

Louisiana Tech University

Louisiana Tech Digital Commons

Doctoral Dissertations

Graduate School

Spring 5-25-2019

Influences on the Self-Efficacy of Non-English Language Arts High School Teachers to Integrate Literacy Into Instruction

Georgina M. Baker

Louisiana Tech University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.latech.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Baker, Georgina M., "" (2019). *Dissertation*. 44.

<https://digitalcommons.latech.edu/dissertations/44>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Louisiana Tech Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Louisiana Tech Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@latech.edu.

**INFLUENCES ON THE SELF-EFFICACY OF
NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS HIGH
SCHOOL TEACHERS TO INTEGRATE
LITERACY INTO INSTRUCTION**

by

Georgina Melissa Baker, B.S., M.Ed.

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY

May 2019

LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

March 29, 2019

Date of dissertation defense

We hereby recommend that the dissertation prepared by

Georgina Melissa Baker

entitled **Influences on the Self-Efficacy of Non-English Language Arts High School**

Teachers to Integrate Literacy into Instruction

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education, Curriculum and Instruction Concentration

Dr. Lynne Nielsen, Supervisor of Dissertation Research

Dr. Dawn Basinger,
Head of Curriculum, Instruction, and Leadership

Members of the Doctoral Committee:

Dr. Bryan McCoy
Dr. Richard Shrubb

Approved:

Don Schillinger
Dean of Education

Approved:

Ramu Ramachandran
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Some secondary teachers of non-reading and non-English language arts content areas resist the idea of integrating literacy instruction with content instruction, due to having low teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (TSELI). To explore this phenomenon, I conducted a qualitative case study, through which, I interviewed a group of 10 teachers of math, science, history, art, and business education, all from the same rural, public high school in Alabama. The purpose of this study was to explore within this group of teachers the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis. This investigation required an exploration of the similarities and differences that existed among the case-study set, in terms of (a) participants' understanding of literacy-instruction integration as it relates to their content area; (b) the ways in which participants incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction and the extent to which they do so; and (c) the beliefs and experiences of participants that have contributed to, or have hindered, their understanding and implementation of literacy-instruction integration.

Several findings of this study aligned with and affirmed aspects of existing self-efficacy research (e.g., some secondary teachers do express low TSELI; deeply held personal beliefs about literacy instruction are contributing factors to feelings of inefficacy and can hinder teachers' progress in literacy-instruction integration; teachers with higher

TSELI are open to trying new instructional strategies and are persistent in following through in their change efforts; etc.). In addition, findings from this study offered new contributions to research related to factors that potentially influence TSELI: awareness-building experiences and follow-up professional development (PD) support. Both can lead teachers to (further) buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area, a contributing factor to the level of TSELI found within the participants of this study. By combining previous TSELI research with the findings of this study, I created a PD framework that contains five guidelines for school and district leaders to use when creating a PD program to help their secondary, non-English language arts and non-reading teachers integrate literacy into content instruction on a consistent basis.

APPROVAL FOR SCHOLARLY DISSEMINATION

The author grants to the Prescott Memorial Library of Louisiana Tech University the right to reproduce, by appropriate methods, upon request, any or all portions of this Dissertation. It was understood that “proper request” consists of the agreement, on the part of the requesting party, that said reproduction is for his personal use and that subsequent reproduction will not occur without written approval of the author of this Dissertation. Further, any portions of the Dissertation used in books, papers, and other works must be appropriately referenced to this Dissertation.

Finally, the author of this Dissertation reserves the right to publish freely, in the literature, at any time, any or all portions of this Dissertation.

Author _____

Date _____

DEDICATION

First, I dedicate this to God. For whatever reason, Lord, You had me begin this very unexpected journey, so many years ago. Thank You for always guiding me and for providing me with the people, means, and strength to bring me through to the other side of this. May my life's work from here on out, both professionally and personally, always serve You!

Secondly, I dedicate this to my parents, brother, and best friends. I absolutely could not have gotten through this journey without your love, support, patience, and encouragement!

Mom and Dad, you both have sacrificed in so many ways throughout my life, to support my educational and personal endeavors. I have always been able to count on you for anything, no matter how big or small, no matter how important or silly. Saying "thank you" just doesn't seem like enough. I strive to be as selfless and as giving as you two are, and I thank you for being such amazing parents and for being a constant source of strength for me!

Chris, your humor constantly kept me laughing throughout this process; thank you for your daily comic relief to life's stresses. I admire your fun-loving nature, your willpower to always better yourself, and your determination to take on new endeavors and to push through challenges! Now that I'm done with this dissertation, I promise to slow down and enjoy life more.

Charmaine and Caitlin, it's been quite a journey from start to finish. I'm so thankful for you both, and I'm grateful to you for your never-ending support and patience. Throughout this journey, you communicated belief in me when I heavily doubted myself; your encouragement and advice always helped to guide and motivate me to keep pushing through, no matter what. Thank you for the pep talks, the blunt talks, and all the moments of fun and relaxation in between. Thank you also for always being so willing to work around my crazy schedule. You two are the epitome of true friendship!

Mom, Dad, Chris, Charmaine, and Caitlin, I love you all, and I'm so blessed to have each of you in my life! I look forward to all the time and fun we'll be able to have together, now that I'm FINALLY done with this dissertation!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	xiv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Purpose of the Study.....	9
Significance of the Study.....	9
Research Questions.....	10
Central Question.....	10
Subquestion 1.....	11
Subquestion 2.....	11
Subquestion 3.....	11
Overview of Methodology.....	11
Definitions.....	13
Summary and Outline of the Study.....	14

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16
Theoretical Framework	17
Self-Efficacy	17
Teacher Efficacy	21
Low Teacher Self-Efficacy for Literacy Instruction.....	25
Professional Development to Challenge Low Teacher Self-Efficacy	29
Future Study Recommendations from Past Researchers	43
Methodological Literature	46
Summary	50
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	55
Research Design.....	56
Qualitative Case Study.....	56
Constructivist Paradigm.....	58
Participants for the Study.....	59
Sample and Sampling Method.....	59
Process for Obtaining and Selecting Participants	60
Data Collection Procedures.....	67
Interviews.....	67
Informed Consent.....	68
Data Saturation.....	69
Role of the Researcher	69
Researcher Positioning.....	71
Data Analysis Procedures	74

Validation of the Study	77
Summary	79
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	80
The Coding Process	82
Participant Profiles.....	87
Marie	89
Renee.....	92
Mona	96
Jean	100
Jess	103
Laura	106
Rachel	110
Carla.....	112
Lucy	115
Elena	117
Findings.....	123
Subquestion 1	123
Subquestion 2.....	124
Subquestion 3.....	127
Beliefs	127
Beliefs that have hindered.....	130
Experiences that have contributed	131
External-teaching experiences	132

Within-classroom experiences	135
Concerns as within-classroom experiences	136
Student success as within-classroom experiences	139
Central Question	141
Interpretation of the Findings.....	156
Theme 1	156
Theme 2	158
Theme 3	162
Limitations of the Study.....	166
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION.....	167
Overview of the Findings.....	168
Comparison of the Findings to Self-Efficacy Research.....	171
Implications for Practice	175
Professional Development Framework.....	177
Guideline 1: For group sessions, the audience, presenter, and information all need to be from within and relevant to the same subject area, not just the same discipline area	177
Guideline 2: Professional development should include sources of self- efficacy information.....	179
Verbal persuasion.....	179
Vicarious experiences	184
Mastery experiences.....	185
Guideline 3: PD should directly address teachers' beliefs and assumptions about literacy instruction.....	188
Guideline 4: Time must be carefully factored in to the PD program.....	189
Guideline 5: The PD program must be consistent and ongoing over time ...	190

Recommendations for Future Research	191
Conclusion	191
REFERENCES	193
APPENDIX A EMAIL REQUESTING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT STUDY WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	209
APPENDIX B HUMAN USE APPROVAL LETTER	211
APPENDIX C PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM	213
APPENDIX D EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS REQUESTING THEIR PARTICIPATION.....	216
APPENDIX E PRELIMINARY QUESTIONNAIRE AND RATIONALE	219
APPENDIX F FOLLOW-UP EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS	237
APPENDIX G PERSONALIZED EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS	239
APPENDIX H INTERVIEW GUIDE	241
APPENDIX I RESEARCHER’S MEMO FORM	244
APPENDIX J LIST OF CODES AND C\TEGORIES AFTER CODING ALL TRANSCRIPTS.....	246
APPENDIX K FINAL LIST OF REVISED CODES AND CATEGORIES AFTER FURTHER ANALYSIS	249
APPENDIX L CONNECTIONS BETWEEN RESEARCH QUESTIONS, STUDY FINDINGS, AND CATEGORIES/PATTERNS.....	253

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	<i>Examples of Codes and Categories after Coding All Transcripts</i>	85
Table 2	<i>Examples of Revised Codes and Categories after Further Analysis</i>	86
Table 3	<i>Participant Overview</i>	88

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to express my sincere appreciation to extended family members, friends, and coworkers who always supported my efforts and kept me in their prayers! I especially want to thank one of my cousins. Nicole, you constantly checked on me and encouraged me to see this dissertation through; you showed genuine interest in my progress, and every time I made a comment about how long this was taking me to complete, you put a positive spin on it and made me feel better. You were a true source of motivation for me throughout this process, and you continue to be an inspiration to me now! I love you!

I also want to thank my work family. I greatly appreciate your continued interest in my progress and your willingness to work with me when my schedule needed adjusting. Your constant words of encouragement helped me to keep pushing to finish! I especially want to say thank you to Mrs. Satterfield and Mrs. Musselman, the two best substitute teachers I've ever worked with. Because of your willingness to help me at the drop of a hat, I was always able to take off from work when needed. More importantly, I was able to do so with peace of mind, because I knew that with you as the substitute, my students would be safe, my lesson plans would be followed, and my classroom would be in tact when I returned. Thank you for being so wonderful at what you do and for being so patient and flexible with me when I needed to figure out my schedule. I greatly appreciate you both!

In addition, I'd like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Lynne Nielsen. Dr. Nielsen, thank you for taking me on! You accepted this position without ever having met me and in spite of the fact that I lived two states away. From the very beginning you made yourself accessible to me whenever I needed you, and you always listened to me, encouraged me, and advocated for me. Thank you for your quick action and dedication to me when I would submit something to you, and thank you for your unwavering commitment to see me through to the end! I am so appreciative to you!

Thank you also to my committee members, Dr. Bryan McCoy and Dr. Richard Shrubbs. Dr. McCoy, you've challenged me in ways I've never been challenged before, and I've learned a lot about conducting research because of you. You've contributed to my increased self-efficacy for writing a dissertation, that's for sure. Truly, thank you! Dr. Shrubbs, thank you so much for your time and contributions; I really appreciate you agreeing to serve on my committee!

To Dr. Lawrence Leonard, from the very beginning you saw something within me and encouraged me to pursue this degree. I will forever be grateful to you for that and for your insight into who I should request to be my dissertation chair upon your retirement. I learned so much from you, and I thank you for your constant kindness, patience, and guidance.

Last, but not least, thank you to the administrators of the school district where I conducted my study, and thank you, most especially, to the participants of this study! I am truly grateful to each of you for your willingness to give your time and to share your thoughts and experiences with me. I am forever indebted to you.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the technologically advanced, information-based society of today, students graduating from high school in the United States must possess advanced levels of literacy skills, if they are to fully participate, confidently compete, and successfully achieve in college, career, and life (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Daggett & Pedinotti, 2014; Lesaux, 2017; Levy & Murnane, 2013; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; National Center for Literacy Education [NCLE], 2013; Selingo, 2018; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Stephens, 2017; Zygouris-Coe, 2012). Because of this, secondary students need ongoing support in developing and advancing their literacy skills (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Moore et al., 1999; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Vacca, 2002). Secondary teachers of all content areas have a responsibility to support the literacy development of their students, and they can fulfill this responsibility by integrating literacy instruction with content instruction on a consistent basis (Bean, 2000; Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Daggett & Pedinotti, 2014; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Spor & Schneider, 1998; Vacca, 2002; Zygouris-Coe, 2012). However, despite the need for secondary students to receive ongoing practice in developing their literacy skills, some secondary teachers resist the idea of consistently integrating literacy with content instruction (Alvermann & Moore, 1991; Greenleaf & Schoenbach, 2004; Moje, 2008; O'Brien & Stewart, 1992; O'Brien,

Stewart, & Moje, 1995; Ratekin, Simpson, Alvermann, & Dishner, 1985; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012), and, as a result, sustained emphasis on developing students' literacy skills through literacy-instruction integration can be inconsistent within secondary schools (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf & Schoenbach, 2004; Moje, 2008; National Council of Teachers of English [NCTE], 2011). One explanation for the phenomenon of teacher resistance to sustained implementation of literacy-instruction integration is that middle school and high school teachers often express low self-efficacy for incorporating literacy instruction into their content area (Barry, 2002; Bean, 2000; Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990). This qualitative case study examined the extent to which this phenomenon existed among a group of 10 high school teachers of math, science, history, art, and business education.

Background

Throughout the past 50 years, significant developments in technology and the globalization of labor markets have steadily heightened the complexity level of the literacy skills needed of those in the workforce (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Carnevale, 1991; Levy & Murnane, 2013; Rosenberg, 1992; Selingo, 2018; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Stephens, 2017; Walker, 1999; Zygoris-Coe, 2012). Now, as a result, high school graduates entering almost any field must be proficient in a variety of advanced reading and writing skills, if they are to achieve sustained professional success (Daggett & Pedinotti, 2014; Levy & Murnane, 2013; National Center for Literacy Education [NCLE], 2013; Selingo, 2018; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Stephens, 2017). This is a dramatic shift from even a generation ago, when high school graduates with limited

literacy proficiency could enter working-class professions and achieve a comfortable lifestyle (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; NCLE, 2013; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008).

Although high school graduates are expected to be proficient in a variety of advanced literacy skills, long-term trends in national data have indicated inconsistent patterns in the reading achievement and proficiency of high school students (ACT, 2017, 2018; Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf & Schoenbach, 2004; Moje, 2008; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2017; National Council of Teachers of English [NCTE], 2007; Shanahan, 2018; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008, 2012; Spor & Schneider, 1998; Wexler, 2018; Williamson, 2008; Zygouris-Coe, 2012). For example, the 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, described the national education system at that time as failing its students, and it included among its evidence data showing that the literacy achievement of high school students had been on a continuous decline for years. Similarly, an analysis of scores from NAEP reading assessments administered periodically between 1992 and 2015 to twelfth-grade students showed a decline in the average reading-proficiency score, with scores decreasing from 292 to 287 over time (NCES, 2017). In fact, between 1992 and 2015, the percentage of 12th-grade students performing within the achievement level of *below basic* increased from 20% to 28%, while the percentage of those performing within the level of *at or above basic* decreased from 80% to 72%, and the percentage of those performing within the level of *at or above proficient* decreased from 40% to 37% (NCES, 2017). However, data from ACT (2017) indicated a rise in the reading achievement of high school students between 2013 and

2017, as 47% of the 2017 graduating class who took the ACT met or surpassed the college-readiness benchmark in reading, which was up from the percentages of high school graduates who met or surpassed the benchmark in 2013 (44%), 2014 (44%), 2015 (46%), and 2016 (44%). Although, ACT (2018) reported the percentage to have declined again to 46% with the 2018 graduating class.

In order to establish a more consistent pattern of growth among national data trends related to the literacy achievement of high school graduates, secondary students need ongoing support in developing and advancing their literacy skills (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Moore et al., 1999; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Vacca, 2002). This support is necessary for secondary students, because, even though they are no longer receiving daily literacy instruction through a separate reading class as they did in elementary school, they are still progressing through stages of the literacy-development process (Moore et al., 1999; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Vacca, 2002), and they are doing so as they are encountering grade-level texts that have become more discipline specific and complex (Moore et al., 1999; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008, 2012; Vacca, 2002). In addition, students who have mastered certain literacy skills earlier in life cannot always transfer those skills automatically at the secondary-school level, because when confronted with more advanced textual situations, their literacy skills are still inadequate for that particular situation (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Vacca, 2002). Consequently, middle school and high school students need guidance from their teachers in transferring and advancing their literacy skills from context to context; they cannot progress through the advanced stages of the literacy-development process and achieve proficiency without this type of proper and explicit

support from their teachers (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Moore et al., 1999; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Vacca, 2002).

Therefore, secondary teachers, regardless of content area, have a responsibility to support their students' literacy development, and they can fulfill this responsibility by consistently integrating literacy instruction with content instruction (Bean, 2000; Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Daggett & Pedinotti, 2014; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Spor & Schneider, 1998; Vacca, 2002; Zygouris-Coe, 2012). Strategic incorporation of literacy instruction with course-content instruction, on a consistent basis, not only will develop students' proficiency in literacy but also will develop their discipline-specific knowledge at the same time (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Lesaux, 2017; McConachie et al., 2006; NCTE, 2007, 2011; Shanahan, 2018; Spencer, Garcia-Simpson, Carter, & Boon, 2008; Spor & Schneider, 1998; Vacca, 2002). Approaches for integrating literacy instruction with content instruction at the secondary-school level include the Content Area Literacy approach and the Disciplinary Literacy approach (Brozo, Moorman, Meyer, & Stewart, 2013; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012, 2017; Zygouris-Coe, 2012). Content Area Literacy is an approach that has existed for decades, through which teachers integrate, within their content instruction, general reading and writing strategies that students can apply to learning in any discipline across the curriculum (Brozo et al., 2013; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012; Spor & Schneider, 1998; Vacca, 2002). In contrast, Disciplinary Literacy is an approach through which teachers emphasize reading and writing strategies that are specific to their particular discipline (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Brozo et al., 2013; McConachie et al., 2006; Moje, 2008;

Shanahan & Shanahan, 2014; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008, 2012, 2017; Zygouris-Coe, 2012); teachers explicitly teach students how literacy within that discipline works and train students to read, write, and think like an expert of that discipline (Brozo et al., 2013; McConachie et al., 2006; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2014; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008, 2012, 2017; Zygouris-Coe, 2012). Secondary teachers can use either of these approaches to make literacy-instruction integration a continuous aspect of their instructional practices (Bean, 2000; Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Daggett & Pedinotti, 2014; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Spor & Schneider, 1998; Vacca, 2002; Zygouris-Coe, 2012).

However, despite the need for secondary teachers to integrate literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis, some secondary teachers of non-reading and non-English language arts subject areas resist doing so (Alvermann & Moore, 1991; Greenleaf & Schoenbach, 2004; Moje, 2008; O'Brien & Stewart, 1992; O'Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995; Ratekin, Simpson, Alvermann, & Dishner, 1985; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012), and sustained implementation of literacy-instruction integration is limited or inconsistent among secondary schools (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf & Schoenbach, 2004; Moje, 2008; NCTE, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

The phenomenon of resistance among some secondary teachers to the idea of consistently integrating literacy instruction with content instruction has been in existence for several decades (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf & Schoenbach, 2004; Moje, 2008; National Council of Teachers of English [NCTE], 2011). One explanation for this phenomenon is that middle school and high school teachers often express low self-

efficacy for incorporating literacy instruction into their content area (Barry, 2002; Bean, 2000; Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990). The term self-efficacy, from Albert Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory, refers to the beliefs one has about his or her capabilities to execute the actions necessary to influence and achieve desired outcomes; it is specific to context, making it possible for one to feel efficacious under certain circumstances while also feeling inefficacious under different circumstances (Bandura, 1997). Therefore, when secondary teachers express low self-efficacy for literacy-instruction integration, they feel highly efficacious as teachers of their content area, but they feel inefficacious in teaching literacy within their content area, as they do not believe they have the capabilities (e.g., skills, knowledge, or abilities) to do so (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Hall, 2005; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011).

A contributing factor to feelings of inefficacy for literacy-instruction integration among secondary teachers has been their deeply held personal beliefs and assumptions about literacy instruction and student literacy development (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; Ness, 2007; O'Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006). Examples of teachers' reported beliefs and assumptions have included that

- they lack knowledge and understanding of the applicability of literacy within their subject area (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Park & Osborne, 2006; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012);

- they do not know how to make literacy discipline specific or what pedagogical strategies to use in doing so (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Greenleaf et al., 2001; Park & Osbourne, 2006; Spor & Schneider, 1998);
- they do not know how to handle students' literacy needs when students are experiencing difficulty (Bintz, 1997; Greenleaf et al., 2001; Shuman, 1975);
- their primary responsibility is to teach content (Alvermann & Moore, 1991; Moje, 2008; Moore et al., 1999);
- incorporating literacy instruction on a regular basis would take away from coverage of content and would be a waste of instructional time (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; McConachie et al., 2006; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Ness, 2007; Park & Osborne, 2006; Schoenbach & Greenleaf, 2000; Shuman, 1975; Thibodeau, 2008); and
- literacy instruction is the responsibility of English teachers only (Bintz, 1997; Hall, 2005; Moore et al., 1999; O'Brien et al., 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006; Spencer, Garcia-Simpson, Carter, & Boon, 2008).

These assumptions and deeply held beliefs have contributed to teachers' feelings of inefficacy for literacy instruction and, therefore, have hindered teachers' potential progress toward literacy-instruction integration in their classrooms (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Moore et al., 1999; Ness, 2007; O'Brien et al., 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006). As Bandura (1997) explained, feelings of low self-efficacy can become so deeply ingrained, that they become resistant to change and prevent teachers from expending much commitment, effort, or persistence toward achieving instructional changes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore among participants the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis. This exploration required an investigation into the similarities and differences that existed among (a) participants' understanding of literacy-instruction integration as it relates to their content area; (b) the ways in which participants incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction and the extent to which they do so; and (c) the beliefs and experiences of participants that have contributed to, or have hindered, their understanding and implementation of literacy-instruction integration.

Significance of the Study

The data and findings from this qualitative case study serve to contribute to the existing body of literature and research in several ways. According to existing research on teacher self-efficacy, to be explained in detail in Chapter 2, more needs to be learned about teacher self-efficacy as it relates specifically to literacy instruction (Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). In addition, more needs to be learned about teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (TSELI) within teachers at the high school level (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). Given that the purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the breadth and depth of TSELI among a group of high school teachers, this study is a contribution to those areas of teacher self-efficacy research where less information exists. Furthermore, as will be discussed in Chapter 5, several findings of this study align with and affirm aspects of previous self-efficacy research (e.g., some

secondary teachers do express low TSELI; deeply held personal beliefs about literacy instruction are contributing factors to feelings of inefficacy; deeply held beliefs can hinder teachers' potential progress toward literacy-instruction integration; teachers with higher TSELI are open to trying new instructional strategies and are persistent in following through in their change efforts; etc.). In addition, findings from this study offer new contributions to research related to factors that potentially influence TSELI: awareness-building experiences and follow-up professional development support; both can lead teachers to (further) buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area. These findings will be described in detail in Chapters 4 and 5. Furthermore, in the Implications section of Chapter 5, I have contributed a professional development framework that offers school and district leaders guidelines to use when creating a professional development program for the purpose of helping secondary teachers integrate literacy instruction into their content instruction on a more consistent basis. I created this framework by combining previous TSELI research with the findings of this study and with the suggestions participants of this study made for how to increase teacher buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area.

