how can educators teach American Indian content in an effective manner?
Having worked with the Municipal School District to establish a historically accurate and contemporary curriculum focused on American Indians remains one accomplishment that brought me both pride and disappointment. This experience made me painfully aware of the need for continuous curriculum improvement, as well as continuous teacher preparation for productive teaching practices. As an outsider and an external consultant with American Indian cultural knowledge, I tried diligently to change the curriculum in a culturally appropriate and sensitive manner. Although this is forward progress, the discontinuity between what needs to be taught to pass standardized tests and what should be taught for socially aware citizens is at odds.

Fighting for an appropriate and accurate place in the core curriculum in this country has been an uphill battle for marginalized people, especially for American Indians. According to Lomawaima (1999), “Native America is remarkably diverse, encompassing hundreds of communities with distinct languages, cultures, philosophies, and educational systems that defy easy generalizations” (p. 5). For American Indians, tensions still exist regarding what to teach about the over 560 tribal entities as well as the most effective methods for how to teach the history and contemporary aspects of diverse tribes and nations.

This is an important issue facing schools today, as “approximately 90% of Indian students in the U.S. are educated in [public] schools that fall beyond the jurisdiction of Indian tribes” (Reinhardt & Maday, 2005, 2006 p. 18). Although there is research and literature pertaining to appropriate content and teaching methods specific to American Indian students (Broken Nose, 1992; Buly & Ohana, 2004; Deloria, 1989; Deyhle & Swisher, 1997; Journell, 2009; Lomawaima, 1999; Pewewardy, 1998; Sleeter, 1992,
2000; Starnes, 2006; Yazzie, 1999), much of this literature has been focused on schools within tribal control, not public schools. Although this multicase study of an American Indian curriculum will enhance the existing literature base, there is still much research that needs to be conducted.

The need for research in this area is also evidenced by the fact that “About 99% of the teachers and administrators in public schools are non-Indian and have had little to no training on Indian education or Indian issues in general” (Reinhardt & Maday, 2005, p. 18). Conducting and viewing research from the perspective of teachers in public schools pertaining to the enactment of curriculum about American Indians will provide us with information on how to improve content knowledge levels and productive teacher practices. Teachers are the gatekeepers, or filters of what information is presented to students. As such, they need to have experiences that help them understand appropriate history, concepts, issues, and methods that will produce productive teaching and learning. As Tippeconnic and Swisher (1999) write,

The misconceptions and stereotypes about native peoples that persist in the academic content and attitudes and behaviors of school personnel must be addressed through preservice and inservice teacher preparation, and in the curricular materials used to train teachers in colleges, universities and school districts. (p. 303)

**Summary**

This multicase research aimed to identify the relationship between perceived efficacy levels, perceived content knowledge and the enactment of the American Indian
curriculum. Analysis of the many forms of data collected show that although efficacy has some effect on implementing this curriculum, the extent of participants’ content knowledge as well as how they acquire such knowledge is much more fundamental to the varied implementation of it.

From the literature about teacher efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard et al., 2004; Guskey, 1988; Pajares, 1996; Rubeck & Enochs, 1991; Schunk, 1991; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998), we know that “people process, weigh, and integrate diverse sources of information concerning their capabilities, and they regulate their choice of behavior accordingly” (Bandura, 1977, p. 212). This study was aimed at the behaviors teachers exhibit according to their perceived efficacy levels. It was asserted that those with higher efficacy would enact the curriculum to a greater extent than those with lower efficacy. As seen in chapter four, although there is somewhat of an efficacious effect on enactment, there are many other more basic factors that influenced the classroom behaviors and practices of the teachers.

Highly efficacious teachers (if not grossly overconfident) are an asset in the classroom. Attempts to influence or modify efficacy levels should be made. Increasing teachers’ content knowledge, or what Shulman (2008) calls the “specialized content knowledge,” in conjunction with efficacy levels is imperative. Teachers in this multicase study will feel more efficacious if their specialized content knowledge is increased. This is not to say that there is only one explanation for the findings in this multicase study. In fact, there are more questions that need to be answered.

In this study, each case had a particular level of perceived efficacy and content knowledge, and therefore should have looked diverse. While I found many individual
traits and characteristics in each of the individual teachers, what became clear was that they each had experiences that shaped their learning about American Indians, and in turn these experiences shaped how they implemented the curriculum, more so than their efficacy levels.

The sources of information or misinformation (such as knowing American Indians, or using popular media to learn about them) that affect or influence personal efficacy weighed heavily on the relationship between teacher efficacy and the enactment of this American Indian curriculum. If teachers had the experience of viewing American Indians in a professional development situation, or if they had worked with American Indian people in the community, their behavior was more heavily influenced. Those that had no formal engagements with American Indians or American Indian curriculum enacted the curriculum to a lesser degree.