Research Questions

One central question and three subquestions guided this case study.

Central Question

Among the study participants, what are the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis?

Subquestion 1

What similarities and differences exist among participants' understanding of literacy-instruction integration as it relates to their content area?

Subquestion 2

What similarities and differences exist among the ways in which participants incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction, as well as among the extent to which they do so?

Subquestion 3

What beliefs and experiences have contributed to, or have hindered, participants' understanding and implementation of literacy-instruction integration?

Overview of Methodology

In order to develop an in-depth understanding of the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction, among the study participants, I used a qualitative research design, because, through this type of design, I was able to deeply explore participants' thoughts, beliefs, and experiences through one-on-one interviews (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 2013; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Furthermore, this qualitative investigation was an instrumental case study (Stake, 1995), through which, I explored the perspectives of a specific set of individuals, to contribute to my overall understanding of the existence and characteristics of the phenomenon of inconsistent integration of literacy instruction among secondary teachers of non-reading or non-English language arts subject areas, due to low teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction.

In the spring of 2018, I interviewed 10 teachers of math, science, history, art and business education, all from within the same public high school in Alabama. To select

these participants, I used the purposeful-sampling technique of criterion sampling; participants' responses to an electronic, preliminary questionnaire had to satisfy specific criteria (discussed in Chapter 3). Interviews were semi-structured; they consisted of me first asking participants open-ended questions regarding their responses to questions on the preliminary questionnaire and then asking them a variety of open-ended questions from the interview guide. (All questions were based on the theoretical constructs I had derived from the literature review of this study.) Interviews averaged about 45 minutes in length and were audio recorded for transcription and data-analysis purposes.

Prior to completion of the preliminary questionnaire and prior to beginning the interview, I obtained consent from participants. Also, throughout the study, I ensured that measures were in place not only to protect the privacy of the participants and the confidentiality of data but also to help me stay aware of how my personal characteristics (e.g., my background, values, assumptions, biases, perspectives, and experiences) may be influencing research decisions and interpretations.

To analyze data, I used a system of coding to group, separate, and regroup data (Saldaña, 2009), in an effort to identify the essence of the data and to draw analytic meaning from them (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014; Saldaña, 2009). I began data analysis immediately following the first interview and then did so after each subsequent interview. Data analysis procedures consisted of transcribing the audio file of the interview, checking the accuracy of the transcript against the audio recording, and coding the data. As I collected more data with each subsequent interview, I revised original codes by removing codes, adding to the list, expanding upon codes, and breaking down

codes into subcodes. With each subsequent transcript and upon a rereading of transcripts, codes became more refined and defined, and I grouped codes under category headings.

Throughout a process of reading, coding, rereading, and recoding transcripts, along with continuously writing memos and then reviewing those memos, I developed a deep understanding of the data. I discovered patterns and themes across the data and then developed generalizations about the case-study set, based on those themes and how they compared to existing research. Throughout the study, I used numerous strategies to validate the research process and the final product of the study; these strategies are explained in Chapter 3.

Definitions

Literacy. Although many types of literacies have been developed and are emphasized in the 21st Century (e.g., digital, visual, media, artistic, civic, and global literacies), the definition of literacy within this study is delimited to include the traditional literacy skills of reading and writing.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 Vocabulary. Two categories of a three-tier vocabulary model designed by Beck, McKeown, and Kucan (2002, 2008). According to the model, Tier 1 vocabulary words are words of everyday speech, learned naturally over time at a young age; Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary, on the other hand, require intentional effort to learn as one gets older. Tier 2 vocabulary is general academic vocabulary that can be found in a variety of written texts and can be applicable to multiple contexts and disciplines. Tier 3 vocabulary, however, is content-related vocabulary; it is vocabulary that is specific to the discipline within which it is taught. Knowledge of this vocabulary is necessary to learn new concepts.

Self-efficacy. The term self-efficacy, from Albert Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory, refers to the beliefs one has about his or her capabilities to execute the actions necessary to influence and achieve desired outcomes; it is specific to context, making it possible for one to feel efficacious under certain circumstances while also feeling inefficacious under different circumstances (Bandura, 1997).

Teacher efficacy. The self-efficacy of teachers is referred to as *teacher efficacy* (Allinder, 1994; Ashton & Webb, 1986; Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, & Morrison, 2012; Guo, Piasta, Justice, & Kaderavek, 2010; Guskey, 1988; Ross, 1992; Smylie, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Woolfolk, Rosoff, & Hoy, 1990). The concept of teacher efficacy involves the extent to which a teacher believes in his or her capability to execute the actions necessary to influence and achieve desired outcomes (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011; Ross, 1992; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

Summary and Outline of the Study

The information presented throughout this chapter provided the backdrop for the creation and design of this research study. A more comprehensive discussion of the previous information follows in Chapters 2 and 3. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature, beginning with an explanation of the theoretical framework for this study (i.e., self-efficacy theory and teacher self-efficacy) and continuing with a description of existing literature and research as it relates to teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction.

The end of Chapter 2 and all of Chapter 3 then offer a comprehensive description of the research design and methodology of this study (e.g., methods for obtaining participants, participant selection, data collection, data analysis, and study validation).

Chapter 4 begins with a more in-depth description of the codes and categories derived during the data-analysis process; this is followed by a descriptive account of each participant's background, thoughts, experiences, and beliefs, in relation to literacy-instruction integration in the content area. Chapter 4 continues with presentations of my analysis and interpretations of the data, as they relate to the central research question and subquestions, along with a presentation of the themes that I found among the data. Chapter 4 concludes with a description of the limitations of this study. The last chapter of this dissertation, Chapter 5, provides a discussion of how the findings and themes of this study are linked to existing literature and research on teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction. This chapter culminates with implications for practice and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Even though secondary students need ongoing support in developing and advancing their literacy skills (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Vacca, 2002), some secondary teachers resist the idea of consistently integrating literacy with content instruction (Alvermann & Moore, 1991; Greenleaf & Schoenbach, 2004; Moje, 2008; O'Brien & Stewart, 1992; O'Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995; Ratekin, Simpson, Alvermann, & Dishner, 1985; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012), often expressing low self-efficacy for literacy-instruction integration (Barry, 2002; Bean, 2000; Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990). This qualitative case study explored the perspectives, beliefs, and experiences of 10 high school teachers, to examine the existence and characteristics of this phenomenon, among the case study set. I created and designed this study based on the theoretical constructs that I pulled from an extensive review of existing literature and research related to teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction. The following sections of this chapter offer the reader a comprehensive presentation of the existing literature, beginning with an explanation of the theoretical framework that underlies this research study and ending with an explanation of the methodological literature related to the research design of this study.

Theoretical Framework

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is a component of Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory, a theoretical perspective that is based upon the triadic model of reciprocal causation, wherein human behavior at any given moment is the result of the continuous interaction of three influences: behavior, environmental factors, and personal influences such as cognition and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1989, 1997). Within this model of causation, the three influences on human behavior interact in a reciprocal manner at different levels of strength, causing various outcomes, some immediately and others over time (Bandura, 1989). For example, personal characteristics of people—such as their expectations, beliefs, goals, how they perceive themselves, what they think, and how they feel, along with their internal physical structure and sensory and neurological systems—affect how they behave, and, in turn, how they behave then activates reciprocal influences on what they think, feel, and believe, as well as on their self-perceptions, goals, and expectations (Bandura, 1986, 1989). Moreover, one's environment affects his or her behavior indirectly, in that it influences one's beliefs, standards, and feelings (Bandura, 1986). However, within social cognitive theory, people possess a cognitive self-system that allows them to exert control over what they think and feel and how they behave (Bandura, 1986). Through this self-system, people are enabled to be proactive in constructing their reality (Bandura, 1986).

Central to the cognitive self-system is one's perceptions of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986). According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy refers to the beliefs one has about his or her capabilities to execute the actions necessary to influence and achieve desired

outcomes. Beliefs of personal efficacy are a key component to one's intentional actions. Specifically, when people believe they have the power within themselves to produce desired results or to safeguard against undesired results, they have incentive to act; however, when people believe they do not have that power within themselves, they will make little to no attempt to act. Therefore, self-efficacy is a strong predictor of behavior in that the level of one's efficacy will influence what actions will be initiated and how much effort and persistence will be expended in performing those actions, even in the face of obstacles and failure (Bandura, 1977, 1989, 1997). In addition, self-efficacy influences the amount of stress one may experience leading up to or during performance of the actions (Bandura, 1989). As a result, self-efficacy is more powerful than one's actual capability to achieve a desired outcome, because it influences not only one's actions but also one's motivation and emotions (Bandura, 1997). Furthermore, self-efficacy is specific to context, an aspect that differentiates it from other forms of self, such as self-esteem, self-concept, and self-worth, making it possible for one to feel efficacious in some contexts while also feeling inefficacious in other contexts (Bandura, 1997).

Bandura (1977, 1986, 1989, 1997) asserted that self-efficacy is constructed from four principal sources of information that each contribute to one's self-efficacy in different ways: performance mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological/affective states. Of the four, performance mastery experiences are the most powerful. When individuals perceive that they have mastered performance in an experience, they will expect to be successful in that experience again (Bandura, 1986); this perception of success in one's performance will increase one's self-

efficacy about his or her capabilities to execute those actions again (Bandura, 1986, 1997). Although, the same is true for one's perception of failure at a performance, which will decrease one's beliefs about his or her capabilities in the future (Bandura, 1986, 1997). Another source of self-efficacy is a vicarious experience, through which one's self-efficacy for a given task can increase (or decrease) based on observing the successes (or failures) of others in performing that task (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997). For example, when observing someone successfully perform a task, the observer's self-efficacy can increase, allowing the observer to feel more confident that he or she, too, is capable of a successful performance of that task, under similar circumstances (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997).

The third source that influences one's self-efficacy is verbal persuasion, which involves verbal communication from someone of importance to the person; this can serve to strengthen (or weaken) the person's beliefs about his or her capabilities to be successful in performing a task (Bandura, 1997). The final source attributing to self-efficacy is physiological/affective states, which involves psychological and emotional feelings of excitement (or discouragement) that one experiences when attempting a task. The produced emotions can contribute to one's beliefs about his or her capabilities (or incompetence) to perform the task again (Bandura, 1997). Bandura (1997) noted, however, that the information conveyed through one or more of these sources is not automatically influential on one's self-efficacy; instead, the information is processed cognitively as a person engages in self-reflective thought about an experience and weighs the information against other relevant personal and situational factors. Although, the

more dependable the experiential source of information is, the more one's perception of self-efficacy can change (Bandura, 1977).

Therefore, self-efficacy is a constantly changing process that increases (or decreases) as one becomes more (or less) confident that he or she can accomplish a task (Bandura, 1997). As Bandura (1997) explained, when one's self-efficacy increases, one's effort and persistence in performing a given task also is likely to increase, which, in turn, can lead to better performance and, eventually, to proficiency in performing the task. Once proficiency has been achieved, this experience will become a mastery experience for the person, thus contributing to future self-efficacy beliefs by confirming or disrupting existing self-efficacy beliefs. Similarly, if one cannot reach proficiency in performing the task, this can lower one's self-efficacy about future performances and can lead to lack of effort and persistence, to the point of one ceasing all future attempts at the task. In either situation, this self-efficacy process for a given task eventually stabilizes, and the self-efficacy beliefs established for that task become enduring and resistant to change.

The concept of self-efficacy has been found to be influential on human behavior in a variety of contexts, including education, psychology, business, and health (Bandura, 1997; Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011; Lent & Hackett, 1987; Pajares, 2002). In academic settings, for example, researchers have substantiated that the self-efficacy of a student greatly influences the student's performance and rate of success (Bandura, 1993, 1997; Klassen et al., 2011; Pajares, 1995; Usher & Pajares, 2008). Likewise, researchers have demonstrated the influential power of self-efficacy on teachers and their performance (Allinder, 1994; Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977;

Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, & Morrison, 2012; Guskey, 1984, 1986, 1988; Holzberger, Philipp, & Kunter, 2013; Ross, 1998; Smylie, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). For example, teachers with higher self-efficacy exhibit enthusiasm in the classroom (Allinder, 1994; Guskey, 1984); create a learning environment that is supportive, inviting, and motivating for students (Guo et al., 2012); are accepting of struggling students and strive to help those students as much as needed (Gibson & Dembo, 1984); and set reachable learning goals for their students (Ross, 1998). In fact, teachers with strong self-efficacy are open to trying new instructional strategies (Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988) and to persisting in efforts to implement and follow through with instructional changes (Berman et al., 1977; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guskey, 1984, 1986, 1988; Smylie, 1988; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). As Bandura (1997) described it, teachers with high self-efficacy feel that they can teach any student, regardless of the challenges that may lie ahead, because they feel capable of overcoming those challenges through creativity, persistence, and hard work. In addition, teachers who have high self-efficacy guide their efforts to solve problems. In contrast, teachers with lower self-efficacy put their effort toward avoiding problems; this avoidance can include little commitment to spending time on solving a problem or disengagement with the problematic situation altogether.

Teacher Efficacy

The self-efficacy of teachers is referred to as *teacher efficacy* (Allinder, 1994; Ashton & Webb, 1986; Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, & Morrison, 2012;

Guo, Piasta, Justice, & Kaderavek, 2010; Guskey, 1988; Ross, 1992; Smylie, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Woolfolk, Rosoff, & Hoy, 1990). The concept of teacher efficacy involves the extent to which a teacher believes in his or her capability to execute the actions necessary to influence and achieve desired outcomes (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011; Ross, 1992; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Just as with the concept of self-efficacy, teacher efficacy is more powerful to a teacher than his or her actual capabilities, because it influences whether the teacher will use his or her capabilities, and/or will take the steps necessary to enhance those capabilities, to reach desired outcomes (Bandura, 1997). More specifically, teacher efficacy influences the amount of effort and persistence a teacher will expend in a given situation, even in the face of adversity (Bandura, 1997; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guo et al., 2012; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). In this way, teacher efficacy serves an important motivational role in influencing a teacher's professional behavior (Guo et al., 2012; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). In addition, teacher efficacy is specific to contexts and tasks (Bandura, 1997; Raudenbush, Rowan, & Cheong, 1992; Ross, Cousins, Gadalla, & Hannay, 1999; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998); because of this, a teacher can feel efficacious in one type of teaching situation, but then under changed circumstances, such as when having to teach a different subject area or when working with a different grouping of students, the same teacher can feel inefficacious (Raudenbush et al., 1992; Ross et al., 1999; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). In this way, teacher efficacy is a constantly changing

process that increases (or decreases) as a teacher becomes more (or less) confident that he or she can accomplish a given task, under a given set of circumstances (Ross, 1998; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

The concept of teacher efficacy (TE) dates back to the 1970s when researchers of the RAND Corporation placed efficacy-related items on a teacher questionnaire and conducted educational studies, through which TE was found to be a strong variable in student and teacher behaviors (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Results from one of the studies indicated a strong relationship between TE and student reading achievement (Armor et al., 1976); results from another study indicated that TE was strongly related not only to improved student achievement but also to teacher change (Berman et al., 1977). The RAND studies heightened interest in the concept of TE, and research on TE has been expanding ever since (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011).

Over the years, researchers have continued to link the presence of high TE to positive outcomes for students and teachers (Guo et al., 2012; Guo et al., 2010; Ross, 1998; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). For example, strong TE has been found to have positive effects on students' motivation (Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1989), students' self-efficacy (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1988), and student achievement (Armor et al., 1976; Ashton & Webb, 1986; Berman et al., 1977; Guo et al., 2010; and Ross, 1992). In fact, high TE has been found in relation to student achievement gains in preschool and elementary literacy (Guo et al., 2012; Guo et al., 2010), as well as in middle school social studies (Ross, 1992) and middle school

reading and math (Ashton & Webb, 1986). These gains could be linked to the fact that strong TE has been found to influence not only the quality of a teacher's instruction (Holzberger, Philipp, & Kunter, 2013) but also a teacher's willingness to use a variety of strategies and resources to meet students' needs (Allinder, 1994; Guo et al., 2012; Guskey, 1988). Similarly, strong TE has been found to have positive effects on teacher behaviors (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), such as their classroom management (Woolfolk et al., 1990) and their classroom practices (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guo et al., 2012; Guo et al., 2010).

In a study conducted by Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, and Morrison (2012), 1,043 fifth-grade students from across nine states and their fifth-grade teachers were studied to determine if TE could predict student literacy outcomes. Data collected were based on teacher responses to a TE questionnaire, classroom observations conducted by the researchers, and student-performance scores on various subtests of the Woodcock-Johnson Test of Achievement. Researchers determined that TE had a significant direct effect on teachers' classroom practices, as teachers with higher TE tended to provide students with more instructional support than did teachers with lower TE. Furthermore, the students of teachers who showed them more support tended to have stronger skills in literacy than did the students whose teachers were less supportive instructionally. Therefore, Guo et al. (2012) concluded that student literacy skills were indirectly, yet significantly, affected by TE, by way of the teacher's level of instructional support. They concluded further that the level of TE can predict teacher behaviors in the classroom, which, in turn, can be a predictor of the literacy outcomes of fifth-grade students.

As illustrated, the concept of TE can play a significant role not only in the professional behavior of teachers but also in the education of their students (Guo et al., 2012; Guo et al., 2010; Ross, 1998; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). However, when it comes to the *literacy* education of students, high school students in particular, secondary teachers tend to express low levels of TE for the task of teaching literacy within their content area (Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; O'Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006).

Low Teacher Self-Efficacy for Literacy Instruction

Middle school and high school teachers of non-reading or non-English language arts subject areas often express low self-efficacy for incorporating literacy instruction into their content instruction (Barry, 2002; Bean, 2000; Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990). Although secondary teachers feel highly efficacious in teaching their discipline, they feel inefficacious in teaching literacy within their discipline (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Hall, 2005; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). As Bandura (1997) explained, when people have low self-efficacy, they do not believe they have the capabilities within themselves to execute the actions necessary to influence or achieve desired outcomes. Feelings of low self-efficacy can become so deeply ingrained that they become resistant to change and hinder teachers' actions toward potential progress (Bandura, 1997; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Ross, 1994; Sparks, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). When teachers have stronger self-efficacy, they are open to trying new instructional strategies and to persisting in efforts to implement and follow

through with instructional changes (Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guskey, 1984, 1986, 1988; Smylie, 1988; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009), but teachers with lower self-efficacy will not expend much commitment, effort, or persistence toward achieving instructional changes; in fact, some inefficacious teachers will disengage from the suggested instructional changes altogether (Bandura, 1997).

A contributing factor to feelings of inefficacy for literacy-instruction integration among secondary teachers has been their deeply held personal beliefs about literacy instruction and student literacy development (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; Ness, 2007; O'Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006). Among the reported personal beliefs of secondary teachers are their feelings of having insufficient knowledge and understanding of the applicability of literacy within their subject area (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Park & Osborne, 2006; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012). For example, many teachers have reported that they do not know how to make literacy discipline specific (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Greenleaf et al., 2001; Park & Osbourne, 2006; Spor & Schneider, 1998), and they do not know what types of literacy skills to teach (Cantrell et al., 2009) or what pedagogical strategies to use in doing so (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Greenleaf et al., 2001; Park & Osbourne, 2006; Spor & Schneider, 1998). In addition, teachers have reported that they do not know how to handle students' literacy needs when students are experiencing difficulty (Bintz, 1997; Greenleaf et al., 2001; Shuman, 1975). Along with feelings of insufficient knowledge

and understanding, teachers have reported a belief that they cannot implement any of the literacy strategies that they have learned, because they have not had enough guided practice in teaching them (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008), or they believe that what they have learned is useless, time consuming, and/or incongruent with their instructional preferences for teaching their subject area (Moje, 2008; O'Brien et al., 1995).

Furthermore, secondary teachers tend to believe that their primary responsibilities are to teach content and to cover all prescribed content for their assigned classes (Alvermann & Moore, 1991; Moje, 2008; Moore et al., 1999). Therefore, some teachers find the idea of having to incorporate literacy instruction burdensome (Moje, 2008; Ness, 2007; O'Brien et al., 1995), because they believe doing so would take away from coverage of content and would be a waste of instructional time (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; McConachie et al., 2006; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Ness, 2007; Park & Osborne, 2006; Schoenbach & Greenleaf, 2000; Shuman, 1975; Thibodeau, 2008). Along these lines, many teachers believe that literacy instruction is the responsibility of the English teachers only (Bintz, 1997; Hall, 2005; Moore et al., 1999; O'Brien et al., 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006; Spencer, Garcia-Simpson, Carter, & Boon, 2008). Although, according to Moje (2008), even some high school English teachers claim that it is their responsibility to teach themes in literature and composition, for example, and not to continue teaching students how to read and write or how to do so for other disciplines. These assumptions and deeply held beliefs about literacy instruction can hinder teachers' potential progress toward literacy-instruction incorporation in their classrooms (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-

Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Moore et al., 1999; Ness, 2007; O'Brien et al., 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006), as can be seen in the following two examples.

In a study investigating the types and amount of reading strategies used by secondary teachers, Ness (2007) observed eight middle school and high school science and social studies teachers for a total of 40 classroom hours. Analysis of her coded data revealed that out of the 2,400 minutes that she observed participants, only 82 minutes were devoted to use of literacy instructional approaches, which Ness concluded was just over three percent of instructional time. She explained that teachers perceived integration of literacy in the content area as unnecessary, burdensome, and time consuming, rather than as a means to teach students content-area material. Ness speculated that it was teachers' beliefs against using class time to incorporate literacy instruction that hindered teachers from doing so.

In a different study, McCoss-Yergian and Krepps (2010) investigated teachers' beliefs on teaching literacy strategies within their content area, by administering surveys to and conducting interviews with 39 middle and high school teachers from one school district in the United States. The researchers did not specify what subjects the participants taught; they only mentioned that participants taught subjects other than reading, English, language arts, and literature. After analysis of the data, McCoss-Yergian and Krepps found that 72% of the participants reported a lack of familiarity with content area literacy strategies, and 67% reported feelings of incapability to teach literacy to their students. In addition, 80% felt that elementary and English teachers were the ones best prepared to teach reading, and 74% believed that any time spent on reading instruction would be a waste of instructional time, because it would compromise

coverage of their subject matter. These beliefs contributed to the lack of effort among the 67% of the participants who reported that they do not spend any time on literacy instruction at all.

The established feelings of inefficacy for 67% of the participants in the McCoss-Yergian and Krepps (2010) study kept those teachers from making attempts at literacy-instruction integration. As Bandura (1997) explained, established self-efficacy for a given situation will remain enduring and resistant to change, unless compelling evidence is presented to strongly challenge it. In the case of low self-efficacy among teachers, researchers have found that it is possible to challenge and change an experienced teacher's deeply embedded efficacy with appropriate professional development support (Cantrell et al., 2009; Greenleaf & Shoenbach, 2004; Guskey, 1988, 1989; Ross, 1998; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

Professional Development to Challenge Low Teacher Self-Efficacy

The purpose of professional development (PD) is to bring about teacher learning that will result in improved teacher performance and, thus, higher student learning and achievement (Learning Forward, 2011; Sparks, 2002; Wei, Darling-Hammond, & Adamson, 2010). However, PD experiences alone will not automatically lead to the professional learning of teachers (DeMonte, 2013; Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). For PD to lead to professional learning, the provided PD experiences must be job embedded (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Learning Forward, 2011; National Center for Literacy Education [NCLE], 2013; Sparks, 2002; Wei et al., 2010), must be sustained over a period of time (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; DeMonte,

2013; Learning Forward, 2011; NCLE, 2013; Sparks, 2002; Wei et al., 2010), and must engage teachers in collaborative activities (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; NCLE, 2013; Wei et al., 2009). Furthermore, the time given to teachers for PD must be strategically structured within the work schedule (Wei et al., 2009), protected (NCLE, 2015), purposeful (NCLE, 2014), and frequently occurring (DeMonte, 2013; Learning Forward, 2011; NCLE, 2013; Sparks, 2002; Wei et al., 2010). When PD experiences are frequently allotted, purposefully structured, job embedded and sustained over time, and when they engage teachers in collaborative activities, they have great potential to bring about teacher learning and improved teacher performance (DeMonte, 2013; Learning Forward, 2011; NCLE, 2013; Sparks, 2002; Wei et al., 2010; Wei et al., 2009), because teachers have ongoing, consistent time within their teaching context (a) to become familiar with the targeted PD topic (Collins, 2000; Fogarty & Pete, 2007; Learning Forward, 2011) and how it applies to their context (Collins, 2000); (b) to commit to changes they may have to implement (Collins, 2000; Fogarty & Pete, 2007); (c) to practice implementing the targeted topic or skills (Fogarty & Pete, 2007; Killion, 2013; Learning Forward, 2011); (d) to refine existing skills (Fogarty & Pete, 2007; Killion, 2013; Learning Forward, 2011); and (e) to collaborate with, support, and give feedback to colleagues (DeMonte, 2013; Fogarty & Pete, 2007; Learning Forward, 2011; Killion, 2013; Wei et al., 2010).

Thibodeau (2008) found much of this to be the case in her seven-month study of eight teachers within one Connecticut high school. The teachers participated in a collaborative study group that Thibodeau, a literacy specialist within the same school district, formed, to guide and support teachers' efforts in meeting the school's

improvement plan of integrating literacy instruction with content-area instruction. The group was made up of teachers of English, math, and science, and they met once a month after school, for two hours at a time, learning from Thibodeau and sharing with each other ideas, concerns, experiences, and resources. An analysis of teacher responses on the pre- and post-experience surveys and interviews demonstrated that teacher learning and performance had increased over time, as teachers reported positive changes in their beliefs about, knowledge of, and implementation efforts in the integration of literacy and content instruction.

Thibodeau (2008) explained that the job-embedded feature of the PD experience gave teachers the time they needed to learn and practice infusing literacy strategies into content instruction; also, the ongoing collaboration opportunities enabled teachers to share with each other and to provide each other with feedback in a timely manner. In addition, the interdisciplinary nature of the collaborative group was a crucial benefit, according to Thibodeau, because most of the participants were accustomed solely to discussing instructional practices with colleagues from within their own department, but through the interdisciplinary experience, all participants discovered value in the varied perspectives and experiences of teachers from different content areas. Thibodeau found that these aspects of the study group (i.e., job embedded, ongoing, collaborative, and interdisciplinary) empowered the teachers to integrate literacy instruction into their content area more so than they ever had before. She concluded that long-term, interdisciplinary collaboration, with guidance from a literacy specialist, are beneficial professional learning experiences for high school teachers who are making attempts to integrate more literacy instruction into their content area.

Although Thibodeau (2008) did not explain her study from the theoretical perspective of teacher self-efficacy (TSE), it is possible that the increase in literacy-instruction integration among the participants in her study was linked to a potential increase in TSE for literacy instruction, because when a teacher is provided with appropriate PD support, his or her self-efficacy for a situation can become increased (Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Greenleaf & Shoenbach, 2004; Guskey, 1988, 1989; Ross, 1998; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009), as a result of the teacher becoming more confident over time that he or she can accomplish a given task (Ross, 1998; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). A rise in TSE can then influence the amount of effort and persistence that the teacher will expend in that situation (Bandura, 1997; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, & Morrison, 2012; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Therefore, in Thibodeau's (2008) study, it is possible that teachers' self-efficacy for literacy instruction increased, as their knowledge and understanding of how to integrate literacy increased over time, and it is possible that any increased TSE, in turn, motivated teachers to exert effort toward implementing literacy in their instructional practices more than ever.

This possibility can be seen directly in the Cantrell, Burns, and Callaway (2009) study, a study conducted within the theoretical perspective of TSE. As part of a larger study, Cantrell et al. (2009) interviewed 28 middle and high school teachers primarily of science, math, English language arts, and social studies, to assess their beliefs about literacy-instruction integration in the content area, after having engaged in a year-long PD program that included supports such as collaboration with colleagues and time to

practice under the guidance of a coach. Most of the participants (82%) reported initial feelings of hesitation toward the idea of integrating literacy; they described feelings of anxiety about losing content instructional time, feelings of discomfort with literacy-related teaching strategies, and feelings of fear in deviating from their traditional teaching methods. However, through the ongoing and consistent PD supports of collaboration and coaching, TSE for literacy instruction rose within participants, while skepticism and discomfort diminished. Cantrell et al. concluded that the positive change in TSE led to increased implementation of the target literacy strategies over time, as teachers developed a better understanding of and practice with using those strategies in their content area.

These studies (i.e., Cantrell et al., 2009; Thibodeau, 2008) demonstrated that when PD experiences are job embedded, frequently allotted, and sustained over time, and when they engage teachers in collaboration and provide them with the guidance of a literacy specialist or coach, they have the potential to bring about teacher learning and change, especially when TSE has been raised throughout the experiences. However, because these two studies were not longitudinal studies, it is unknown for how long teachers sustained their implementation changes. While it appears that PD experiences contributed to increases in participants' TSE for literacy instruction in both studies, it is unclear if the PD experiences and the rise in TSE were enough to achieve sustained implementation changes within the teachers.

In order to increase the potential for sustained changes in teacher practices, it is necessary to include within PD experiences specific features that directly attend to the self-efficacy of teachers (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guo et al., 2012; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). PD should address teachers' beliefs (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell

& Hughes, 2008; Timperley & Phillips, 2003), since deeply held personal beliefs of teachers contribute to low TSE for literacy instruction (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; Ness, 2007; O'Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006). For example, Cantrell et al. (2009) suggested including PD activities that are designed to determine teachers' specific beliefs and the extent to which those beliefs could enhance or hinder teachers' willingness to implement literacy instruction. In addition to a focus on teachers' beliefs, PD should include experiences that provide teachers with the sources of self-efficacy information that Bandura (1977, 1986, 1989, 1997) explained were influential on one's self-efficacy: performance mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological/affective states (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

First, PD experiences must include opportunities for teachers to achieve mastery experiences; mastery experiences, and the physiological excitement associated with mastery experiences, can have the most direct influence (Bandura, 1997). When an individual perceives that he or she has succeeded in performing a new task, the person has achieved a mastery experience and will expect to be successful in that task again (Bandura, 1986); this perception of success increases the individual's self-efficacy for that task (Bandura, 1986, 1997). As Bandura (1997) explained further, when a person's self-efficacy increases, his or her effort and persistence in performing that task also is likely to increase, which, in turn, can lead to better performance and, eventually, to proficiency in performing the task. Once proficiency has been achieved, the entire

experience becomes a mastery experience for the person, thus contributing to future self-efficacy beliefs by confirming or disrupting existing self-efficacy beliefs. Without ongoing opportunities and support to reach proficiency in performing a task, one's self-efficacy for the task can be lowered, leading to a lack of effort and persistence in future performances, to the point of one ceasing attempts at that task altogether. Furthermore, to heighten the probability of raising a teacher's self-efficacy through mastery experiences, the opportunities for continued practice should take place within the teacher's own classroom, with his or her students (Bandura, 1997; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; Thibodeau, 2008). As Bandura (1997) explained, TSE is specific to context and tasks; one can only come to know his or her true capabilities in real settings.

Second, PD also should include opportunities to increase TSE through vicarious experiences and verbal persuasion (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). PD that includes a vicarious experience gives teachers the opportunity to observe someone else successfully performing a task; this has the potential to increase a teacher's self-efficacy because observing the success of the other person can help the teacher to feel more confident that he or she, too, is capable of a successful performance of that task, under similar circumstances (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997). For example, Cantrell et al. (2009) found that the efficacy of their teacher-participants improved when teachers observed their PD coaches successfully using new literacy strategies with their students. In using a vicarious experience in PD, however, the person being observed must be someone credible and similar to the observer, or the potential of the vicarious experience to influence TSE will be low (Bandura, 1986). In addition to PD

including vicarious experiences to potentially increase TSE, PD also should include experiences of verbal persuasion, in which someone credible to the teacher verbally communicates information that serves to persuade the teacher that he or she can be successful and should persist in developing their skills (Bandura, 1997). Opportunities for verbal persuasion can occur through one-on-one settings between a teacher and a PD coach (Cantrell et al., 2009) or through general PD workshop settings, where a presenter provides teachers with persuasive information, such as how to implement a new skill or how to overcome obstacles that may arise (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). While verbal persuasion and vicarious experiences have potential to influence TSE (Bandura, 1997), it should be noted that PD experiences that consist only of one or both of these sources will not be as effective in leading teachers toward sustained improvement in efficacy and change implementation as what PD opportunities with mastery experiences will be (Bandura, 1997; Guskey, 1986; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

This can be seen in the findings of the Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) study. Through a quasi-experimental, quantitative study, Tschannen-Moran and McMaster investigated the extent to which PD activities, that were based on Bandura's influential sources of self-efficacy, could increase TSE, and they sought to explore the extent to which any increased TSE could increase teacher implementation of the targeted teaching strategy. The study consisted of 93 participants who were teachers of kindergarten through the second grade, from nine schools located throughout five school systems. Through cluster sampling and stratified random selection, participants were chosen and placed into one of four treatment groups. Although the focal point of each

treatment group was to provide teachers with PD on a new teaching strategy that they could implement with their beginning readers, the format of the PD activities differed among the four treatment groups, as each group participated in different types of activities that represented one or more of Bandura's influential sources of self-efficacy.

The treatment groups and PD formats were set up as follows. All four treatment groups began with the source of verbal persuasion, through participants attending a three-hour workshop about the new strategy (i.e., the use of hand signals to help students decode words and conceptually match written letters to their sounds). During this workshop, the presenter lectured about the new strategy, and participants completed written exercises in their manual. This workshop was the extent of PD for participants in Treatment Group 1. PD continued, however, for participants in Treatment Groups 2, 3, and 4, through inclusion of a vicarious experience: Participants watched a 20-minute demonstration of the presenter modeling instruction of the new strategy with local students. Once the demonstration was over, PD for participants in Treatment Group 2 ended. Participants in Treatment Groups 3 and 4 received additional PD, through inclusion of a 75-minute practice session, during which time, participants collaboratively discussed how they would implement the new strategy, and they planned lessons that they could implement immediately. This practice session served as a limited mastery-experience source for participants, and this ended PD for participants in Treatment Group 3. Those in Treatment Group 4, on the other hand, received an additional opportunity for a more in-depth mastery experience, through coaching opportunities that occurred weeks after the initial workshop. For this additional experience, the presenter conducted a review session of the hand signals with the participants of Treatment Group 4 and then

conducted one-on-one coaching sessions with each participant, on two occasions, within each teacher's classroom. This follow-up support to the initial workshop was included to provide participants with individualized mastery experiences, as well as with additional verbal persuasion and, for those whose coach modeled use of the strategy with the teacher's own students, an additional vicarious experience. This coaching experience ended PD for participants in Treatment Group 4.

All 93 participants of the study were given surveys to complete before and one-month after participation in their assigned PD. The surveys were used to investigate potential changes in participants' general TSE and their TSE for literacy instruction, as a result of participating in the PD experiences, and to investigate participants' level of implementation of the targeted teaching strategy. The three measures used were the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), an adapted version of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy for Literacy Instruction measurement (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2004), and a six-item scale regarding teachers' implementation of the new strategy, for which the researchers did not specify a name.

Analysis of survey data revealed that 90% of the participants in Treatment Group 4 experienced high increases in their general TSE, their TSE for literacy instruction, and their implementation of the new strategy. (Although, all data were based on self-reports by participants; ongoing classroom observations were not conducted to determine the actual amount of implementation that teachers were, or were not, doing over time, which the researchers acknowledged as a possible limitation to the study.) On the other hand, participants in Treatment Groups 1, 2, and 3 only showed modest gains in their general TSE and showed no gains in their implementation of the new reading strategy. As for

gains in their TSE for literacy instruction, participants in Treatment Group 1 showed modest gains, but, much to the surprise of the researchers, TSE for reading instruction actually decreased for participants in Treatment Groups 2 and 3. The researchers speculated that as teachers in Treatment Groups 2 and 3 became more aware of the new teaching strategy through the additional PD experiences, some teachers adjusted their understanding of how to teach reading and created a new standard for themselves; this newly formed standard left teachers feeling inadequate in their capabilities to meet that standard, which lowered their TSE for teaching reading. Other researchers (e.g., Guskey, 1984; Ross, 1994; Stein & Wang, 1988) have seen this same occurrence in teachers, especially during the earlier stages of a PD initiative, when teachers are dealing with possible changes to their way of thinking and/or to their instructional behaviors.

However, Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) reasoned that a similar decrease in TSE did not occur for participants in Treatment Group 4 because they received coaching, to counter any feelings of inadequacy in their capabilities that they may have had prior to, or that may have occurred during the earlier stages of, the PD process. Through follow-up coaching, participants of Treatment Group 4 had the opportunity to practice and to correct their skills in teaching the new strategy, under the guidance of their coach, and they had the added support of their coach offering individualized verbal communication, which strengthened their beliefs about their capabilities as they practiced their skills. Many teachers ended up perceiving success in their performances, which added to their increased beliefs about their capabilities to teach the strategy effectively again. Thus, Tschannen-Moran and McMaster concluded that the opportunities for mastery experience and individualized verbal persuasion that

participants in Treatment Group 4 experienced were powerful influences on TSE for teaching reading and on teacher implementation, while the large-group PD formats that included general verbal persuasion, vicarious experience, and limited mastery experiences were not. In addition, Tschannen-Moran and McMaster emphasized that verbal persuasion and vicarious experiences are most effective in PD when they are individualized for the teacher and for his or her context.

Another study demonstrating powerful PD influences on TSE for literacy instruction was the Cantrell and Hughes (2008) study. In their mixed-methods study, Cantrell and Hughes explored the effects of a year-long PD program on TSE for literacy instruction, as well as the relationship between that efficacy and teacher implementation of literacy instruction in the content area. The context for this study was part of a larger program designed at the state level, to offer teachers long-term PD on infusing literacy instruction into their content area and to evaluate the effects of PD on teacher practices and student learning and achievement over time. Twenty-two of the teachers who participated in the state-level PD program served as participants for this study. (Although, it is unclear how Cantrell and Hughes chose their particular sample of teachers.) The 22 participants were administered surveys, but only 17 of them participated in the interviews, which the researchers acknowledged as a possible limitation of the study, since interview data may not have been representative of all participants originally surveyed and mainly could have represented perceptions of the participants who were more open to change or who were more satisfied with the overall PD experience. Nonetheless, the original 22 participants consisted of teachers of sixth and ninth grades,

who taught language arts, social studies, science, or math, in one of eight schools from across the state.

The state-level PD program that study participants engaged in was designed to teach content area teachers ways to support their students' content-area learning and their students' academic reading skills, through use of content-related literacy skills. In addition, the program was designed to build TSE for teaching literacy and to support teachers' implementation of and proficiency with content-related literacy instruction. Participation in the PD program consisted of a week-long PD institute in the summer, during which time teachers were taught through lecture and demonstration methods by a facilitator; teachers also worked collaboratively in common-discipline, cross-discipline, and common-school teams, to discuss and plan application of the new strategies in their classes. In addition to the summer institute, on two occasions during the school year, teachers participated in a day-long meeting, during which time, they shared their PD-related successes and challenges, as well as ideas and resources; also during these meetings, they investigated additional content-related strategies and conducted more lesson planning. Moreover, each month, a coach worked on site with teachers, as a facilitator at team-planning meetings and as an individual guide and model for each teacher; also, the coach was available off site, through email or by phone, whenever teachers had questions or needed resources.

For the purposes of the Cantrell and Hughes (2008) study, a survey was given to the 22 study participants, both prior to and at the end of the year-long PD experience, to measure their self-efficacy for literacy instruction before and after the program; in addition, the researchers conducted interviews with 17 of the study participants, to

explore the development of teachers' self-efficacy for and implementation of literacy instruction. Furthermore, the researchers conducted classroom observations, to measure participants' implementation of the literacy strategies. (Although, only two observations per participant were conducted, so any amount of implementation beyond what researchers observed was self-reported by participants and could have been inflated, which the researchers acknowledged as a limitation of the study.)

At the conclusion of all data collection, the researchers conducted statistical analyses of survey and observational-protocol data, through use of descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations; also, they conducted qualitative analyses of interview data, through use of a two-level coding system. Quantitative results showed significant increases in participants' TSE for literacy instruction, from the beginning of the PD program to the end of it; in addition, qualitative results showed that the coaching and collaboration elements of the year-long PD experience greatly contributed to the positive development of teachers' efficacy for and implementation of literacy instruction.

According to Cantrell and Hughes (2008), coaching helped to develop TSE for literacy instruction because it supported teachers' attempts at implementation on a consistent and ongoing basis. Teachers were given time to practice, under guidance, with coaches offering feedback and suggestions and even modeling the strategies for teachers when needed. Although teachers reported initial implementation challenges, they said that with more guided practice and feedback, they felt successful in their efforts over time, which, as Cantrell and Hughes explained, raised TSE and motivated teachers to persist in their efforts. In addition, many teachers reported observing increases in student learning as well, which Cantrell and Hughes stated also contributed to increases in

teachers' efficacy for literacy instruction. Furthermore, Cantrell and Hughes explained that the collaborative features of the PD experiences contributed to increases in TSE and implementation, because, through collaboration, teachers shared their experiences, ideas, and resources with each other, and they learned vicariously through each other's accounts of successes and challenges.

Although Cantrell and Hughes (2008) did not fully explain their findings in terms of Bandura's sources of self-efficacy information, as the Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) study did, Bandura's sources were evident in the findings of the Cantrell and Hughes study: Coaching provided the opportunity for teachers eventually to achieve mastery experience, and it provided teachers with individualized verbal persuasion and vicarious experiences, just as it did for the participants in Treatment Group 4 of the Tschannen-Moran and McMaster study. In both studies, PD experiences related to Bandura's sources of self-efficacy information contributed to increases in TSE for teaching literacy, as well as to increases in implementation of literacy instruction in the content area. Thus, as these two studies demonstrate, for PD to have a lasting effect on TE for literacy instruction, it should include job embedded, frequent, and continuous opportunities for teachers to work collaboratively with colleagues and with a coach, so that teachers can consistently practice integrating literacy instruction with content instruction, until eventually reaching a level of mastery experience that will help teachers permanently sustain their literacy-implementation efforts.

Future Study Recommendations from Past Researchers

Scholarly literature and research on the topic of teacher self-efficacy are abundant and growing (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011;

Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). However, researchers of teacher self-efficacy (e.g., Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, & Morrison, 2012; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998) have recommended areas for future study, to add to the existing body of literature and to fill in gaps within the research. One area of suggestion is more investigation into the formation and development of teacher self-efficacy (Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). For example, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) suggested more inquiry into how self-efficacy beliefs are established; in line with this, Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, and Hoy (1998) recommended more exploration into the factors that influence self-efficacy formation, and Klassen, Tze, Betts, and Gordon (2011) recommended additional examination into the influential power of Bandura's self-efficacy sources on self-efficacy formation. Another area of suggestion is more exploration of how to strengthen the self-efficacy of teachers (Guo et al., 2012; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). For example, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) suggested more research on the kinds of experiences that are strong enough to provoke veteran teachers to reexamine and change their established self-efficacy beliefs. In addition, Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, and Morrison (2012) suggested more study into the types of professional development supports that strengthen teacher self-efficacy and instructional practices, and Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) recommended further examination into how specific aspects of coaching support teacher self-efficacy

and implementation. Furthermore, Klassen et al. (2011) suggested more investigation into how context affects the self-efficacy of teachers, a suggestion mirrored by Guo et al. (2012) when they advised more investigation into potential aspects of the teaching context that could serve to strengthen teacher self-efficacy and teachers' instructional practices.

In addition to these suggested areas for future study, more information is needed on teacher self-efficacy as it relates specifically to literacy instruction (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009), as scholarly literature and empirical evidence on teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction have been sparse (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). A finding from the Klassen et al. (2011) study demonstrated this. In an analysis of 218 research studies on teacher self-efficacy, published between 1998 and 2009, Klassen et al. found that only two percent of the studies were related to teacher self-efficacy for teaching literacy, while 60% were related to teaching in general, 15% were related to teacher self-efficacy for teaching science, and the remaining were related to teacher self-efficacy for teaching subject areas such as math, language, and technology. Recommendations for future study in the area of teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction have included more investigation into how self-efficacy beliefs for literacy instruction become established (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011), as well as more exploration into teachers' beliefs about literacy instruction and how those beliefs have contributed, or continue to contribute, to low self-efficacy for literacy instruction (Cantrell et al., 2009). In addition to these, more professional development frameworks

designed specifically to address, increase, and support teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction need to be created, implemented, and studied (Cantrell and Hughes, 2008).

Along with these recommendations for future study in the area of teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction, researchers (i.e., Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011) have highlighted the need for more self-efficacy-related studies that include high school teachers as the main study participants, since most of the existing studies have been conducted with primary and elementary teachers, leaving less to be known about teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction as it relates specifically to the high school teacher. In fact, Cantrell and Hughes (2008) underscored the importance of addressing this need by explaining that teachers of middle school and high school tend to express much lower self-efficacy for literacy than elementary teachers do.