In addition, if teachers felt they had successful performance accomplishment with a particular lesson in the unit, they continued and even built upon that accomplishment. Despite a strong and efficacious desire to effectively enact the American Indian curriculum, the evidence in this multicase study has not proven that the curriculum is implemented in the manner it is written. Teachers’ emerging knowledge of the content is to be commended, but there is room to grow. There are measures that can be taken to further identify content knowledge levels and to justify the need for professional development and learning activities for teachers. These cognitive and motivational processes will affect teaching and content knowledge in a way that is beneficial to the district, the teachers, and the students.
Without district support, this *American Indian* curriculum will fall to the wayside of the core curriculum. Professional development opportunities along with time for planning across schools will help isolated teachers in sharing relevant information as well as productive practices. These opportunities, as well as the formation of evaluation criteria, will develop the teaching of this curriculum into true enactment of the American Indian curriculum.

Municipal School District is uniquely situated to establish a strong collaboration with American Indian students at the nearby university. Positive curricular and pedagogical change are possible if stakeholders are willing to dedicate resources, efforts, and time to undertake the meaningful enactment of a culturally sensitive and appropriate curriculum that is written from the perspective of and with accurate representation of American Indians and the world we live in.
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Title of Project: Teacher Self-Efficacy in Enacting American Indian Curriculum

Principal Investigator: Jane Harstad, Doctoral Candidate
401 A Rackley Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-8671; jfh176@psu.edu

Advisor: Dr. Susan Faircloth
Suite 200 Rackley Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-3775; scf2@psu.edu

Other Investigator(s): Rebecca Burns (video recorder)

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research study is to examine efficacy levels of participants teaching an American Indian-focused curriculum.

2. Procedures to be followed: Participants will be asked to complete the following:
   a. An 17 question initial participant survey
   b. A 12 question curriculum confidence scale
   c. A videotaped lesson with StudioCode recall of important aspects regarding the lesson
   d. A wrap-up interview consisting of 11 questions

3. Discomforts and Risks: There are minimal risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Some of the questions are personal and might cause discomfort.

4. Benefits: Participants will learn more about themselves and their beliefs by participating in this study. Participants will also have a better understanding of the American Indian curriculum or background information after participating in this study.

5. Duration:
   a. It will take about 30 minutes to complete the initial survey.
   b. It will take approximately 10 minutes to fill out the curriculum confidence scale.
   c. One lesson per teacher will be videotaped. Length of lesson will vary by teacher. Approximately one hour (maximum) to review and comment using StudioCode. (researcher will provide instruction if needed on the use of StudioCode).
   d. The open-ended interview is expected to be completed in 60 minutes.

6. Statement of Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is confidential. The data will be stored and secured in a password-protected computer at my home office. The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections, the Institutional Review Board and the Office for Human Research Protections in the Department of Health and Human Services may review records related to this research study. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

7. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact Jane Harstad at (814) 441-6358 with questions, complaints or concerns about this research. You can also call this number if you feel this study has harmed you. If you have any questions, concerns, problems about your rights as a research participant or would like to offer input, please contact The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections (ORP) at (814) 865-1775. The ORP cannot answer questions about research procedures. Questions about research procedures can be answered by the research team.
8. **Payment for participation**: Participants will receive a lesson about wild rice (Mahnomen) and its uses among the Ojibwe in Minnesota and surrounding geographic locations.

9. **Voluntary Participation**: Your decision to participate in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise. Participation in this study will have no impact on your employment with your school or school district.

10. **Participant Withdrawal**: Participants may withdraw their participation at any time if data collection is not anonymous.

11. **Audio and Video Recording**: Participants will be notified when they are being audio or video recorded. Audio and video recorded information will be stored on a password protected computer using pseudonyms and codes to protect anonymity. The Principal Investigator will have access to the audio or video recordings.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.

_____________________________  _______________________
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_____________________________  _______________________
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- What it means to be exempt and how determinations are made
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- What occurs at the time of follow-up
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Initial Participant Survey

Place an X beside the response that best answers each of the questions below:

1) I have been teaching in my current position for
   ___ 2 years or less
   ___ 3-5 years
   ___ 6-10 years
   ___ More than 10 years

2) I have been teaching
   ___ 2 years or less
   ___ 3-5 years
   ___ 6-10 years
   ___ More than 10 years

3) I have taught the American Indians curriculum
   ___ 0 times  ___ 4-5 times
   ___ 1 time    ___ 6-10 times
   ___ 2 times   ___ more than 10 times
   ___ 3 times   ___
4) The American Indians curriculum is beneficial for students.

_____ strongly agree
____ agree
____ disagree
____ strongly disagree

Please explain:

5) I have completed ________ classes or professional development seminars specifically tailored to the history of American Indians/Alaskan Natives within the last five years (please indicate the number of classes).

Please describe the types of classes or professional development sessions you have completed:

6) I read articles, newspapers, and/or other academic resources about American Indians in order to facilitate my understanding of the content in the American Indians curriculum.

_____ strongly agree
____ agree
____ disagree
____ strongly disagree

Please explain:
7) To what extent do you consider yourself knowledgeable in teaching the content of the American Indians unit?

___ extremely knowledgeable
___ knowledgeable
___ somewhat knowledgeable
___ not knowledgeable at all

Please explain:

8) When I taught the American Indians unit, I think I achieved the unit’s intended outcomes.