Methodological Literature

As a beginning researcher, I created and designed this study based on the theoretical constructs that I pulled from the literature review of this study. I used these constructs to place boundaries around the scope of my study, to create my research questions and the questions eventually asked of the participants, and to make methodological decisions. I decided to design my study as a qualitative study, using a group of high school teachers of non-reading and non-English language arts subjects areas as the participants.

The choice of a qualitative research design served three purposes. First, through this type of design, I was able to deeply explore participants' thoughts, beliefs, and experiences, because qualitative inquiry involves a method of data collection where the

researcher serves as the primary measuring instrument, collecting data by personally interacting with participants in their natural setting (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 2013; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007); in this study, I personally interacted with participants by conducting one-on-one interviews with them, eliciting information from them by inviting them to freely express themselves and to elaborate upon their responses when I needed clarification or more information.

Second, choice of a qualitative design enabled me to contribute to an area of research that could benefit from more qualitative studies. To illustrate, in an analysis of 218 research studies on teacher self-efficacy, Klassen, Tze, Betts, and Gordon (2011) found that less than nine percent of the total studies analyzed used a qualitative approach, while almost 77% of the studies exclusively used quantitative approaches, and almost 15% used mixed-methods approaches. In addition, I found a similar pattern in an analysis of the approaches used in the six studies I discussed in the literature review (i.e., Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Ness, 2007; Thibodeau, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). My analysis revealed that 67% of the studies used a quantitative or mixed-methods approach, while only 33% used a qualitative one. The Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) study was a quasi-experimental, quantitative study; the Cantrell and Hughes (2008), McCoss-Yergian and Krepps (2010), and Thibodeau (2008) studies were mixed-methods studies. Only the Ness (2007) study and the Cantrell, Burns, and Callaway (2009) study were qualitative.

Third, choice of a qualitative design helped me to avoid use of a potentially problematic teacher self-efficacy measurement, as there have been continuous concerns

surrounding some of the efficacy measurements used within quantitative and mixed-methods studies related to teacher self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Henson, 2002; Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011; Pajares, 1995; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). For example, several of the existing self-efficacy measures are not congruent with self-efficacy theory as Bandura (1977, 1986, 1989, 1997) conceptualized it, because they measure teachers' outcome expectations rather than their efficacy expectations (Henson, 2002; Klassen et al., 2011; Pajares, 1995; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Bandura (1977, 1986) made a clear distinction between efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one has about his or her capabilities to successfully execute the actions necessary to achieve a desired outcome, while an outcome expectation is one's expectation of the likely outcomes that his or her behavior will produce (Bandura, 1977, 1986; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). According to Klassen et al. (2011), many of the earlier efficacy measures, such as the Teacher Efficacy Scale by Gibson and Dembo (1984), incorrectly focused on teachers' beliefs about the outcome of their behavior instead of on teachers' beliefs about their capabilities to produce the actions needed to achieve certain outcomes. Along with the conceptual problem of some of the existing efficacy scales, another problem within efficacy measurements has been the incongruence between the self-efficacy beliefs being measured and the specificity of the behaviors in question (Klassen et al., 2011; Pajares, 1995); in order for self-efficacy measures to be predictive of future behavior, the behaviors in question must be specifically defined (Bandura, 1997; Klassen et al., 2011; Pajares, 1995; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Identifying the appropriate level of

specificity has been challenging for researchers (Klassen et al., 2011; Pajares, 1995; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Given the continuous concerns surrounding some of the efficacy measurements, a qualitative research design was the most appropriate choice design for this study, because through one-on-one interviews with participants, I was able not only to avoid use of a potentially problematic teacher self-efficacy measurement but also to explore participants' self-efficacy for literacy instruction to a deeper extent than had I used a quantitative or a mixed-methods design.

Along with my decision to conduct a qualitative study, I also chose to use a group of high school teachers of non-reading and non-English language arts subjects areas as the participants of this study. This decision developed in part from the fact that researchers (i.e., Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011) had highlighted the need for more self-efficacy-related studies that included high school teachers as the main study participants, since most of the existing studies had been conducted with primary and elementary teachers. This was something I found to be the case in my analysis of the six studies fully described in the literature review (i.e., Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Ness, 2007; Thibodeau, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Out of the six, only one study (i.e., Thibodeau, 2008) had high school teachers as the sole participants. The participants in the Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) study were teachers of kindergarten through the second grade, while the participants of the remaining four studies consisted of a mix of middle school and high school teachers.

Furthermore, along with seeking teachers from the high school level, I chose to seek teachers of non-reading and non-English language arts (ELA) subject areas, since

secondary teachers of non-reading and non-ELA subject areas were the ones identified in the research as being resistant to literacy-instruction integration because of low teacher self-efficacy for doing so. In my analysis of the six studies fully described in the literature review, I noticed that five of six used middle and high school teachers as participants, but none of the studies specified whether any of the participants were from subjects other than English, science, social studies, and math. For example, Cantrell et al. (2009) and Cantrell and Hughes (2008) stated that their participants were teachers of English, social studies, science, and math. Ness (2007) said that her participants were only teachers of social studies and science. McCoss-Yergian and Krepps (2010) did not specify what subjects their participants taught; they only mentioned that participants taught subjects other than reading, English, language arts, and literature. Thibodeau's (2008) description of participants also was not clear; however, it appeared as though her participants primarily taught English, math, and science. Throughout this analysis, I wondered about the self-efficacy for literacy instruction of high school teachers of other subject areas; therefore, I decided to conduct a qualitative study with a group of high school teachers from within any of the following subject areas: math, social studies, science, world language education, career and technical education, health education, and art education.

Summary

Chapter 2 provided an explanation of the theoretical framework surrounding this qualitative research study, as well as a comprehensive review of the literature related to the problem of low teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction and a review of the methodological literature related to the research design of this study. The chapter began

with an explanation of Albert Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory. Self-efficacy refers to the beliefs one has about his or her capabilities to execute the actions necessary to influence and achieve desired outcomes, and it is constructed from four principal sources of information: performance mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological/affective states (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1989, 1997). Self-efficacy is influential on teachers and their performance (Allinder, 1994; Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, & Morrison, 2012; Guskey, 1984, 1986, 1988; Holzberger, Philipp, & Kunter, 2013; Ross, 1998; Smylie, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

The concept of teacher self-efficacy (TSE) involves the extent to which a teacher believes in his or her capability to execute the actions necessary to influence and achieve desired outcomes (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011; Ross, 1992; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). TSE is more powerful to a teacher than his or her actual capabilities, because it influences whether the teacher will use his or her capabilities, and/or will take the steps necessary to enhance those capabilities, to reach desired outcomes (Bandura, 1997). In this way, TSE serves an important motivational role in influencing a teacher's professional behavior (Guo et al., 2012; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

Some secondary teachers express low levels of TSE for the task of teaching literacy within their content area (Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; O'Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995;

Park & Osborne, 2006). Established feelings of inefficacy for a given situation will remain enduring and resistant to change, unless compelling evidence is presented to strongly challenge it (Bandura, 1997). It is possible to challenge and change an experienced teacher's deeply embedded efficacy with appropriate professional development (PD) support (Cantrell et al., 2009; Greenleaf & Shoenbach, 2004; Guskey, 1988, 1989; Ross, 1998; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009), because when a teacher is provided with appropriate PD support, his or her self-efficacy for a situation can become increased (Cantrell et al., 2009; Greenleaf & Shoenbach, 2004; Guskey, 1988, 1989; Ross, 1998; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009), as a result of the teacher becoming more confident over time that he or she can accomplish a given task (Ross, 1998; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). When PD experiences are frequently allotted, purposefully structured, job embedded and sustained over time, and when they engage teachers in collaborative activities, they have great potential to bring about teacher learning and improved teacher performance (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; DeMonte, 2013; Learning Forward, 2011; National Center for Literacy Education [NCLE], 2013; Sparks, 2002; Thibodeau, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Wei, Darling-Hammond, & Adamson, 2010; Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). Furthermore, when PD experiences provide teachers with the guidance of a coach (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Thibodeau, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009), they have potential to bring about teacher learning and change.

In order to increase the potential for sustained changes in teacher practices, it is necessary to include within PD experiences specific features that directly attend to the self-efficacy of teachers (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guo et al., 2012; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). PD should address teachers' beliefs (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Timperley & Phillips, 2003), since deeply held personal beliefs of teachers contribute to low TSE for literacy instruction (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; Ness, 2007; O'Brien et al., 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006). In addition to a focus on teachers' beliefs, PD should include experiences that provide teachers with the sources of self-efficacy information that Bandura (1977, 1986, 1989, 1997) explained were influential on one's self-efficacy: performance mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological/affective states (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Verbal persuasion and vicarious experiences have potential to influence TSE (Bandura, 1997); however, PD experiences that consist only of one or both of these sources will not be as effective in leading teachers toward sustained improvement in efficacy and change implementation as what PD opportunities with mastery experiences will be (Bandura, 1997; Guskey, 1986; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

While scholarly literature and research on the topic of teacher self-efficacy are abundant and have been growing (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011), more information is needed on teacher self-efficacy as it relates specifically to literacy instruction (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes,

2008; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009), as well as to high school teachers (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). Therefore, as described in the methodological literature section of this chapter, I pulled theoretical constructs from the literature review and used them to design my study. I chose to create a qualitative study using a group of high school teachers of non-reading and non-English language arts subject areas as the participants, to explore the breadth and depth of their teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction, through one-on-one interviews. A comprehensive description of the methodology used to conduct this study follows in Chapter 3.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Despite the need for secondary teachers to integrate literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis, implementation of literacy-instruction integration can be limited or inconsistent among some secondary teachers of non-reading and non-English language arts subject areas, due to low teacher self-efficacy for doing so. To gain a deeper understanding of the existence and characteristics of this phenomenon, I conducted a qualitative case study, through which I interviewed a group of 10 teachers of math, science, history, art, and business education, from within the same public high school in Alabama, regarding their beliefs about and experiences with literacy-instruction integration. One central research question and three subquestions guided this case study:

- Central Question: Among the study participants, what are the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis?
- Subquestion 1: What similarities and differences exist among participants' understanding of literacy-instruction integration as it relates to their content area?

- Subquestion 2: What similarities and differences exist among the ways in which participants incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction, as well as among the extent to which they do so?
- Subquestion 3: What beliefs and experiences have contributed to, or have hindered, participants' understanding and implementation of literacy-instruction integration?

The sections that follow offer a comprehensive description of the research design of this study and the methodology used in the execution of it.

Research Design

Qualitative Case Study

To explore the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction, among the study participants, I used a qualitative research design, because, through this type of design, I was able to serve as the primary measuring instrument, collecting data by personally interacting with participants through one-on-one interviews (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 2013; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). This permitted me to deeply explore participants' thoughts, beliefs, and experiences, as they related to literacy-instruction integration, because through this method of data collection, I was able not only to invite participants to freely express themselves but also to ask participants to elaborate upon their responses when I needed more information or clarification (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Creswell, 2013). In addition, because I wanted to gain a deeper understanding of the existence and characteristics of the phenomenon of inconsistent integration of literacy instruction among secondary teachers of non-reading or non-English language arts (ELA) subject areas, due to low teacher self-efficacy for

literacy instruction, I decided to interview a specific set of non-reading/ELA, secondary teachers. This decision turned my qualitative study into a qualitative case study. Case study research allows for a deep exploration into a phenomenon, by investigating the perspective of a specific set of individuals within their real-life context (Creswell, 2013; Gall et al., 2007; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995); the specific set of individuals make up a bounded case study set (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 1995), which serves as a means through which to gain a deeper understanding of the existence and characteristics of the phenomenon. Furthermore, because I was using the perspectives of the set of individuals to contribute to my understanding of the phenomenon, rather than to understand each individual, this qualitative case study was an *instrumental case study* (Stake, 1995). As Stake (1995) explained, in an instrumental case study, the close examination of each individual's perspective, experiences, and context facilitates a deeper understanding of the phenomenon.

To conduct this instrumental case study, I interviewed 10 teachers of math, science, history, art, and business education, all from within the same public high school in Alabama, during the spring of 2018. This specific set of individuals was bounded by location, time, content areas, and grade levels, and through one-on-one interviews, I developed insight into the range of teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction that existed among this group of teachers. I learned various similarities and differences among them in terms of (a) their understanding of literacy-instruction integration as it relates to their content area; (b) the ways in which they incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction and the extent to which they do so; and (c) the beliefs and

experiences that have contributed to, or have hindered, their understanding and implementation of literacy-instruction integration.

Constructivist Paradigm

Epistemologically, this study was positioned within the constructivist paradigm. According to the constructivist paradigm, there is no single reality waiting to be discovered; instead, reality is multiple, something constructed differently by each person, through the meaning he or she ascribes to events and experiences in the world (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Creswell, 2013; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). Similarly, knowledge, too, is constructed; it is not something out there to be discovered (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Stake, 1995). Within a constructivist approach to research, the very act of research is a construction, from beginning to end, made up of the multiple realities that have been constructed by each participant and the researcher; the participants share their constructed reality with the researcher, and the researcher applies meaning to what the participants have shared, based on the researcher's own construction of reality (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). In this way, the end product of the research study is a construction that the researcher and the participants have co-created (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Merriam, 1998). According to Stake (1995), there is one more layer to this: the constructed reality of the individual reading the research study. The reader will interpret the research based on his or her own constructed reality; for this reason, in Chapter 4, I followed what Stake emphasized a researcher should do: I attempted to provide the reader with an abundant description of data before supplying my interpretations, so that the reader could reflect upon his or her own interpretations first.

Participants for the Study

Sample and Sampling Method

The participants for this study consisted of a group of 10 teachers from the same rural, public high school in Alabama. (I chose to conduct this study in Alabama because that is my permanent place of residence.) This group of teachers made up a bounded case study set; they were bounded by characteristics such as location, time, and teaching experience. Of the 10, two were math teachers, three were science teachers, two were history teachers, one was a business education teacher, and two were art teachers. All participants were female—an unintentional characteristic of the participants that occurred. They ranged in age from 26 to 59, and all had a master's degree. They varied in the number of years they had been teaching, with the number of years ranging from five years to 24 years.

To select participants for this study, I used purposeful sampling, a technique through which the researcher purposefully selects individuals who can give the researcher deep insight into the research topic (Creswell, 2013); when using purposeful sampling, the intent of the researcher is to gain in-depth information, not to accomplish population validity (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). I considered various types of purposeful-sampling strategies; however, given that my intention was to interview participants who met certain specifications, the most appropriate type of purposeful-sampling technique for my study was criterion sampling, since criterion sampling involves the selection of participants who satisfy specific criteria (Creswell, 2013; Gall et al., 2007). The criteria of participant selection will be described in the next section.

Process for Obtaining and Selecting Participants

While waiting on approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Louisiana Tech University to conduct my study, I began researching information about the various school systems that were geographically located within a reasonable driving distance from me, so that I could interview participants in person once my study was underway. As part of my research, I searched for evidence where high school teachers within any of those school systems had received long-term professional development (PD) related to literacy-instruction integration. I searched for this so that I could find participants who had received literacy-related PD and then inquire about how they have integrated literacy instruction since their PD experience(s) and also ask about their related feelings and/or beliefs about doing so. However, it is important to note at this point that my intention was never to see how teachers responded similarly or differently to the specific PD experience(s); rather, it was my intention to find participants from a pool of teachers who I knew had received literacy-related PD, rather than choosing from a random pool of teachers who may or may not have received PD experiences related to literacy instruction at some point in their past.

After finding very little information, I decided to request use of my school system of employment as the school district for my case study, because I knew that PD related to literacy-instruction integration had taken place, system-wide, between 2013 and 2015. During this time, there had been a strong emphasis on literacy-instruction integration within all content areas (e.g., math, science, social studies, English, world languages, career and technical education, fine arts, physical education, etc.) and grade levels (i.e., elementary through secondary). Knowing this, I felt confident that I could find teachers

who had participated in this long-term PD focus. In fact, I became really interested in this possibility after going back through district PD documents and verifying what I remembered to be the case: The consistent, district-wide PD focus on literacy instruction stopped suddenly after 2015, and focus shifted to other topics, such as STEM and formative assessments. I decided that talking to high school teachers from within this district could be very valuable, because I wanted to see how many of the teachers, if any, were focusing on literacy instruction in their classrooms, even though there had been no formal, district-wide PD on literacy instruction since 2015. In addition, I decided to request permission to interview teachers on staff at the largest high school in the district (which was not the same school where I was teaching at the time); this school had over 100 teachers on staff, so I thought I would have a larger pool from which to get participants.

In finalizing my decision on which school district and high school from which to request permission to conduct my study, I enlisted the help of a former instructional coach for the district, who worked with teachers at the high school level during the time of the long-term PD focus on literacy-instruction integration. She confirmed for me that she used to emphasize and model for secondary teachers how to incorporate literacy instruction in their content area. Also, she gave me a list of names of teachers who still taught at that high school and used to be receptive to her coaching. I felt this was important to know, because I needed participants who were at least open to the idea of literacy-instruction integration, so that I could find out more about their beliefs, experiences, successes, and challenges, rather than potentially working with participants

who were completely against literacy-instruction integration, as I would not have been able to gain much information related to the purposes of this research study.

Upon receiving permission from the IRB to conduct my study, I emailed one of the directors at the central office of my school district, to request permission to conduct my study within the district (see Appendix A for a copy of this email). I explained who I was and what I was requesting; in addition, I attached to the email the IRB approval form and the Participant Consent Form (see Appendices B and C for copies of these forms), to provide specific information about the study. While waiting on permission from the district director, I completed three tasks: (a) I created the preliminary questionnaire on SurveyMonkey.com; (b) I drafted the email I would send to potential participants to request their possible participation; and (c) I took the liberty to begin creating a list of teachers to contact for possible participation, should I be given permission to conduct the study at that school of my choice.

To narrow down the list of teachers to contact for possible participation, I downloaded the list of faculty names from the school website, and I categorized teachers by subject area. Because I was looking for a specific group of teachers (i.e., teachers from non-reading and non-English language arts subject areas), I crossed off faculty members who taught English or Special Education, as well as the Athletic Director, the Graduation Coach, and the distance learning teachers. Also, because I was looking for teachers who had been at this school since at least the 2013-2014 school year, the first year that district PD heavily focused on literacy-instruction integration within all content areas and grade levels, I looked through the archived documents on the school district's website, sifting through the Minutes from the monthly board of education meetings that

were held between 2013 and 2018. The minutes contained the hire dates of new employees; therefore, based on my research, I was able to create a list of the teachers who had been at that school since at least the 2013-2014 school year. I then sorted the list based on the subject area teachers taught. At that point, the list of potential participants consisted of 40 teachers: 14 in math, eight in social studies, 10 in science, four in business education, one in health, one in art, one in theatre, and one in art survey; there were no longer any eligible teachers from the areas of world languages, physical education, driver's education, band, speech, or debate. I then highlighted on my list any names that the former instructional coach had recommended to me, which turned out to be only six of the 40.

Immediately after receiving approval from the district office to conduct my study within the district, I called and spoke with the principal of the chosen high school, to request permission to interview teachers. I explained my research goals to him and named the teachers I had narrowed my list down to as possible participants. He gave me advice on whether he thought those teachers would be helpful, given my research goals. I ended up with a list of 17 teachers with whom to make initial contact: three teachers from math, three from social studies, three from science, four from business education, two from art, one from theatre, and one from art survey; in all, three teachers were male and 14 were female. Following our conversation, the principal emailed the 17 teachers to introduce them to the idea of possibly participating in my study. He contacted me a few days later giving me permission to communicate directly with the teachers from that point forward.

Upon receiving permission from the principal, I emailed the 17 teachers to request possible participation in the study (see Appendix D for a copy of this email). In the email, I introduced myself and explained the purpose and procedures of the study, as well as information regarding the voluntary nature of the study and how privacy and confidentiality would be maintained. Also, I included my contact information and the link to the preliminary questionnaire on the Survey Monkey website (see Appendix E for a copy of the Preliminary Questionnaire and for an explanation of the rationale behind the questions asked). I requested that they take some time to consider whether to participate or not, but I included a deadline date by which to complete the questionnaire, since my school district had given me a time frame within which to complete the interviews. In addition, I explained that only certain people would be chosen for an interview, depending on their questionnaire responses; however, I did not reveal to them the criteria of selection (which will be discussed below).

From this initial email, I only received two responses: one from a teacher who chose to decline and one from a teacher who completed and submitted the preliminary questionnaire. I began to worry that some teachers might be having doubts about participating, given the topic of literacy-instruction integration in the content area; years of experience working with colleagues of non-English language arts subject areas had taught me that some teachers may feel that they have nothing to offer on this topic or that a study on this topic may not be worth their time. (More on my personal background will be explained below in the Role of the Researcher section.) Therefore, I decided to send the remaining 15 teachers who had not responded yet a follow-up email (see Appendix F for a copy of this email). Within this email, I described why I chose literacy instruction

as the center of my research study, and I explained to them how useful their comments could be to me, whether they actually integrated literacy instruction with their content instruction or not.

Following this second email request for participation, two more teachers completed and submitted the preliminary questionnaire. However, no other teachers responded to the email or completed the preliminary questionnaire, and the deadline for submitted preliminary questionnaires passed. As a result, I sent one last email to the remaining 13 teachers, politely requesting to be notified of their intention to participate or not (see Appendix G for a copy of this email). This time, I sent the email to each individual, with his or her name in the subject line. It was imperative that I find out the intention of each of the remaining teachers, because I was on a tight schedule, since my school district had given me a time frame within which to conduct my interviews. I needed to know whether or not to be contacting the principal for permission to communicate with a new group of teachers at the school. Within one day of sending this email, I received seven completed preliminary questionnaires, as well as emails from three teachers declining participation in the study. In all, out of the 17 participants from whom I initially requested participation, 10 teachers submitted a completed preliminary questionnaire and indicated their willingness to be interviewed, four teachers declined participation in the study, and three teachers never responded at all.

To select the potential participants to interview, I sifted through the responses on the preliminary questionnaires, looking for the teachers who most met the following criteria of selection:

- Teacher submitted a completed preliminary questionnaire and gave contact information for a possible interview.
- Teacher has been teaching for at least five years.
- Most teaching experience is from with a public-school setting.
- Most experience is in teaching students at the high school level (i.e., from ninth to twelfth grades).
- Teacher has been at current school (or has been within current school district) of employment since at least the 2013-2014 school year.
- Most experience is in teaching math, social studies, career and technical education, or art education.
- Teacher appears to value literacy development of secondary students (based on responses to questions within the Professional Opinions and Practices section of the preliminary questionnaire).
- Teacher appears to have a strong sense of self-efficacy for teaching in general (based on responses to questions within the Professional Opinions and Practices section of the preliminary questionnaire).

It turned out that all 10 of the questionnaire respondents met all or the majority of the criteria. Therefore, I decided to interview all 10 teachers, since I only received responses from 10 of the original 17 teachers and since I was under time constraints.

Data Collection Procedures

Interviews

I collected data through conducting one-on-one interviews with each participant, in person. Interviews averaged about 45 minutes in length and were held in participants' classrooms, either during their planning period or after school. Throughout each interview, I used a Sony IC Recorder to capture each interview in MP3 format; the purpose of the audio recording was for me to have a complete record of the interview, for transcription and data analysis after the interview.

Interviews were semi-structured, in that each interview consisted of me first asking participants open-ended questions regarding their responses to questions 14 to 23 on the preliminary questionnaire and then asking them a variety of open-ended questions from the interview guide. I developed these questions in relation to the central research question and subquestions of this study, all of which were based on the theoretical constructs that I had derived from the literature review of this study; however, the first six questions asked in Question 20 of the preliminary questionnaire came directly from the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

When asking participants questions based on their responses to questions 14 to 23 on the preliminary questionnaire, I first reminded them of what they said and then asked them to elaborate or explain further. In some cases, participants would continuously talk on their own, leading me to ask other questions, all in a natural, conversation-like manner. Examples of questions I asked participants in relation to their responses to questions 14 through 23 on the preliminary questionnaire included *What does this mean?* *Can you give an example?*; *Why do you think this is?*; *Why the difference in your*

response to this question versus your response to that question?; Can you expand on that?; How so?; Why not?; and How can we get other teachers to think like this?.

After our discussion related to the questions on the preliminary questionnaire, I asked the participants open-ended questions from the interview guide (see Appendix H). Use of the interview guide served several purposes. It not only helped me to make sure that I covered all the necessary topics but also helped me to remember what I wanted to tell each participant at the beginning and end of the interview. In addition, it helped me remember to go over the informed consent form with each participant, to have the participant sign it, and to give the participant a copy of it, all prior to starting the interview. Overall, the interview guide helped me to maintain a type of structure to each interview, allowing me to minimize the possibility of bias among interviews.

Informed Consent

Throughout the data-collection process, I asked participants to sign the Informed Consent Form (i.e., the Participant Consent Form) twice. The first time was at the beginning of the electronic preliminary questionnaire; participants had to click on the *yes* option of the Informed Consent Page, before they could proceed with the questionnaire. Then, at the beginning of the interview, I gave participants a hard copy of the consent form, reminded them of the information on it, and asked them to sign it. The information covered on the consent form included the title and purpose of the study; the characteristics of the participants being sought; the procedures to be used to collect and analyze data; the procedures for maintaining privacy of participants and confidentiality of data; and the potential benefits of the study, along with potential risks or discomforts in participating in the study. In addition, the following was explained on the consent form:

that participation in the study was voluntary, that refusal to participate would not affect participants' relationships with their employer or with Louisiana Tech University; that participants would be given sufficient information and time to make a decision to participate; that participants could withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any questions without penalty; that upon completion of the study, the results would be freely available to participants upon request; and that participants were not being asked to waive any of their rights related to participating in this study.

Data Saturation

At the conclusion of the interviews, I felt confident that I had reached data saturation because even though I had not completed the data-analysis process yet, I already had begun to notice patterns in what participants had said. Also, I could tell that I had obtained data from this particular case-study set that represented a wide and complex range of teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction, in terms of participants' current practices and beliefs, their past experiences, and their overall understanding of literacy-instruction integration in the content area.

Role of the Researcher

As the researcher, I chose the research topic and methodology to use, and I served as the data collector, analyzer, and interpreter. I was the primary measuring instrument (Creswell, 2013; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007), personally interacting with the participants to gain their perspectives. Throughout the research process, I strove to be ethical and to aim for sensitivity (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). To ensure that I was ethical from the start, I obtained necessary approval prior to beginning the study, by obtaining consent from my dissertation committee, as well as from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of

Louisiana Tech University. While conducting the study, I was committed to following through with the IRB-approved procedures (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Also, I took measures to obtain consent from participants to interview them, to digitally record the interview, and to take notes during the interview (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Further, I maintained honesty by disclosing to participants the purpose of the study and how the data and findings would be used, as well as by reporting my findings honestly (Creswell, 2013), while maintaining confidentiality (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Creswell, 2013) through use of participant pseudonyms and by keeping all research notes, recordings, transcripts, and signed consent forms in a secure location. In addition, I aimed for sensitivity by establishing rapport and developing trust with the participants and by being attentive to and respectful of them and their time (Corbin & Strauss, 2015).

Along with these roles, I strove to stay aware of how my personal characteristics (e.g., my background, values, assumptions, biases, perspectives, and experiences) may be influencing research decisions and interpretations. To help me stay attuned to how my personal characteristics might be influencing the research process, I engaged in several methods to help me maintain a form of dialogue between myself and the data/research process (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2015). For example, prior to the start of data collection, I completed the preliminary questionnaire and wrote a synopsis of my answers to make myself aware of my own thoughts, beliefs, and perspective. I referred back to this synopsis numerous times when analyzing data, to ensure that I was not forcing my own ideas on the data and that I was remaining as open as possible to different meanings within the data (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2015). In addition, I was self-reflective throughout the research process, by writing memos throughout data analysis

(Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Creswell, 2013; Glaser & Strauss, 1967), to record my thoughts about the data. In fact, I developed my own form for the memos I wrote (see Appendix I); in the final section of the memo form, what I titled “Related Self-Reflection,” I would reflect upon whether any of my experiences, assumptions, or biases could be influencing my interpretation of the data being discussed in that memo. Doing this helped me in my attempts to stay objective and to keep myself from under-valuing or over-valuing participants’ statements, especially when they went against what I believed to be true or when they were similar to my beliefs and experiences.

To give the reader an understanding of the personal characteristics of mine that could have been influential throughout the research process, I have provided below a description of my background and experiences, as well as the synopsis of my answers to questions on the preliminary questionnaire. I have included this to be fully transparent with the reader (Carlson, 2010; Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998).

Researcher Positioning

I have been a teacher for over 16 years. I have a bachelor’s degree in Spanish and English Education at the secondary level, and I have a master’s degree in Spanish Education. For the first two years of my teaching career, I split time between two schools, teaching middle school reading and high school English. However, since then, I have taught nothing but middle school and high school Spanish, with most of my experience being at the high school level. In addition, I have taught in a public-school setting for over 13 years, but I also taught in a private-school setting for three years.

I have been teaching within my current school district of employment for over 11 years, although not consecutively. I first taught at the high school where I conducted this

study, from 2003 to 2009. After moving away to Louisiana for a few years, I returned to Alabama, to the same school district from before, but to a different high school, and I have been at that same high school since 2013. I currently teach Spanish I and Spanish II, to students of 10th through 12th grades.

I feel very efficacious as a Spanish teacher; I have had years to develop my lessons, to learn what concepts students have trouble with and how to help them, and to develop my skills in classroom management. Throughout my career, administrators have encouraged me to incorporate as much literacy instruction as possible within my content area, but this task has always been a challenge to me. Even though I have attended professional development workshops related to literacy (e.g., the literacy standards, *Literacy Across the Curriculum*, Tier 2 academic vocabulary, *How to Increase Students' ACT Scores Through Reading*, etc.), I have never been able to put these ideas into practice on a consistent basis, and I often have wondered if other teachers (of non-English language arts content areas) have experienced the same dilemma that I have in trying to find the balance between including literacy instruction while mainly keeping the focus on topics within my Spanish content area.

I was employed in the school system within which I conducted my study when the district-wide emphasis on literacy-instruction integration took place, from 2013 to 2015. For reasons unknown to me, I was chosen as one of the elective teachers in the district to conduct a professional development (PD) session for other secondary elective teachers in the district, on the topic of using close-reading skills in the classroom. I conducted this full-day session in August 2015, but it was through my research in preparing for this

session throughout the summer beforehand that my eyes were opened to how beneficial literacy-instruction integration could be in my classroom.

That next school year, I began applying some of what I had learned over the summer. For example, one time, I had students read an article in English about sports in Spanish-speaking countries; we practiced close-reading skills throughout the reading. Also, I had asked the English teachers at my school for a list of Tier 2 academic vocabulary (see Definitions section in Chapter 1) to teach in my classes. They gave it to me, and I began daily vocabulary instruction as our bell-ringer activity. However, I struggled to maintain this over time. I felt it was all too surface level and that students were not getting much out of these activities, because, truthfully, I did not know what I was doing. I ended up quitting my attempts to integrate literacy, and, unfortunately, I have not had the time to go back and research more or to revamp what I was trying to do, because all of my free time since then has been used to complete my doctoral program.

However, I plan on integrating literacy on a deeper level and on a more consistent basis after I have graduated. I want to do this because my mindset about literacy-instruction integration has gradually changed over time. I have realized that literacy can be used to teach content; it does not have to take away from content instruction. In addition, I have realized that if I were to choose to take a few minutes during class to directly teach students an aspect of literacy, it would be okay to do so, because I would still be teaching students an important concept and giving them practice in it. As a result of this change in mindset, I now believe that all secondary teachers, regardless of subject area, have a responsibility to provide explicit literacy instruction when at all possible and to integrate literacy with content-area instruction on a consistent basis. However, I

believe that teachers (including myself) need more guidance and on a consistent basis. I have noticed that, in the past, teachers have been told to incorporate literacy instruction but then have not received training on how to do this. Also, I have noticed that when teachers have received training, it has done very little to alter their long-term instructional practices, as many of them either will not follow through with any of what they have learned or will follow through but in a superficial way and in very limited amounts. I admit that both scenarios have occurred with me.

All of this is what led me to choose this area of focus for my research study. Basically, I was curious to know what other non-English language arts, high school teachers did to integrate literacy instruction in their content area, if they did so on a consistent basis, and why or why not.

Data Analysis Procedures

I began data analysis immediately following the first interview and then did so after each subsequent interview, since data collection and analysis should occur simultaneously (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Creswell, 2013; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Merriam, 1998; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). Immediately following each interview, I wrote a post-interview reflection memo, recording my initial thoughts related to the interview. Also following each interview, I transferred the audio recording from the voice recorder to my computer, as a MP3 file. I uploaded the file to *Rev* for transcription. *Rev* is an online transcription service that I utilized for each interview. I uploaded the MP3 audio file from my computer to the *Rev* website, and a professional transcriber transcribed the audio file and emailed me the typed transcript within a 24-hour period, as a Microsoft Word document. According to *Rev* policy, all

files are securely stored, are transmitted using a high level of secure encryption, are never shared with anyone outside of the company, and are only visible to the employees who have signed a confidentiality agreement (Rev, n.d.). However, to fully conceal each participant's identity from the Rev transcriber, I used the pseudonym that the participant gave in the last question of the preliminary questionnaire, when referring to the participant throughout the interview.

Upon receipt of each transcript from Rev, I checked the accuracy of it by listening to the audio recording of the interview while reading the transcript; I made corrections as needed. After checking the accuracy of the transcript, I read over the entire transcript again, in one sitting, in order to remind myself of the participant's responses and to get an understanding of the participant's words as a whole (Corbin & Strauss, 2015); once I finished that reading, I documented my general thoughts about the data by writing a memo.

I then began cycles of coding. I reread the transcript a third time, looking for natural breaks in it, and I created sections (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). I asked myself questions about each section, such as *What, in general, is the main idea or activity being expressed in this section?* (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Then I engaged in holistic coding (Saldaña, 2009), where I applied a phrase to represent the essence of that section. In doing this, I now realize that I was using what Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014) referred to as a researcher-generated start list of codes, a list of pre-established codes that were based on topics covered in the preliminary questionnaire and during the interviews, that had derived from the theoretical constructs I created from the literature review and resulting research questions for this study. I did not have this start list of codes written

down, but I realize now that the initial holistic codes were, in a sense, pre-established, because the topics were in my mind as I began coding the first few transcripts.

As I collected more data with each subsequent interview, I revised the original set of codes by removing codes, adding to the list, expanding upon codes, and breaking down codes into subcodes. With each subsequent transcript, codes became more refined and defined, and I began grouping codes under category headings. Throughout this process, I continued writing memos, in which I described the codes and categories, documented new thoughts, and compared my new thoughts to the ones written in previous memos. Also, I included in the memos self-reflective thoughts, to be sure that I was not forcing data into codes and that I was not allowing my personal background, assumptions, and biases to influence the analysis process.

After I finished coding all 10 transcripts, I realized that I had coded the second half of the transcripts with more awareness about what the data were revealing; therefore, I revisited the first half of transcripts and reread and recoded each one, to make sure I had not missed anything. By revisiting these, I ended up with an even more enlightened understanding of what the data were revealing, so I revisited the second half of transcripts and recoded them. Revisiting the second half of the transcripts ended up leading to a deeper analysis of the derived categories, which led me to reorganizing and refining the list of codes and categories. I again reviewed the transcripts and previous memos with the more refined list of codes and categories in mind. From this, I confirmed patterns within the data and developed from them answers to the research central question and subquestions, as well as themes.

Validation of the Study

Throughout the study, I used numerous strategies to validate the research process and the final product of the study. By presenting these strategies to readers, I hope to establish for readers' *dependability, credibility, transferability, and confirmability* within the study, terms for qualitative validation that Lincoln and Guba (1985) created as counterparts to the quantitative terms of *reliability, internal validity, external validity, and objectivity*. According to Marshall and Rossman (1989), the qualitative terms are alternative constructs that better represent qualitative inquiry.

To ensure dependability, I maintained consistency across interviews by using the preliminary questionnaire and the interview guide, and I ensured that transcript data represented exactly what was said during interviews, by recording each interview session, by checking the transcript of each recorded interview for accuracy against the recording, and by analyzing data directly from the transcripts (Creswell, 2013). Furthermore, during data analysis, I kept a running list of codes, to help maintain consistency in coding. Moreover, I have kept all documents related to this study, should any of them need to be reviewed by other researchers in the future (Creswell, 2013).

To ensure credibility, I have attempted to make the study believable and trustworthy (Corbin & Strauss, 2015); my intention is that readers will be able to trust that I made every attempt to collect, analyze, and report data in an ethical and appropriate way (Carlson, 2010) and that readers will be able to form their own naturalistic generalizations (Stake, 1995) from the information provided.

To aid in these goals, I have attempted to be as transparent as possible by

- providing a detailed description of and evidence for how I collected and analyzed data (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995);
- positioning myself in the research (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995), explicitly stating my background and experiences, as they relate to the topic of this study and how they may have shaped the research process and my interpretation of data; and
- providing a thick description of data that includes direct quotations and wording from participants, when reporting and supporting my findings (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), in order to give the reader enough information to form his or her own naturalistic generalizations (Stake, 1995).

To be able to provide this type of transparent description, I maintained an audit trail (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003), to provide clear record of all research activity, documentation, and decisions made; I established the audit trail by keeping all documents, such as interview notes and transcripts, and I kept the memos that show record of analytic thought throughout the analysis process (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014; Stake, 1995).

Along with strategies to establish dependability, credibility, and transferability of the study, I attempted to establish confirmability as well. To ensure confirmability, I continually checked for researcher bias in my interpretations. For example, at the end of my analytic memos, I reflected upon and wrote about how my personal characteristics

may have shaped my interpretations of data described. This helped me stay attuned to how and why I was assigning certain meaning to data, choosing certain codes and categories, and asking certain types of questions of the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2015).

Summary

Throughout Chapter 3, I have described the methods used in designing and conducting this qualitative case study. Through criterion sampling, I selected 10 participants to interview regarding their beliefs about and experiences with literacy-instruction integration, in order to explore the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction, among the case-study set. I conducted one-on-one, semi-structured interviews, in the spring of 2018, and I analyzed data using a system of coding to group, separate, and regroup data (Saldaña, 2009), in an effort to identify the essence of the data and to draw analytic meaning from them (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014; Saldaña, 2009). Throughout a process of reading, coding, rereading, and recoding transcripts, along with writing memos to document my thoughts about the data, I developed categories for summarized and similar codes, eventually combining the categories into themes. In the next chapter, I present a more detailed account of the codes and categories derived during the data-analysis process. In addition, I offer the reader a description of each participant's beliefs and experiences as they relate to literacy-instruction integration, as well as my interpretations of the analyzed data.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

As explained in Chapter 2, despite the need for secondary teachers to integrate literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis, some secondary teachers of non-reading and non-English language arts subject areas resist doing so, because of low teacher self-efficacy for incorporating literacy instruction into their content area. To explore this phenomenon, I interviewed a group of 10 teachers from the same high school in Alabama, regarding their beliefs about and experiences with literacy-instruction integration. The purpose of this study was to explore within this group of high school teachers the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis. This investigation required an exploration of the similarities and differences that existed among the case study set, in terms of (a) participants' understanding of literacy-instruction integration as it relates to their content area; (b) the ways in which participants incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction and the extent to which they do so; and (c) the beliefs and experiences of participants that have contributed to, or have hindered, their understanding and implementation of literacy-instruction integration.

Therefore, the following research questions guided this case study:

- Central Question: Among the study participants, what are the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis?
- Subquestion 1: What similarities and differences exist among participants' understanding of literacy-instruction integration as it relates to their content area?
- Subquestion 2: What similarities and differences exist among the ways in which participants incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction, as well as among the extent to which they do so?
- Subquestion 3: What beliefs and experiences have contributed to, or have hindered, participants' understanding and implementation of literacy-instruction integration?

Before presenting the findings of this study that answered these questions, I have presented within this chapter an in-depth description of the codes and categories derived during the data-analysis process; this is followed by a descriptive account of each participant's background, thoughts, experiences, and beliefs, in relation to literacy-instruction integration in the content area. Next in the chapter is a presentation of the findings, as they relate to the central research question and subquestions; this is followed by my interpretation of the findings, presented in the form of three themes found across the data. This chapter concludes with a description of the limitations of this study.

The Coding Process

As explained in Chapter 3, I began data analysis immediately following the first interview and then did so after each subsequent interview. Data analysis procedures consisted of transcribing the audio file of the interview, checking the accuracy of the transcript against the audio recording, coding the data, rereading and recoding the data at different stages of the data-analysis process, writing memos, reviewing written memos, and constantly comparing data, codes, categories, and documented thoughts within the memos. Through this process, I revised and refined the list of codes and categories numerous times, as illustrated below.

After checking the accuracy of the transcript of the first interview, I read over the entire transcript again, in one sitting, in order to remind myself of the participant's responses and to get an understanding of the participant's words as a whole (Corbin & Strauss, 2015); once I finished that reading, I documented my general thoughts about the data by writing a memo. I then reread the transcript a third time, looking for natural breaks in it, and I created sections (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). I asked myself questions about each section, such as *What, in general, is the main idea or activity being expressed in this section?* (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Then I engaged in holistic coding (Saldaña, 2009), where I applied a phrase to represent the essence of that section. In applying these phrases, I now realize that I was using what Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014) referred to as a researcher-generated start list of codes, a list of pre-established codes that were based on topics covered in the preliminary questionnaire and during the interviews, that had derived from the theoretical constructs I created from the literature review and resulting research questions for this study. I did not have this start list of codes written

down, but I realize now that the initial holistic codes were, in a sense, pre-established, because the topics were in my mind as I began coding the first few transcripts. There were seven initial holistic codes, and they were as follows:

- What she does to implement literacy instruction
- How she feels about what she does to implement literacy instruction
- Why she does what she does in implementing literacy instruction
- How she defines literacy instruction
- Challenges in implementing literacy instruction
- Current/Past PD/Accountability for implementing literacy instruction
- PD suggestions to help other teachers get on board/follow through with implementing literacy instruction

As I collected more data with each subsequent interview, I revised the original set of codes by removing codes, adding to the list, expanding upon codes, and breaking down codes into subcodes. The revised list consisted of 15 codes:

- How she defines literacy/literacy instruction
- What she does to implement literacy instruction
- Why she does what she does in implementing literacy instruction
- Origin of her desire/knowledge to implement/to keep implementing literacy instruction
- Her view of her self-efficacy for implementing literacy instruction
- Whose responsibility?
- Values literacy instruction
- Concerns with/Challenges to bringing in literacy instruction

- Pushback
- Struggling readers
- Current/Past accountability for implementing literacy instruction
- If told accountability were to be coming...
- Thoughts on current and past PD for implementing literacy instruction
- How wants to improve on what she does
- Suggestions for future PD

By the time I finished coding all 10 transcripts, the list of codes had become more refined and defined, and I had grouped codes under category headings; the new list consisted of 39 codes and seven categories (see Table 1 for examples from this list; see Appendix J for the full list). However, after coding all 10 transcripts, I realized that I had coded the second half of the transcripts with more awareness about what the data were revealing; therefore, I revisited the first half of transcripts and reread and recoded each one according to the new list.

Table 1

Examples of Codes and Categories after Coding All Transcripts

Codes	Categories
Compliance	
Prior experiences before teaching	
Outside PD	
All students need practice for future	Why she does what she does...
All teachers have responsibility	
Only English teachers are responsible	
Experiences with student success/buy-in	
Values literacy instruction	
Time	
Coverage of content	
Concerns about students lacking in general skills and vocabulary knowledge	Challenges to implementation/Concerns
Pushback from students, parents, and/or administrators	
Feels lack of confidence /training	
Be with other subject-area teachers	
Help teachers realize...	PD suggestions to help teachers get on board/follow through
Give plenty of time for...	
Demonstrations / Show practical and applicable ideas	
Consistent theme over time	
Subject-specific information	

Upon revisiting the first half of the transcripts, I ended up with an even more enlightened understanding of what the data were revealing, so I revisited the second half of transcripts and recoded them more closely, all while continuing to write memos to document my thoughts about the data. Revisiting the second half of the transcripts ended up leading to a deeper analysis of the derived categories, which led to me reorganizing and refining the list of codes and categories one last time (see Table 2 for examples from this list; see Appendix K for full list). The list changed from 39 codes to 38, more-specific codes, and it changed from seven categories to 12 categories.

Table 2

Examples of Revised Codes and Categories after Further Analysis

Codes	Categories
Believes important for students' future Believes all teachers have a responsibility To comply	Why she does what she does
Outside PD (led to realizations and changes in practices) Prior to teaching work experience Concerns that have developed within her throughout teaching career Experiences with student success	Influences on beliefs and literacy- integration efforts
No time because feels need to cover content Feels she does not know enough Literacy is responsibility of English teacher only	Beliefs that hinder
Subject-specific information Time to experience on own Demonstrations	Characteristics of PD experiences that led to change in teacher's beliefs and practices

With the revised list of codes and categories in mind, I again reviewed the transcripts and memos. Through this review, I confirmed patterns within the data and developed from them answers to the research subquestions and central question (see Appendix L for a concise view of the connections between the research questions, the study findings, and the categories/patterns that led to the study findings). In addition, I developed the following three themes:

- Participants who appeared to have the most confidence in their capabilities to integrate literacy instruction (i.e., the most self-efficacy for literacy instruction) demonstrated the most awareness and understanding of how and why to apply literacy to their content-area instruction, reported the most

effort and persistence in doing so, and described attributing their beliefs and efforts to awareness-building experiences that included external-teaching experiences and within-classroom experiences.