___ strongly agree
___ agree
___ disagree
___ strongly disagree

Please explain:

9) The goals and outcomes the students achieved the last time I taught this curriculum was typical of the outcomes/goals achieved when I have previously taught this unit.

___ strongly agree
___ agree
___ disagree
___ strongly disagree

Please explain:
10) I have enough information to teach this curriculum well.

____ strongly agree
____ agree
____ disagree
____ strongly disagree

Please explain:

11) Available teacher resources, such as books and videotapes, are adequate for the American Indians unit.

____ strongly agree
____ agree
____ disagree
____ strongly disagree

Please explain:

12) I believe the American Indians unit is valuable to the students in our district.

____ strongly agree
____ agree
____ disagree
____ strongly disagree

Please explain:
13) The *Background Information* resource guide is sufficient to prepare me for teaching this unit.

____ strongly agree
____ agree
____ disagree
____ strongly disagree

Please explain:

14) To what extent do you feel you are comfortable with the content of the *American Indians* curriculum?

____ extremely comfortable
____ somewhat comfortable
____ uncomfortable
____ extremely uncomfortable

Please explain:

15) If the *American Indians* curriculum was removed from the overall curriculum, I would...

____ strongly agree
____ agree
____ disagree
____ strongly disagree

Please explain:
16) What do you hope students learn from the *American Indians* curriculum?

17) Please use the space below to communicate any other comments you would like to share about the *American Indians* curriculum.
Appendix E

Confidence Rating Scale

This questionnaire is designed to gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that present difficulties for teachers who are teaching the *American Indian* curriculum.

Rate your degree of confidence for each item by recording a number from 0 to 100 using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Confident</td>
<td>Moderately Confident</td>
<td>Highly Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>0 - 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to achieve intended outcomes for this unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to adapt this curriculum to my class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to assess student learning accurately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to change children’s perspectives about American Indians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create interesting lessons/activities for this unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to find additional resources for this unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to find information I need to teach this unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to teach all topics in the unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use available resources for this unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use professional development for this unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use media and popular culture to enhance this unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use a variety of activities with this unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Open-ended Interview Questions

1. What do you see as the intended goals or the outcomes of the American Indian focused curriculum?

2. To what extent do you think you achieve these goals and outcomes?

3. What factors contribute to your level of confidence in teaching the American Indian focused curriculum?

4. To what extent (how much) do these factors contribute to your level of confidence in teaching the American Indian focused curriculum?

5. What factors do you think can help you increase your confidence in your ability to effectively teach the American Indian focused curriculum?

6. What classroom activities are best used when teaching the American Indian focused curriculum?

7. What measures do you use in assessing the students’ learning when teaching the American Indian focused curriculum?

8. What topics are easily covered in this unit? Do you avoid any of the topics included in the curriculum for this unit? Please Explain.

9. On the videos, you indicated that the following items were important. Why do you think these items were important?

10. Tell me more about this curriculum and how you teach it.

11. Is there anything else you would like to add to what has been asked or answered by you so far?

Probe for additional information as needed
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Quantisizing Content Knowledge Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 points</td>
<td>3(+)+ classes</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>extremely knowledgeable</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>extremely comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 points</td>
<td>2 classes</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>1 class</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat knowledgeable</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>uncomfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>no classes</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not knowledgeable</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>extremely uncomfortable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent | 5 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 14 |
-------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
R4114        | no classes | agree | somewhat knowledgeable | disagree | disagree | disagree | uncomfortable |
Y4311        | no classes | strongly agree | somewhat knowledgeable | disagree | disagree | disagree | comfortable |
R3119        | 1 class | agree | somewhat knowledgeable | agree | agree | agree | comfortable |
G3820        | 1 class | agree | knowledgeable | agree | agree | agree | comfortable |
R3121        | 1 class | agree | somewhat knowledgeable | agree | agree | agree | extremely comfortable |
Y4307        | no classes | strongly agree | somewhat knowledgeable | agree | agree | agree | extremely comfortable |
G4840        | 2 classes | agree | knowledgeable | agree | agree | agree | extremely comfortable |

Quantitative Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
R4114       | 0 | 20| 10| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 70    |
Y4311       | 0 | 40| 10| 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 100   |
R3119       | 10| 20| 20| 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120   |
G3820       | 10| 20| 20| 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 130   |
R3121       | 10| 20| 20| 20 | 20 | 20 | 40 | 140   |
Y4307       | 0 | 40| 10| 20 | 20 | 20 | 40 | 150   |
G4840       | 20| 20| 20| 20 | 20 | 20 | 40 | 160   |
## Appendix H

### Respondent Efficacy Assessment Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3121</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3119</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4840</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4307</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4311</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4114</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3820</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Initial Participant Quantitative Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Identification</th>
<th>Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G4840</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4307</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3121</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3820</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3119</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4311</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4114</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDEV</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1stdev</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1stdev</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant Pool Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Efficacy</th>
<th>High Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Low Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4840</td>
<td>R3119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Efficacy</td>
<td>Low Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Low Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3820</td>
<td>Y4311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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