- Participants who appeared to have less confidence in their capabilities to integrate literacy instruction (i.e., less self-efficacy for literacy instruction)—in comparison to their participant-counterparts described as having more confidence in their capabilities—demonstrated less awareness and understanding about how or why to apply literacy within their content area, reported less effort and persistence to consistently incorporate literacy instruction, and described holding at least one belief that seemed to be strong enough to hinder their literacy-integration efforts in some way.
- Teacher buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area was a contributing factor to the level of participants' self-efficacy for literacy instruction.

The answers to the research questions, as well as a complete description of the themes, will be presented in detail later in the Findings section of this chapter. However, first, a descriptive account of each participant's background and experiences, as they relate to literacy-instruction integration, has been presented.

Participant Profiles

As explained in Chapter 3, the participants for this study consisted of a group of 10 teachers from the same rural, public high school in Alabama. Of the 10, three were science teachers, two were math teachers, two were history teachers, two were art teachers, and one was a business education teacher. All participants were female—an

unintentional characteristic of the participants that occurred. They ranged in age from 26 to 59, and all had a master's degree. They varied in the number of years they had been teaching, with the number of years ranging from five years to 24 years. Throughout the written results, I have used a pseudonym when referring to each participant, as shown in Table 3.

The information provided throughout this section offers the reader a descriptive account of each participant's background, thoughts, experiences, and beliefs, in relation to literacy-instruction integration in the content area. I have provided this information not only to help the reader understand my analysis and interpretation of the data (presented later in this chapter) but also to help the reader be able to form his or her own interpretations and naturalistic generalizations (Stake, 1995).

Table 3

Participant Overview

Participant Pseudonym	Course Currently Teaching	No. of Years Teaching
Marie	Business Education	19
Renee	History	9
Mona	Science	16
Jean	Math	8
Jess	Art	13
Laura	Science	7
Rachel	Math	24
Carla	Science	5
Lucy	Art	24
Elena	History	21

Marie

Marie, a business education teacher of 19 years, described her literacy-instruction integration as involving the inclusion of reading and writing activities. She explained that for each lesson, she introduces the content of the lesson by having students read a text and then complete a writing component, such as a note-taking guide, to help students become familiar with the content before instruction. In addition, a few times each month, she brings in content-related articles from business and industry for students to read. She said that she chunks each article into sections and has students complete a graphic organizer while reading, to help them comprehend each section and the overall message of the article; she then requires students to demonstrate comprehension of the article by writing about it, using textual evidence to support their thoughts. Marie explained that she is a strong advocate of giving her students ongoing opportunities such as these, to strengthen their literacy skills. She believes that students will need to possess strong literacy skills in the future, since “literacy is a skill required in the workforce.” Therefore, she believes that every secondary teacher, regardless of content area, has the responsibility to teach literacy and to offer students ongoing practice in reading and writing.

Marie described that she attributes her beliefs and literacy-integration efforts to her work experience prior to teaching. As she explained,

I have a business background. Being in the workforce, it’s amazing to me how few people can write decently and speak decently. I can remember working in an office and somebody couldn’t even really alphabetize. I was like, “What’s going on in education here?”

Marie's prior-to-teaching work experience made her aware of the fact that literacy skills among people in the workforce can be lacking at times, and this influenced her desire to place an emphasis on building students' literacy skills through literacy-instruction integration. In addition, Marie explained that she constantly reads business articles, and these have influenced her as well:

I'm always looking up articles about what employers want from employees and what problems they have. I was just reading an interesting article about how, in a business, they were having to bring in people to teach employees how to write a decent memo, with spelling and grammar, and just with complete sentences that make sense. So, a driving thought that always stays in the back of my mind is what businesses say about the employees they're getting and how they can't read well or write a decent sentence.

Marie's experiences in and knowledge of the business world have influenced and continue to influence her efforts to integrate literacy instruction into her content area.

Other driving factors that have influenced Marie's efforts to integrate literacy instruction have been the concerns that have developed within Marie throughout her teaching career. For example, she mentioned that she has become increasingly concerned at how many students seem to be lacking in their reading-comprehension, inferencing, and articulation-of-thought skills; she said, "Students will read a paragraph and just go, 'I don't get it,' and I'll say, 'Well, what don't you get? Do you not understand the vocabulary?'" and they'll say, 'I don't know; I just don't understand it.' In addition, Marie stated that many students seem to prefer to memorize, regurgitate, and/or copy down

information, and they prefer for the teacher to tell them the answers or to explain things to them rather than thinking deeply and critically on their own; as she explained,

When students don't understand a term, many times they won't look it up. They'll wait for [the teacher] to define it. If they don't understand what it's inferring, or the hidden meaning in a text, they'll wait for [the teacher] to tell them.

Marie described this as students having a lack of independent-thinking skills.

Furthermore, Marie said that students seem to struggle in their range and knowledge of “general vocabulary;” as a result of this observation, Marie said that she changed her instructional practices to include more emphasis on Tier 2 vocabulary (see Definitions section in Chapter 1). In fact, Marie explained that many of her concerns regarding students' literacy skills resulted in her incorporating more literacy-related activities into her instructional practices.

In this way, Marie's literacy-integration efforts have been self-initiated. She stated that she has not been, nor is being, held accountable by administration to incorporate literacy instruction. She added further that even if literacy-instruction integration was something that had ever been pushed by administration, she “probably would not have known about it,” since it has been her experience at each one of her schools of employment that “if there is something that's being pushed, encouraged, or required as a skill, [elective teachers are] kind of left out of the loop...for training and professional development.” She said that more teachers, including elective teachers, would buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area if administrators better communicated the importance of it in every content area, and if administrators offered more professional development for teachers. She stated that

professional development on literacy-instruction integration in her content area would be valuable to her so that she could learn more. In addition, she offered suggestions for getting other teachers to buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area: She explained that teachers who have not bought-in need help realizing (a) “that kids aren’t understanding what they’re reading and need guidance;” (b) that students need practice in literacy to prepare them for their future; (c) that integrating literacy in the content area does not have to be something that takes a long time out of class time; and (d) that content can be taught through literacy instruction.

Renee

Renee, a high school teacher of nine years, currently teaches history, but prior to becoming a fulltime history teacher, Renee taught English and even received her master’s degree in English language arts. However, her work history demonstrates that she has slightly more experience in teaching history than English. Renee explained that, within her history classes, she integrates literacy instruction through use of “guided and purposeful” reading and writing activities that give students opportunities to develop their reading-comprehension, inferencing, higher-order thinking, and articulation-of-thought skills. The types of reading activities she mentioned included having students read content-related articles and texts that she has chunked ahead of time. The writing activities she described ranged from having students annotate or complete graphic organizers for sections of texts to having students write analytically about texts, using textual evidence to support their claims; Renee said that she pushes her students to practice articulating their thoughts, verbally and in written form, using explanations and supporting evidence to do so.

Renee stated that she incorporates literacy instruction into every lesson, through use of what she labeled as “quick and easy strategies.” As she explained,

We do a lot of reading in history, and I'm a big believer in quick and easy strategies. It doesn't have to be complex or fancy, but when I assign a reading, the students have to have some sort of purpose for the reading. It could be just something as simple as pick out three pieces of information you think are the most important and tell why. The *why* component is very important, because that's higher order and makes students have to form an argument using textual evidence.

In addition, she described her strategies as being “before-, during-, and after-reading strategies,” through which she can “set the stage for students before reading [a] text, guide them while reading, and have them do something after the reading, to ensure they've comprehended what they read.”

Renee explained that she believes that it is every secondary teacher's responsibility to teach literacy, regardless of content area. She believes that each content area teacher should bring in literacy instruction through use of content-related informational texts, and she believes that these types of texts “are more relevant to high school students' futures” than the fictional texts they are required to read in their English language arts (ELA) classes. As she stated, “I am an English teacher at heart; that's my first love, and I want to share that love with students, but let's be real: Most students are not going to be reading fiction for a living.” This further explained what she wrote on her preliminary questionnaire and later verified during the interview:

Students will be required to be literate on a variety of levels after graduating high school. Therefore, it is especially important that all teachers, core and noncore,

expose students to opportunities to exercise their literacy skills. However, many of our students will not be pursuing a career after graduation that requires reading fiction; therefore, you might argue that non-ELA teachers shoulder [more] responsibility in literacy education to equip students to read real-world, relevant texts.

Renee described two influencing factors that have contributed to her beliefs and literacy-integration efforts. One factor has been the master's degree she received in ELA; she said that this enhanced her understanding and use of literacy-instruction integration within her history classes. As she explained in her preliminary questionnaire and later verified during her interview, "I feel that since I received my master's in ELA instruction, I am well equipped with strategies to teach literacy; I simply apply them in a history classroom." Another influencing factor that has contributed to her beliefs and literacy-integration efforts has been her growing concern over time that more and more students seem to be lacking in reading-comprehension, inferring, and articulation-of-thought skills and also seem to prefer to copy down and regurgitate information rather than to think critically on their own. As she explained during the interview:

I don't often like to use the textbooks, because students have been trained by previous history teachers to just copy and copy from the textbook, and then when I confront [the students] and say, "What does that mean?" they don't know; they can't articulate it to me. They just copied from the book without comprehending what they read.

Renee explained that she has learned from working with students over time that students need help in improving their literacy-related skills; therefore, she consistently makes efforts to integrate literacy-related activities into her instructional practices.

Although Renee feels “well equipped...to teach literacy” within her history classroom, she stated that professional development on literacy-instruction integration in her content area would be valuable to her, especially if she could learn from other social studies teachers about how they incorporate literacy instruction. In addition, she stated that she and colleagues could benefit from having professional development sessions with business leaders, to learn from their perspective what students will need to be able to do in the business world, as it relates to reading and writing. For example, she said,

Sometimes I think we teachers get caught up in this academic world. I mean, this is all I've done; I've never been in the business world. So, maybe if someone from the business community could come in and say, “Hey, this is what we'd like our employees to be able to do,” and then show us, I think that could be really beneficial, because it would make it more meaningful to teachers.

Renee further expressed the need for teachers to be shown how to incorporate literacy. She said that, compared to when she began teaching almost ten years ago, she believes that more high school teachers have at least accepted the idea that literacy instruction should be a part of their role as a teacher, but the problem continues to be that many “do not know how to do literacy instruction” and, therefore, are hesitant about it or do not want to do it. She believes that there would be more teacher buy-in if they had help understanding that literacy instruction does not have to take a long time, and, depending on the content area, it does not have to occur every day; in addition, teachers need to be

shown “quick and easy strategies” that apply to their specific content area, and they need to understand that they can “just start with incorporating one literacy strategy and add to it over time.”

Mona

Mona, a science teacher of 16 years, stated that she integrates literacy instruction as a means for teaching students course content, and she described her literacy-instruction integration as involving the inclusion of reading and writing activities, as well as activities that develop students’ higher-order thinking skills and knowledge of discipline-specific vocabulary. For example, within every lesson, she includes Tier 3 vocabulary instruction (see Definitions section in Chapter 1), and, throughout the year, she engages students in a variety of literacy-related activities, such as by having students work in small groups to read, discuss, and analyze sections of scientific articles or by having students individually read through a content-related passage, analyze the information, and generate a written argument about the information, using textual evidence to justify their thoughts. In addition, once a year, Mona integrates a supplemental, course-related nonfiction book that students read outside of class; she assigns students to read a certain number of pages by a certain due date, and then she quizzes students on their comprehension of the assigned reading and holds a class discussion about it.

Mona described attributing her literacy-integration efforts to realizations she had over a two-year period (i.e., from 2015 to 2017) while attending outside-district professional development workshops that were related to the advanced placement (AP) science course she was teaching. According to Mona, the workshops placed a heavy emphasis on literacy within the science classroom, and through them, she learned

numerous strategies for bridging literacy with content instruction. Mona said that the workshops were very helpful to her because before attending the workshops, she was a “pure lecturer” and “was never into helping kids with reading;” she said that she “didn’t think it was part of [her] job” because she thought, “well, they taught reading in elementary school, so I don’t need to help them in reading.” However, through attending the AP professional development workshops, Mona came to the realization that students need guidance with science vocabulary and reading, and she realized that she should be giving students more opportunities to practice reading. As she explained,

I came to the realization that there was a lot of vocabulary and information that I needed to help students understand. I talk the science talk all the time; they do not. I need to help them; I need to focus more on reading science material in my classes, and I need to give them strategies and ways to be able to break down information and to gain knowledge from that information.

As a result, Mona began implementing literacy-related activities within her AP classes, and she continued to do so more and more over time.

Along with Mona’s realizations being a contributing factor to her literacy-integration efforts, Mona described that her experiences of student buy-in and success with her efforts also contributed. For example, Mona explained the following:

We did a generate-an-argument assignment a couple of days ago. That’s where they were given information, and they had to read and then analyze that and then provide their evidence according to what the paper said and then justify their thoughts. It was really neat when one of them said, “I really understand this. I really get it this time.” This is the fourth one that we’ve done, so the first one was

like AHH, but then as we've done them more and they get used to seeing the different terminology and the different things, they're buying in! I'm so happy! Seeing how they've come along this year, I want to do more next year, and I want to do it with all of my classes, not just with my AP students.

Later in the interview, Mona stated that she feels as though she is reaching more students than ever before, by now integrating literacy instruction as she does. Her experiences of student buy-in and success with her efforts have motivated her not only to keep integrating literacy but also to keep increasing the amount that she does so.

In addition, Mona's experiences with integrating literacy have led her to believe that every secondary teacher, no matter the content area, has a responsibility to teach literacy. In fact, her description of this belief included an explanation of why English teachers should *not* be the *only* ones teaching literacy:

If I had to teach an English lesson, I would not be able to do it. I don't know how I'm supposed to expect an English teacher to teach the science-content part of reading. They're not qualified for that either. They're qualified to help students learn to read, but they're not qualified to help students actually understand the science material. I'm the specialist in science content, so I need to help them.

Mona's beliefs and instructional practices regarding literacy-instruction integration changed after her experiences at the AP professional development workshops. She explained that she had never had professional development experiences like those before—where literacy integration in the science classroom was the focus and where she was shown demonstrations and was given time to experience the strategies for herself. She said that previous professional development experiences within her district and at her

school were “mostly lecture style” and did not allow teachers much time afterwards to plan out or to practice incorporating the information presented before a new professional development topic would be introduced. However, Mona’s experiences with the AP professional development workshops, along with her experiences of student success with her literacy-integration efforts, led her to want to continue learning and growing in her efforts. In fact, she stated during the interview that, recently, she had taken it upon herself to sign up for a college course called *Reading to Learn Scientific Texts*, “a free online course through Stanford University that [would] be offered [over the upcoming] summer on how to teach students how to read in science.” She explained that she decided to take this course because she felt that even though she had “grown a lot,” she has “a lot more room for improvement,” and she wants “to keep learning and improving.”

In addition, Mona described wanting to help other teachers get on board with incorporating literacy instruction. For example, she mentioned having other teachers visit her classroom and talk to her, so that she could show them what she has been doing with her students to incorporate “reading to learn,” as she believes that teachers need to see demonstrations, to make what they are learning more meaningful to them. However, she emphasized that teachers need additional time and opportunity to experience and later practice what they have learned, because, as she explained, she never would have tried the strategies in her classes had she only been told about them and not experienced them during her training. In addition, she emphasized that teachers need help understanding that literacy-instruction integration does not have to be something that takes a long time out of class, and more importantly, she said, teachers need help understanding that content can be taught through literacy-instruction integration.

Jean

Jean, a math teacher of eight years, described her literacy-instruction integration as involving the inclusion of reading and writing activities, as well as the inclusion of discipline-specific vocabulary instruction. She explained that, to her, every secondary teacher has a responsibility to teach literacy, regardless of content area, and she believes her role in this is to develop students' skills in *mathematical* literacy. For this reason, she emphasizes math terminology with her students every day, and she includes on every assessment a vocabulary section where she tests students' knowledge of the math terminology. As she explained, "I teach my students to use proper mathematical terminology in everything they do for me. Like, they can't say *top number* and *bottom number*; they have to say *numerator* and *denominator*." She requires her students to use math terminology in their verbal and written explanations of completed math problems, and she pushes herself to use proper terminology during instruction, when asking review questions, and when giving directions to practice activities or on tests. She believes that constant use of and emphasis on math vocabulary will help students develop deep conceptual knowledge over time, because the vocabulary will help them to make connections across concepts; in addition, it will help students be able to comprehend tasks required of them in directions to math activities or in word problems, as well as to articulate, orally and in written form, why they have worked a problem as they have and justify their results.

Along with Jean's consistent emphasis on math terminology, she integrates other literacy-related activities throughout the year. For example, she explained the following:

I try to do a lot of projects. One of the projects I recently did was a research project related to college and career requirements like ACT and GPA. When I give something like this, I always include reflections and writing opportunities; so, with this one, students had to do a one-page journal entry. Another assignment that I gave this year was prior to doing the lesson on complex numbers. I gave students an excerpt from this book that talked about the origins of the complex number i —why we have it, where it came from, the history behind it. And we had a round table discussion of that, and they had to write about that. I always grade their writing assignments. While I don't grade them on those types of things like spelling or grammatical errors or whatnot, I reserve *As* for those that are able to articulate their thoughts properly. So, I don't just give an *A* because you tried necessarily.

Jean described attributing her beliefs and her literacy-integration efforts to two experiences: her work experience prior to teaching and her participation in professional development sessions held by the Alabama State Department of Education from 2012 to 2015. Regarding her work experience prior to becoming a teacher, Jean explained, “I worked in industry first, and I think just having been in industry and having to communicate made me realize the importance of teaching my students what the real world is really like.” Through this experience, Jean learned the importance of knowing how to communicate, which impacted the emphasis she places on math terminology and student articulation of thought. The second influential experience for Jean was her long-term participation in the professional development workshops conducted by the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE), after the state adoption of the College- and

Career-Ready Standards (CCRS) for the areas of math, English language arts, and literacy, in 2010. (The CCRS were the product of combining the Common Core State Standards for math and English language arts with specific content standards from the previously used courses of study in Alabama.) The CCRS for math were implemented in Alabama schools at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year. From roughly 2012 to 2015, Jean served as one of the representatives from her school district, attending the state-led professional development trainings on the math CCRS and then conducting turn-around trainings for math teachers in her district and across the state. Jean explained that during this time, she not only was “learning from the workshops how to teach math in a different way” but also was researching on her own and experimenting with what she was learning. She said that all the research she conducted in preparing for the turn-around trainings led her to a deep understanding of how to teach math with a consistent emphasis on vocabulary and through use of deeper-level questions that stemmed from the Depth of Knowledge chart.

This experience, along with her work experience prior to becoming a teacher, contributed to Jean’s beliefs and literacy-integration efforts in her content area. A third influential factor on Jean’s efforts occurred when she first began teaching; she described how she “realized early on as a new teacher” that her students were not grasping new concepts taught, because they could not remember the meaning of discipline-specific vocabulary previously taught. From this, Jean changed her practices to include an ongoing emphasis on the repetitive use and assessment of math terminology. One other influential factor on Jean’s literacy-integration efforts has been the successful experiences she has had with students since implementing literacy instruction. She explained how her

literacy-related efforts and determination continue to increase because her students continue to rise to her level of expectation for what they can do. She explained that that keeps motivating her to keep pushing her students and to keep increasing her level of expectation each year.

Although Jean has received pushback at times from students, parents, and administrators regarding her efforts to emphasize vocabulary and writing in her math classes, she has persisted in her efforts because she believes that what she is doing is for the benefit of her students' future. She explained that she has not had much encouragement from administrators over the years, to persist in her literacy-integration efforts, nor has she been held accountable for doing so, but she said that she feels passionately about making literacy a focus in her math class and, therefore, will continue doing so, as well as improving upon her efforts.

Jess

Jess, an art teacher of 13 years, described her literacy-instruction integration as involving the inclusion of reading and writing activities, as well as activities that develop students' researching skills, higher-order thinking skills, and knowledge of discipline-specific vocabulary. She explained that she believes that it is every secondary teacher's responsibility to teach literacy, regardless of content area, and she believes that reading and writing are skills that students need strengthened through practice in every class, because their future employers will "expect good skills." For this reason, she integrates literacy instruction into every lesson of her Art I classes, through use of reading and writing activities. For example, each lesson begins with students reading information about the upcoming art concept and then taking notes from the reading and writing a

summary of the reading. In addition, once a week, students read a passage about a famous artist and answer reading-comprehension questions, in written form.

Furthermore, once or twice a year, students research more information about a famous artist and create a project based on the information they found.

Likewise, Jess described integrating literacy instruction into her Art II and AP Art classes, though she does so more sporadically throughout the school year than in her Art I classes. For example, she explained that once each grading period or semester, Art II students write an analysis of a work of art; in addition, once or twice a year, they complete a research-based project about an artist, an art period, or an art career, during which they conduct research, write about their findings, and draw something in relation to what they found. Within her AP class, Jess requires students to include a journal entry for each art piece in their portfolio, as they complete each art piece.

Jess described attributing her beliefs and literacy-integration efforts to two influences. One influence was her own experience as an art student in high school; she explained that the types of literacy-related activities that she brings into her classroom are the types of activities she was required to do when taking art. The other influence has been her ongoing concern that students “do not read and write on their own;” she explained that the more she has noticed this, the more motivated she has been to make changes to her instructional practices to include more literacy-related activities. She said that she wants to give students as many opportunities as she can to practice their reading and writing skills in her class, so that they will not “lose those skills” and will be well prepared for life after high school.

However, along with describing influences on her literacy-integration efforts, Jess described beliefs that limit her efforts. The first belief is that she does not have the time to bring in literacy instruction more than she does. As she explained,

I feel like with the time we have and the fact that we have to—the art part is what makes an art class. I do value them being exposed to reading in all classes, and I feel like trying to incorporate reading and writing at a reasonable level throughout the year is good, because this is an art class, not an English class.

The second belief is that she does not know enough about the instruction and grading of student writing to be influential on students' writing skills. As she explained,

Well, I'm not an English teacher; I'm not a reading teacher. My students are from ninth to twelfth grades, so I have all age groups in all my classes. Not only do I have all age groups in all my classes, but I also have different ranges from IEP to gifted. So, I struggle with knowing what level each individual student should be at. Like, the level a ninth grader writes at is going to be different than the level a twelfth grader is writing at, and so should I grade their writing differently, or should I be holding them all to the same standard across the board? I don't know.

Because of her uncertainty, she grades students' writing assignments for completion of the assignment, rather than for articulation of thought. She stated, "As it is now, I don't think I'm influencing them a great deal, because they know that they're going to get the credit for doing it, even if it's not done well." She expressed the desire to improve upon this practice, for the benefit of her students, but she equally expressed the concern that she does not know enough about the instruction of writing to be able to be influential on her students' writing skills.

Jess said that professional development on literacy-instruction integration would be valuable to her. She said that, currently, she does not receive any at her school, and she said that she is not being held accountable by administration for incorporating literacy. She explained that “at some point a couple of years ago,” teachers were required to make students do a writing assessment and then to grade it, but teachers “were never asked for it or told to do anything else with it or to do anything else like it in the future.” Jess said that if she ever were to be held accountable for incorporating literacy and were to be given professional development on doing so, she would happily expand her efforts. However, she explained that professional development would only be helpful to her if it were to be “professional development just for art.” She said that too often “elective teachers get thrown in with other content areas, and the information is so broad and generalized because the presenter is trying to reach everybody, and then no one gets anything specifically useful out of it.” She said that it would be most beneficial to her if “an art teacher who has really focused on literacy instruction in the art classroom could give [her] insight into what [she] could do differently or better.”

Laura

Laura, a science teacher of seven years, described her literacy-instruction integration as involving the inclusion of reading and writing activities, as well as the inclusion of discipline-specific vocabulary instruction. The reading and writing activities she described involved students reading sections of the course textbook for information and vocabulary and then answering questions about the readings. Laura explained that through use of these activities, she emphasizes content vocabulary with students on a daily basis; in fact, she said that she has designed her lessons so that she can expose her

students to lesson vocabulary at least three times per lesson. She explained the following:

First, I have students read the textbook to research vocabulary and information and answer questions I've given them. This helps students become familiar with the lesson vocabulary and content before I ever start lecturing and using the vocabulary for that lesson in my lectures. Then, during my lectures, I try to break down words and definitions into common-sense phrases, to help them understand the vocabulary better. And then after the lecture, I have students work with the vocabulary and content again, like with a workbook page.

For Laura, placing consistent emphasis on science vocabulary with her students is necessary, because she believes that students cannot learn a concept if they do not understand the content vocabulary attached to it. She explained feeling this way because, as a newer teacher, she realized that students “were not gaining much from [her] lectures because they didn't understand the vocabulary words [she] was using in the lectures.” As a result, she changed her instructional methods to have students read and “work with the new vocabulary first, prior to the lectures.”

Laura described holding the belief that it is every secondary teacher's responsibility to teach literacy, regardless of content area, and to provide students practice in vocabulary skills. As she explained, “Students need literacy instruction in every class because every class has its own lingo that students need help understanding, in order to be able to understand that class' content.” She further explained, “We can't just have students memorize vocabulary; we have to teach them skills to break down vocabulary, so they can apply those skills to new words later on.” It is for this reason that

Laura said she includes within her vocabulary instruction an emphasis on academic vocabulary (i.e., Tier 2 vocabulary) as well. As she described, “I also stress across-the-board vocabulary like *synonymous* and *analyze*, because those are words students need to know in any class, and those are words they stumble on sometimes on the ACT.”

Laura’s strong belief in the importance of vocabulary instruction within a class has influenced her literacy-integration efforts (i.e., the emphasis she places on teaching vocabulary). However, Laura described holding other beliefs that could be limiting her from including a variety of literacy-related instructional practices. For example, she mentioned that she feels pressure to cover course content and standards and, therefore, believes that she does not have time to bring in literacy instruction more than she does. In addition, she expressed the belief that she, as a science teacher, does not have the creativity needed to integrate literacy instruction into science. She explained the following:

I think when you start talking about literacy, especially in a science classroom, the teacher has to think more creatively than we science teachers think. Because we're pretty much canned: This is the content; this is what you do. So, the minute you start talking literacy, that means I've got to creatively think, “How can I get literacy put in here?” I think that's probably why you might not see very many science teachers take to it quickly or easily. It's a challenging thing for us to think that way.

Furthermore, Laura expressed the belief that literacy instruction is a separate entity from content-area instruction. Evidence of this included the statement, “I've got to make sure that I'm covering all these standards, so I'm not always consistent on focusing on saying

like, ‘Okay, we’re doing literacy today,’” as well as her statement that she does not have students read the scientific articles supplemented within the course textbook unless she needs “a filler activity, like when there will be a substitute that day.” Although, later, she expressed value in bringing in other literacy-related activities when she stated, “Maybe we need to bring back some of those things, where you bring in a science article of the week and discuss it;” however, she followed this statement with the comment: “But you know, it’s all this time constraint thing, isn’t it? I mean, that’s the problem with it.”

The realizations Laura had as a new teacher regarding the need for her to emphasize content vocabulary led her to change her instructional practices to include more vocabulary instruction and to believe that vocabulary instruction should be an important emphasis in all secondary content areas. However, by Laura viewing literacy instruction and content instruction as two separate entities, she feels as though she is not creative enough and does not have time to bring in more literacy-related activities beyond vocabulary instruction. Nonetheless, she said that professional development on literacy-instruction integration in her content area would be valuable to her; she stated that “being able to fully spend time learning about the specific literacy in [my content area] would be so helpful because our vocabulary is so unique.” Although she only mentioned seeing value in professional development related to vocabulary in her content area and no other types of literacy-related practices, she did say that she would find professional development valuable if she could learn from someone who knows about literacy in her specific content area. She explained that, in the past, literacy-related professional development has not been helpful because it has always been led by English teachers or reading teachers who “are so removed from [her] content area” that they do not introduce

applicable or practical ideas for use within her discipline. She said that, as a result, those presenters “only show things like Socratic Circles, and you’re left trying to interpret how to make that work in your classroom.” She said that it ends up being a waste of time. She explained that it would be useful to her, and to other science teachers, if they were to be presented with professional development that was designed “especially for science teachers.” To this, she added that “for some science teachers, though, it will take more; it will take administrators making literacy more of a consistent focus and holding teachers accountable for it.” She suggested that it would be helpful to have a year-long focus on just literacy, because “the more teachers hear it, the more they will do it, because they know their administrators are serious about it.”

Rachel

Rachel, a math teacher of 24 years, emphasized that her role as a math teacher is to help students in developing their skills in *mathematical* literacy, which, to her, involves placing an emphasis on math vocabulary. She explained that she emphasizes math terminology during instruction and requires students to use the terminology in their oral and written explanations of solutions to math problems; in addition, she requires students to keep a running list of math words and definitions as they encounter new words, quizzes students on their knowledge of math terminology, and re-quizzes students on frequently missed math vocabulary and concepts. She said that constant use of and emphasis on math vocabulary not only can help students understand what mathematical tasks are involved in accomplishing word problems and in following directions to activities but also can help develop students’ conceptual knowledge over time, which will aid students on the math portion of the ACT and in future math courses in college.

Rachel explained that her belief in the importance of developing students' mathematical literacy came about after realizing that the trouble her students were experiencing in grasping mathematical concepts had to do with their understanding and retention of the math terminology. She said that from that realization, she began implementing ways to help students retain math vocabulary, and, as a result, she saw growth over time in student understanding and retention of math terminology and, thus, growth in student comprehension of math concepts. Rachel's ongoing experiences with student growth have motivated her to continue her efforts in emphasizing math vocabulary.

Although Rachel described having high motivation to incorporate instruction and emphasis on math vocabulary in her classes, she described having low motivation to integrate other literacy-related instructional practices and activities, because she does not believe she has the time to do so and still be able to cover course content. For example, she stated, "When I think about all the objectives in the course of study, the things we have to cover, I don't think I could add anymore." Later she stated, "It seems like, at one point in time, [administrators] wanted all of us to bring in some reading and writing [into our classes]; I was thinking, how am I going to fit that in? I feel like I'm overwhelmed already."

Rachel made several comments such as these throughout the interview; however, later in the interview, she expressed value in the idea of high school students getting literacy instruction in every class. She explained that she has noticed in the past that students seem to have limited vocabulary in general, so much so that "they cannot relate to some of the passages on the ACT" or cannot understand word problems. She added

that she was not “just talking about mathematical vocabulary;” she was referring to “vocabulary a Junior or Senior in high school should know” (i.e., Tier 2 vocabulary). Even so, however, her feelings of pressure to cover course content have prevailed. For example, after she stated that she is overwhelmed by the amount of course content she must teach in a year, she said this of integrating more literacy instruction: “Might it help the students? Probably so, but I don't think I can do it.”

Nonetheless, Rachel explained that she could benefit from professional development on how to integrate more literacy instruction, but she said that it would have to be “the proper type of professional development.” She explained that, too often, professional development is “nothing but lectures” and “you never have time to practice anything you're told.” She said that she would like to have strategies modeled for her, and she would like to be given time to “let it sink in” and to practice it. However, even with these suggestions for professional development, she questioned whether the new strategies would be applicable to her content area, and she still questioned whether she could fit in the new strategies, given all the content she must cover in a year.

Carla

Carla, a science teacher of five years, described her literacy-instruction integration as involving the inclusion of reading and writing activities, as well as the instruction of discipline-specific vocabulary. She explained that she emphasizes course vocabulary with students on a daily basis; in addition, over a period of several weeks, she engages students in the reading of a content-related, nonfiction book, to supplement course materials. She said that she assigns students to read a certain number of pages outside of

class time, by a certain due date, and then quizzes students on their comprehension of the assigned reading and holds a class discussion about it.

According to Carla, the majority of her literacy-instruction integration takes place through the reading and discussions involved in using the supplemental book and through the writing students do on their comprehension quizzes of the assigned readings. She explained that she incorporated the supplemental book readings and quizzes two years ago, in order to comply with her administrator's expectations for teachers to include literacy instruction within their content area. She said that, at the time, she did not know how to apply literacy within her content area, so she took some time to research information and materials for doing so and came across the supplemental book idea. She said that she continues to incorporate the book once a year, even though she is no longer held accountable by administration to do so. However, she mentioned that she has not expanded use of the book to her non-Honors classes, because, as she explained, "I am still in a place where I'm still testing the waters with it and trying to get more confident with it." In addition, she said that she has not expanded her literacy instruction to include any other types of literacy-related activities, because she feels as though she does "not know how to do literacy" in her content area.

In fact, throughout the interview, Carla described three other beliefs of hers that could be contributing to her limited literacy-instruction integration. For one, she described literacy integration as a separate entity from content instruction. Evidence of this included her statement that if she were to be held accountable again for including literacy instruction, she would comply, because, as she explained, "It wouldn't be a huge thing to ask if it wasn't more than 10 minutes to throw in there." Additionally, she stated,

“I don't necessarily stop what we're doing to really focus on that...[because] we have to get through what's in our course of study”—a statement which indicated also a belief that she does not have time to focus on literacy more than she does, because it will take away from coverage of course content and standards. Furthermore, Carla said that she believes that literacy instruction is the responsibility of English teachers. As she explained, “literacy should be fostered through all subjects to some degree,” because, after high school, students will need to be able to “communicate in a professional manner, orally and in written form, regardless of career or college path;” however, according to Carla, fostering literacy is “primarily the job of English teachers, as outlined in their course of study.”

Nevertheless, Carla stated that she would be willing to incorporate more literacy instruction “if it were required of [her].” She explained that she “would be happy to comply” as long as she were “to be provided with the right professional development,” where she could be shown how to incorporate literacy instruction “in a practical way;” with this, she said that she “would not be opposed to bringing in more literacy.” Additionally, she offered that the “right professional development” would include opportunities to learn from teachers who teach her specific subject area within the science discipline (e.g., Earth Science, Physical Science, Biology, Anatomy, Chemistry, Physics, etc.). She explained that it is not always useful to meet with a mix of science teachers; as an example, she said, “Even though Biology is a huge part of Anatomy, Biology stuff isn't always going to apply to what a teacher is trying to get accomplished in the Anatomy classroom.” She said that opportunities to learn from and to collaborate with

teachers from within her specific area of science would boost her confidence in teaching the book and in bringing in other literacy-related ideas.

Lucy

Lucy, an art teacher of 24 years, defined her literacy-instruction integration as involving reading and writing activities, as well as activities that develop students' higher-order thinking skills and knowledge of discipline-specific vocabulary. She explained that, in her Art I classes, she emphasizes content vocabulary in each lesson, and, in her Art II classes, she requires students to write an analysis about a work of art, once or twice per semester; as she described it, this assignment involves having students "read a work of art, break it down visually and write about it, using higher-order thinking skills like describing, analyzing, interpreting, and evaluating." However, Lucy pinpointed a weekly activity that she requires of her Art I students as being her main form of literacy integration. She said that, once a week, she requires her students to read a passage about a famous artist and then answer reading-comprehension questions in writing. She said that she incorporated the weekly readings a couple of years ago, in order to comply with what her administrator required of teachers at the time. As she explained it, her principal, about three years ago, told the faculty that they needed to begin including more reading and writing components in their classes on a regular basis. To meet that requirement, she spent the next summer creating the weekly passages and questions on famous artists; she stated that she wanted to create something that she "could do and would actually use."

Lucy explained that she has been using the weekly passages with her Art I students ever since, even though her administrators no longer require teachers to integrate

literacy within their content area. However, throughout Lucy's explanation of this, she expressed frustration with the fact that, to her, administrators always choose what she called "traditional literacy," meaning, literacy that emphasizes practice in reading and writing skills only, as the type of literacy they expect of teachers, regardless of content area. She stated the following:

I have been teaching 24 years, and I have always included the reading-a-work-of-art assignment. And I've always felt like that was literacy, and even on a higher-level thinking than is in the average classroom, because with that assignment, [students are] having to break something visual down, and then put it into words, which uses a whole different part of your brain. And yet, that never falls into any of the categories that we're supposed to be doing with literacy.

Also, Lucy explained that she believes that traditional literacy instruction is the responsibility of English teachers; she said that English class is the most beneficial place for students to practice that type of literacy.

Nonetheless, Lucy stated that she would be willing to incorporate more instruction of traditional literacy if administrators were to require it of her again. However, she added that doing so would take away part of the experience of her class; as she explained, "regularly incorporating literacy strategies would disrupt the creative process for kids at times." In addition, she said that if increasing her literacy-instruction integration were required of her, related professional development could be useful to her. Although, to this she added that her professional development time would be better spent on training "other art teachers to use literacy in visual arts to support literacy instead of altering the program in which [she has been] trained," as administrators expect her to do.

Elena

Elena has been a high school English teacher for over 20 years; however, for the last two years, she has been teaching history. Although Elena's professional background involves considerable experience incorporating literacy instruction into an English classroom, Elena reported that she has not integrated literacy instruction into her history classes very much. She said that, occasionally, she will have students read the textbook to supplement her instruction, so that they can see how the same information is presented and explained in the textbook; also, she will have students write analytically about the reading and will require them to use textual evidence to support their claims. In addition, Elena said that, on occasion, she will emphasize Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary. As she explained,

I haven't quite figured out literacy in history yet. Some things will catch my eye in the middle of a lesson, like when students don't seem to understand something. I may just off the cuff say, "Everybody look at this word, and look at the root of this word, and look at how this phrase is worded within the speech." That wasn't really my original goal, but I'm realizing more and more that these students, just like my students in an English class, could benefit if we focused on this word or that word. So now, sometimes I'll be reviewing my notes for my lesson, and I'll say, "Oh there's a word we need to go over," and I'll add it to my lesson plan.

Elena explained that the words she decides to emphasize during a lesson sometimes end up being not just discipline-specific vocabulary but also what she called "across-the-board" vocabulary (i.e., Tier 2 vocabulary). She described holding the belief that students need vocabulary instruction of Tier 2 words in all of their classes, so that

“they can see connections between and across disciplines” and so that their repertoire of Tier 2 vocabulary knowledge can widen, as she has noticed over the years that students do not have a wide range of academic-vocabulary knowledge. In addition, she described believing that it is every secondary teacher's responsibility to teach literacy, regardless of content area. As part of her explanation of this belief, she explained why she believes that English teachers should *not* be the *only* ones teaching literacy:

If we leave it up to just the English teachers, literacy instruction might not happen to the extent it should because there are so many standards to cover in English. You have the writing standards and the language standards and the reading-informational-texts standards versus the reading-fiction standards. It's unbelievable.

Furthermore, Elena explained that by every teacher, regardless of content area, emphasizing literacy in his or her classroom, students' literacy skills can be developed and practiced on a consistent basis, which she believes is important because students not only will need those skills in their future but also “need to know how to read on their own and how to think independently about what they read, free of technology.”

Although Elena holds these beliefs, she explained that she is still learning how to integrate literacy instruction into her history classes. She described feeling pressure to meet course standards and to cover a specific amount of course content by the end of the school year, as reasons for not having brought in literacy instruction more than she has. However, she immediately added to this: “But then I question myself all the time: ‘If I had stopped and addressed this literacy concern over here, could we have plowed through this more quickly, because this one thread could have woven it all together?’” Over time,

however, she is becoming more comfortable with stopping to address the literacy concerns that arise, through vocabulary instruction, and she has received positive feedback from students after doing so, which has motivated her to persist in doing so.

For example, she said,

I've had students this year say things like, "I am going to remember that because you talked about that word," or say something like, "I like it when you tell us about words, because that sticks with me." And I'm like, "Okay, I'll keep doing it!"

Her positive experiences thus far with integrating vocabulary instruction have motivated her to want to keep persisting in doing so and even to want to be more intentional about doing so within her lessons.

Overall, Elena said that she is still developing herself as a history teacher.

Although she has knowledge of a variety of literacy-related instructional practices and activities, she stated that professional development on literacy-instruction integration in history would be valuable to her, especially if she could learn from other social studies teachers about how they incorporate literacy instruction and if she could see various strategies demonstrated. She said that, too often, literacy-related professional development is not beneficial to teachers because either the information presented is not relevant or is vague. For example, she said,

A lot of what we tend to get in terms of literacy professional development tends to approach it like we're only trying to reach people who are non-readers....Then sometimes we get these strategies that might be useful in a sixth-grade classroom, but they're not necessarily useful [at the high school level]. Or, somebody only

shows how it's useful in the English classroom. Or, an English teacher is the presenter and says to the group, "Here's how we do it in English; now think of ways you could do that in your classroom."

She said that she needs more information that is specifically applicable to history, and she needs to see demonstrations.

As Elena continued talking about her professional development needs as a novice history teacher, she offered numerous suggestions for ways to make professional development be something that helps teachers buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in their content area. (In fact, during this part of the interview, it was as though she transitioned to speaking as the veteran English teacher she had become over the years, the one who is very knowledgeable about literacy integration; she spoke with confidence, as if she had forgotten her own lack of action and lack of confidence in integrating literacy within her history classes.) First, she explained that professional development needs to help teachers who have not bought-in to the idea of literacy instruction realize that literacy instruction does not have to take a long time. She said that teachers have a misconception that literacy integration has to take time away from content coverage; she said that it does not and suggested that it could be as simple as being the focus of a bell-ringer assignment. Second, she said that professional development needs to help teachers realize that literacy instruction would be beneficial to students, because students often do not understand what they read and need guidance. Third, she said that professional development needs to help teachers realize that literacy-instruction integration is something they *can* do.

For example, she stated,

Teachers [need] to see it in action...in small groups instead of in a big cluster of teachers. They need to see it demoed, to teach them how to teach it and to get them to buy into it and be like, “Oh, yeah, I could do that!”

Elena elaborated further on the idea of professional development helping teachers realize that they can incorporate literacy instruction. She said that teachers not only need the literacy component to be modeled for them but also need (a) time to brainstorm and collaborate with same-subject teachers, in small groups, and (b) time to digest the new information and to plan and create materials for bringing about the literacy component.

As she explained,

If we're going to make any connections for teachers about literacy, I think it's going to be in the modeling. Like one summer, model how to teach a literacy component with teachers, and then as soon as that's over, split teachers into small groups to brainstorm together about what they just saw. Then, allow them time to go back to their room and, for example, craft six different bell-ringers where the literacy component modeled is the focus of the bell-ringers. Then the teachers are already ready for the first week of school, and they'll already be addressing literacy. And it's because they've seen it and had time to think about it.

Elena offered one other suggestion for modeling literacy instruction for teachers. She said that part of modeling it could include a small group of same-subject teachers watching a video of a same-subject teacher modeling the literacy component with high school students. She said, “Let's take these four kids and film them and their teacher doing a close-reading activity with a document that's about history for example....And

then let's hear them talk about how the [activity] helped them comprehend the reading.” All of this would allow the teachers to see a demonstration of teacher who teaches their subject area using a literacy strategy to teach course material, and it would allow teachers to hear directly from the high-school students themselves about the benefits of the literacy activity on students' comprehension of the text.

Along with these suggestions, Elena said that more teachers would buy in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area if the same professional development theme was carried over time, and if there was a consistent focus on it throughout the year. She explained that, in the past, the professional development theme at the school has not been consistent over time and has changed too often. As she explained,

Sometimes we do this leaping around. Last year we got this, whatever it was, and I was interested, and then they said, “When you come to the next session, we're going to do this.” Well, then something happened, and the next session really became about something else like school safety, which obviously is important, but there's no continuity. Or it's like somebody from the state level says, “We want you to check off all these boxes.” And, so, we check them off. Nobody grows from any of that.

Findings

Analysis of the data revealed patterns that answered the three subquestions and the central question of this research study. An explanation of the answers to each question follows.

Subquestion 1

What similarities and differences exist among participants' understanding of literacy-instruction integration as it relates to their content area?

All 10 participants defined literacy-instruction integration as involving the inclusion of reading and writing activities. In addition, eight participants said that it involves the inclusion of vocabulary instruction, and five participants added that it involves placing an emphasis on developing other skills within students, such as their higher-order thinking skills. The types of reading activities participants mentioned included students reading for information, by reading content-related passages or articles, or students reading for information and content vocabulary, by reading sections of a course textbook or a PowerPoint; in addition, Carla and Mona described having students read a nonfiction book, to supplement course material. The writing activities that participants described involved students writing briefly about the readings, through use of activities such as completing a graphic organizer, taking notes, answering questions, and writing a summary, or students writing more in depth and analytically about the readings, using textual evidence to support their writing. In addition, Jean, Jess, and Lucy described the use of writing activities without a reading component; they described having students write a reflection after completing a math or an art project or write an analysis of a work of art. However, only three participants (Renee, Marie, and Mona)

described using reading and writing activities to guide students' comprehension of texts. All three said that they chunk texts into sections ahead of time; Mona and Renee added that they have students annotate sections of texts as well.

The eight participants who described literacy-instruction integration as involving the instruction of content vocabulary (i.e., Tier 3 vocabulary; see Definitions section in Chapter 1) said that students need vocabulary instruction to help them in grasping course content. For example, Jean and Rachel strongly felt that constant use of and emphasis on math vocabulary would help students develop deep conceptual knowledge over time, because the vocabulary would help them to make more connections across concepts. Also, Laura and Elena described the importance of including in vocabulary instruction an emphasis on Tier 2 vocabulary (see Definitions section in Chapter 1), because, as Elena stated, instruction on both types of words will help students “see connections between and across disciplines.”

In addition to participants' descriptions of literacy-instruction integration as involving reading, writing, and vocabulary activities, five participants (Renee, Mona, Jess, Lucy, and Elena) defined it as an opportunity to develop students' skills in higher-order thinking, analytical thinking, inferencing, and researching; also, Renee added that she uses writing activities as an opportunity for students to practice articulating their thoughts about the readings and to use explanations and supporting evidence to do so.

Subquestion 2

What similarities and differences exist among the ways in which participants incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction, as well as among the extent to which they do so?

The ways in which participants incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction varied. Nine of the participants (all but Elena) reported incorporating some type of literacy instruction into every lesson. Laura, Mona, Carla, Lucy, Jean, and Rachel described doing so by emphasizing content-related vocabulary throughout each lesson. In comparison, Jess, Marie, and Renee described doing so by incorporating reading and writing activities into every lesson. For example, Jess said that every Art I lesson begins with students reading information about the upcoming art concept and then taking notes from the reading and writing a summary of it. Marie said that she introduces every lesson by requiring students to read through the lesson PowerPoint and complete a graphic organizer for the information, to give students an opportunity to explore the information before she talks about it. Like Marie, Renee said that she incorporates use of texts and graphic organizers into every lesson; however, she continues her literacy-related instructional practices throughout the lessons. For example, she explained that she uses before-, during-, and after-reading strategies to help students comprehend and learn from what they read, and she said that several of the after-reading strategies that she utilizes regularly involve writing activities that require students to practice their higher-order thinking skills and to think analytically.

Six of the nine participants who reported incorporating some type of literacy instruction into every lesson also reported incorporating additional literacy-related activities at various times of the year. Lucy and Jess reported having students read a passage each week about a famous artist and answer questions. Marie reported having students read business and industry articles a few times a month; each time, the articles are chunked into sections, and students have to complete a graphic organizer and then

write about the article using textual evidence, to demonstrate that they comprehended the article. Mona described having students participate in various literacy-related activities throughout the year. For example, she said that students sometimes work in small groups to read, discuss, and analyze sections of scientific articles, or they sometimes work individually to read through a content-related passage, analyze the information, and generate a written argument about the information, using textual evidence to justify their thoughts. Furthermore, Mona and Carla said that they engage students in the reading of a supplemental, course-related non-fiction book, once a year, over a period of several weeks. Both teachers assign students to read a certain number of pages by a certain due date, and then they quiz students on their comprehension of the assigned readings and have a class discussion on them.

Moreover, Jess reported that she requires her Art I and Art II students to complete a project once or twice a year. She said that her Art I students must research and read about a famous artist and then create a project based on the information found. Art II students must complete a research-based project about an artist, an art period, or an art career, during which they conduct research, write about their findings, and draw something in relation to what they found. Like Jess, Jean reported that she has her math students complete course-related projects throughout the year; she said that her projects include “reflections and writing opportunities” for students. Also, she described giving her students an excerpt from a book “about the origins of the complex number i ,” students read and write about it.

Out of the ten participants, Elena was the only participant who did not report integrating any type of literacy instruction with any form of consistency in terms of what

she does and the extent to which she does it. She said that, occasionally, she will emphasize Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary. Also, she said that she will have students read the textbook sometimes, to supplement her instruction, and, at times, she will have students write analytically about the reading and will require them to use textual evidence to support their claims.

Subquestion 3

What beliefs and experiences have contributed to, or have hindered, participants' understanding and implementation of literacy-instruction integration?

Beliefs. To initially explore participants' beliefs regarding literacy-instruction integration, the following question was asked on the preliminary questionnaire: *Whose responsibility should it be to teach explicit literacy instruction to students at the secondary-school level?* All but two of the participants answered, and later verified during the interview, that it is every teacher's responsibility to teach literacy, regardless of content area; however, Rachel added to her response by stating that it is every teacher's responsibility "but not as much in math." Lucy and Carla were the two participants who felt differently, as they stated a belief that literacy instruction is the responsibility of English teachers; for example, Carla said that "literacy should be fostered through all subjects to some degree," but she emphasized later that fostering literacy is "primarily the job of English teachers, as outlined in their course of study." In contrast, Elena and Mona, who believe that literacy instruction is every teacher's responsibility, expanded their answers during the interview by giving reasons why the English teachers should *not* be the *only* ones teaching literacy.

Elena explained the following:

If we leave it up to just the English teachers, literacy instruction might not happen to the extent it should because there are so many standards to cover in English. You have the writing standards and the language standards and the reading-informational-texts standards versus the reading-fiction standards. It's unbelievable.

Mona stated,

If I had to teach an English lesson, I would not be able to do it. I don't know how I'm supposed to expect an English teacher to teach the science-content part of reading. They're not qualified for that either. They're qualified to help students learn to read, but they're not qualified to help students actually understand the science material. I'm the specialist in science content, so I need to help them.

Renee's view took this notion a little further. To her, each content area teacher should bring in literacy instruction through use of content-related informational texts; she believes that these types of texts “are more relevant to high school students' futures” than the fictional texts they are required to read in their English language arts (ELA) classes.

As she explained on her questionnaire and verified during her interview:

Students will be required to be literate on a variety of levels after graduating high school. Therefore, it is especially important that all teachers, core and noncore, expose students to opportunities to exercise their literacy skills. However, many of our students will not be pursuing a career after graduation that requires reading fiction; therefore, you might argue that non-ELA teachers shoulder [more]

responsibility in literacy education to equip students to read real-world, relevant texts.

Along with these beliefs, all 10 participants answered that they believe that high school students do need practice in literacy. Seven of the 10 believe that students should receive it through all classes. Of the remaining three teachers, Jean and Rachel emphasized that their role as math teachers is to help students in developing their skills in mathematical literacy, and Lucy stated that English class is the most beneficial place for students to practice literacy. For those who stated that students do need opportunities to practice literacy skills in all classes, they explained that students need the practice because they will need literacy skills in the future. According to Jess, reading and writing are skills that students need strengthened through practice in every class, because they are “lifelong tools, regardless of what [students] do after graduation;” to this she added that future employers will “expect good skills.” Marie made a similar comment; she said that students need ongoing opportunities to strengthen their literacy skills, because “literacy is a skill required in the workforce,” and students will need to possess strong literacy skills in the future. Elena explained that students need practice in literacy because they will “need to know how to read on their own and how to think independently about what they read, free of technology,” and Carla explained that students will need their literacy skills after high school to be able to “communicate in a professional manner, orally and in written form, regardless of career or college path.” Laura emphasized the need for students to practice vocabulary skills, stating that “we can’t just have students memorize vocabulary; we have to teach them skills to break down vocabulary, so they can apply those skills to new words later on.” Like Laura, Jean

and Rachel emphasized the need for students to practice vocabulary skills but with math terminology, stating that constant practice in mathematical vocabulary would help students do well on the ACT and in future math courses in college.

Beliefs that have hindered. In determining if participants held any beliefs about literacy-instruction integration that could be hindering their integration efforts, certain statements of six of the participants (Laura, Carla, Rachel, Jess, Elena, and Lucy) revealed this possibility as they described how they integrate literacy instruction. Five of the six mentioned that they feel pressure to cover course content and standards and, therefore, do not have time to bring in literacy instruction more than they do; these participants were Laura, Carla, Rachel, Jess, and Elena. For example, Laura explicitly stated, “I’ve got to make sure that I’m covering all these standards.” Carla explained, “I don’t necessarily stop what we’re doing to really focus on [literacy]...[because] we have to get through what’s in our course of study.” Rachel said, “When I think about all the objects in the course of study, the things we have to cover, I don’t think I could add anymore.” Jess indirectly mentioned concerns about time and content coverage when she stated, “I feel like with the time we have and the fact that we have to—the art part is what makes an art class.” Similarly, Elena described feeling pressure to meet course standards and to cover a specific amount of course content by the end of the school year.

In addition to the shared belief among these five participants regarding the possibility of more literacy instruction interfering with coverage of course content, Lucy stated that “regularly incorporating literacy strategies [in art class] would disrupt the creative process for [students] at times.” Furthermore, Carla, Elena, and Laura revealed that they feel lacking in some way and, therefore, cannot integrate literacy instruction

more than they do. For example, Carla and Elena described feeling as though they do not know how to apply literacy within their content area. Carla explicitly stated that she does “not know how to do literacy” in her content area; she stated that she never received enough training on how to apply it. Likewise, Elena said, “I haven’t quite figured out literacy in history yet;” also, in describing her literacy-integration efforts thus far, she said, “A lot of it for me has been accidental.” Along with Carla and Elena describing a belief that they are lacking in knowledge of how to apply literacy, Laura described feeling as though she does not have the creativity needed to integrate literacy instruction into science. She explained the following:

I think when you start talking about literacy, especially in a science classroom, the teacher has to think more creatively than we science teachers think. Because we're pretty much canned: This is the content; this is what you do. So, the minute you start talking literacy, that means I've got to creatively think, “How can I get literacy put in here?” I think that's probably why you might not see very many science teachers take to it quickly or easily. It's a challenging thing for us to think that way.

Experiences that have contributed. While the previous examples demonstrate beliefs held by six of the participants that could possibly be hindering them from putting forth more effort into literacy-instruction integration, eight participants (i.e., all participants except Carla and Lucy) revealed experiences that have contributed to the effort they put into literacy-instruction integration. An analysis of these experiences revealed them to be experiences that brought awareness to the teachers regarding the need for literacy-instruction integration within their classroom; these experiences, from

this point forward, will be referred to as Awareness-Building Experiences (ABEs). Further analysis of the ABEs revealed two types of experiences: External-Teaching Experiences and Within-Classroom Experiences. External-Teaching Experiences (ETEs) were the experiences teachers described that occurred separate from their teaching experiences and time spent with students. Within-Classroom Experiences (WCEs) were the experiences teachers described that occurred while teaching and working with students. Both ETEs and WCEs were experiences that built awareness within teachers and contributed to the effort they put into integrating literacy within their content area.

External-teaching experiences. Five participants (Jess, Renee, Mona, Marie, and Jean) reported external-teaching experiences (ETEs). Jess, Renee, and Mona described one ETE; Marie and Jean described two ETEs. For Jess and Renee, their experiences as students themselves have contributed to their integration of literacy instruction. Jess explained that the types of literacy-related activities that she brings into her classroom (e.g., requiring Art I students to read information about art and write summaries and having Art II students complete a project that involves researching, drawing, and writing) are the types of activities she was required to do as an art student in high school. Likewise, Renee's experiences as a student contributed to her literacy-integration efforts. Prior to becoming a fulltime history teacher, Renee received a master's degree in English language arts (ELA); she said this enhanced her understanding and use of literacy-instruction integration within her history classes. As she explained in her preliminary questionnaire and later verified during her interview, "I feel that since I received my master's in ELA instruction, I am well equipped with strategies to teach literacy; I simply apply them in a history classroom."

Another participant who described one ETE was Mona. Mona's contributing ETE occurred through professional development workshops unrelated to her school and district. From 2015 to 2017, Mona attended several professional development workshops related to the advanced placement (AP) science course she was teaching. According to Mona, the workshops placed a heavy emphasis on literacy integration in science, and through them, she learned numerous strategies for bringing literacy into her content instruction. For example, she learned how to use scientific articles and readings as a tool to teach course content, and she learned how to have students annotate and analyze the readings and then collaborate, discuss, and write about them. Mona explained that, through attending the workshops, she came to the realization that students need guidance with science vocabulary and reading, and she realized that as a "specialist in science content," she should be giving students more opportunities to practice reading science-related texts.

Like Mona, one of Jean's contributing ETEs occurred through her participation in professional development sessions. From 2012 to 2015, Jean served as one of the representatives from her school district and attended professional development training sessions on the newly adopted state standards for math, led by the Alabama State Department of Education. Also, as a representative throughout this time, she conducted turn-around trainings not only for the math teachers in her district but also for math teachers across the state. Jean explained that, from this experience, she not only learned "how to teach math in a different way" but also had time to research and practice on her own. She said that, over time, she developed a deep understanding for how to teach math

with a consistent emphasis on vocabulary and through use of deeper-level questions that stemmed from the Depth of Knowledge chart.

Another ETE for Jean was her work experience prior to becoming a teacher. As Jean explained, “I worked in industry first, and I think just having been in industry and having to communicate made me realize the importance of teaching my students what the real world is really like.” Through this experience, she learned the importance of knowing how to communicate, which impacted the emphasis she places on math terminology and student articulation of thought. For example, she gives her students daily opportunities to practice articulating how they have worked a problem and why they have worked a problem as they have, and when they do not understand something, she requires them “to use math terminology to be able to communicate what they don’t know...and ask the right questions.” Jean’s ETEs—her work experience prior to becoming a teacher, as well as her experiences in attending the math professional development workshops and then conducting the turn-around trainings—contributed to her integration of literacy instruction within her math classes.

Like Jean, Marie’s work experience prior to teaching contributed to her literacy-instruction integration. She stated, “I have a business background. Being in the workforce, it’s amazing to me how few people can write decently and speak decently.” Marie’s prior-to-teaching work experience made her aware of the fact that literacy skills among people in the workforce can be lacking at times, and this influenced her desire to place an emphasis on building students’ literacy skills through literacy-instruction integration. In addition, Marie explained that she constantly reads business articles, and these have influenced her as well:

I'm always looking up articles about what employers want from employees and what problems they have. I was just reading an interesting article about how, in a business, they were having to bring in people to teach employees how to write a decent memo, with spelling and grammar, and just with complete sentences that make sense. So, a driving thought that always stays in the back of my mind is what businesses say about the employees they're getting and how they that can't read well or write a decent sentence.

Marie's experiences in and knowledge of the business world have influenced and continue to influence her efforts to integrate literacy instruction into her content area.

The ETEs just described for Marie, Jean, Mona, Renee, and Jess demonstrate experiences that occurred for these teachers separate from their teaching experiences with students. For Jean and Marie, work experience prior to becoming a teacher influenced their view regarding the importance of literacy-instruction integration. For Jess and Renee, experiences of being students themselves were influential. Mona and Jean described being influenced by professional development experiences that were unrelated to their school, and Marie reported being influenced by her own self-initiated experiences of conducting her own research and staying current with the business world. Each of these experiences brought awareness to the teachers regarding literacy-instruction integration and, thus, contributed to the effort these teachers put in to integrating literacy within their content area.

Within-classroom experiences. Along with the external-teaching experiences (ETEs) just described, eight participants (all but Lucy and Carla) revealed within-classroom experiences (WCEs) that contributed to the effort they put into literacy-

instruction integration. Like ETEs, WCEs were a type of experience that brought awareness to the teachers regarding literacy-instruction integration and, thus, contributed to the effort they put into integrating literacy within their classroom. However, unlike ETEs, which occurred separate from teachers' teaching experiences and time spent with students, WCEs were the experiences teachers described that occurred while teaching and working with students. Eight participants (Jess, Renee, Marie, Mona, Jean, Laura, Rachel, and Elena) reported at least one WCE that helped in their literacy-instruction integration. Further analysis of the reported WCEs revealed two subcategories of WCEs: *concerns* and *student success*. The WCEs related to the subcategory concerns were experiences whereby teachers had made observations that students were lacking in certain literacy-related skills, and their observations caused teachers to be concerned, which, in turn, created within teachers a desire to implement certain practices that could help students in their literacy-related deficiencies. The WCEs related to the subcategory student success were experiences whereby teachers and/or their students experienced success during or after implementation of a literacy-related activity, which, in turn, created within teachers a desire to keep persisting in their literacy-integration efforts. Both subcategories of WCEs, contributed to the effort teachers put in to integrating literacy in their content area. Six participants reported at least one WCE related to the subcategory concerns, and four participants reported at least once WCE related to the subcategory student success.

Concerns as within-classroom experiences. Seven participants (Jess, Renee, Marie, Jean, Laura, Rachel, and Elena) reported at least one within-classroom experience (WCE) related to the subcategory concerns. Further analysis of the described concerns

revealed two main types of concerns: concerns related to *a deficiency within students' general literacy skills* and concerns related to *a deficiency within students' knowledge of vocabulary*. Both types of concerns created within teachers a desire to implement certain practices that could help students in their literacy-related deficiencies.

Three participants (Marie, Renee, and Jess) expressed a concern related to a deficiency within students' general literacy skills. To illustrate, Marie and Renee mentioned that, over time, they have become increasingly concerned at how many students seem to be lacking in their reading-comprehension, inferencing, and articulation-of-thought skills; in addition, both mentioned that many students seem to prefer to memorize, regurgitate, and/or copy down information rather than to think deeply and critically on their own. For example, in explaining her concern of students' lack of reading-comprehension and articulation-of-thought skills, Marie said, "Students will read a paragraph and just go, 'I don't get it,' and I'll say, 'Well, what don't you get? Do you not understand the vocabulary?'" and they'll say, 'I don't know; I just don't understand it.'" Likewise, one of Renee's descriptions of the same concerns included why she, as a history teacher, does not have students work with the textbook very often:

I don't often like to use the textbooks, because students have been trained by previous history teachers to just copy and copy from the textbook, and then when I confront [the students] and say, "What does that mean?" they don't know; they can't articulate it to me. They just copied from the book without comprehending what they read. Like if I'm talking to a student and say, "You wrote down that 'Monroe declared that this side of the hemisphere has closed colonization.'" What does that mean?" He can't tell me. He just copied it down.

Renee and Marie both noticed that students tend to not think critically about what they read; Renee described this as students having a lack of deep-thinking skills, and Marie described it as students having a lack of independent-thinking skills. Marie said that students prefer for the teacher to tell them the answers and explain what something means, rather than having to think about it on their own; as she explained,

When students don't understand a term, many times they won't look it up. They'll wait for [the teacher] to define it. If they don't understand what it's inferring, or the hidden meaning in a text, they'll wait for [the teacher] to tell them.

Both Marie and Renee explained these concerns as being among the reasons for the integration of literacy in their content area. They saw that students need help in improving their literacy-related skills; therefore, they consistently make efforts to integrate literacy-related activities. Likewise, Jess expressed the same idea that a concern of hers continuously adds to her motivation to integrate literacy-related activities as she does. As she explained, she has noticed that students “do not read and write on their own;” because of this, she wants to give students as many opportunities as she can to practice their reading and writing skills in her class, so that they will not “lose those skills” and will be well prepared for life after high school.

Like Marie, Renee, and Jess, Carla expressed concerns related to a lack of general literacy skills among students, and she shared in the concern over the tendency of students to prefer their teachers to tell them answers or to copy information, rather than to think deeply and critically on their own. However, unlike Marie, Renee, and Jess, Carla did not link her concerns to any literacy-related action on her part to help students improve.

The second type of described concern that created within teachers a desire to implement certain practices that could help students in their literacy-related deficiencies was the concern related to a deficiency within students' knowledge of vocabulary. Five participants described concerns related to students' vocabulary knowledge: Jean, Rachel, Laura, Marie, and Elena. Jean, Rachel, and Laura, specifically, described students needing help with understanding and retaining knowledge of Tier 3 vocabulary. All three mentioned realizations they had had about students not being able to learn a new concept because they could not remember the meaning of discipline-specific vocabulary previously taught. From this, Jean and Rachel changed their practices to include an ongoing emphasis on the repetitive use and assessment of math terminology, and Laura changed her practices to include exposing students to new vocabulary at least three times per lesson and having students read about and "work with the new vocabulary...prior to the lectures." In addition, Laura, Marie, and Elena described placing an emphasis at times on Tier 2 vocabulary, because they had noticed that students do not have a good range of this type of "across-the-board vocabulary," as Laura and Elena called it. Rachel mentioned having this same concern regarding students' lack of Tier 2 vocabulary knowledge; however, she did not mention making changes in her practices to include instruction of more Tier 2 vocabulary, as a result of her concern.

Student success as within-classroom experiences. Of the eight participants who reported within-classroom experiences (WCEs) that brought awareness to them and, thus, contributed to their literacy-integration efforts, four of them (Mona, Jean, Rachel, and Elena) reported at least one WCE related to the second subcategory of WCEs: student success. All four described increasing their literacy-integration efforts as a result of

experiencing success after making changes to their instructional practices to include more literacy-related activities. For example, Mona explained,

We did a generate-an-argument assignment a couple of days ago. That's where they were given information, and they had to read and then analyze that and then provide their evidence according to what the paper said and then justify their thoughts. It was really neat when one of them said, "I really understand this. I really get it this time." This is the fourth one that we've done, so the first one was like AHH, but then as we've done them more, and they get used to seeing the different terminology and the different things, they're buying in! I'm so happy! Seeing how they've come along this year, I want to do more next year, and I want to do it with all of my classes, not just with my AP students.

Mona's experiences of student buy-in and success with her efforts have motivated her to keep integrating literacy instruction and to increase the amount that she does so.

Likewise, Jean and Rachel have experienced success with their math students. Jean explained how her literacy-related efforts and determination continue to increase because her students continue to rise to her level of expectation for what they can do. This keeps motivating her to keep pushing her students and to keep increasing her level of expectation each year. In comparison, Rachel explained that, over time, she has seen growth in students' understanding and retention of math terminology and concepts, as a result of the emphasis she places on math vocabulary; she said that this has motivated her to continue her efforts in emphasizing vocabulary. Like Rachel, Elena has been motivated to continue her effort toward emphasizing vocabulary, after experiences of success with students. As she explained, she has not been emphasizing vocabulary very

long, but she stumbled upon how helpful it could be after spontaneously teaching students about word origin and vocabulary, in an effort to help them understand course content. She said that students have told her on several occasions how helpful that information has been to their understanding. As a result, she has seized more of those teachable moments over time and has started planning ahead for potentially troublesome words in her daily lessons. Her experiences with student success have made her want to be more intentional about making vocabulary instruction part of her lessons.

As demonstrated, four participants had at least one WCE related to student success, and seven participants had at least one WCE related to concerns. In total, eight participants had at least one WCE that helped in their literacy-instruction integration. Of the 10 total participants for the study, one participant (Carla) mentioned having concerns regarding student literacy, but she did not describe any connection between her concerns and making changes in her literacy practices as a result. Also, of the 10 total participants for the study, Lucy was the only participant who did not mention any WCEs at all.

Central Question

Among the study participants, what are the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis?

As explained in Chapter 2, teacher self-efficacy involves the extent to which a teacher believes in his or her capabilities to execute the actions necessary to influence and achieve desired outcomes (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Bandura, 1997; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011; Ross, 1992; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). When teachers believe they have the capabilities within themselves to produce desired results, they have incentive to

act; however, when teachers believe they do not have the capabilities within themselves, they will make little to no attempt to act (Bandura, 1997). In this way, the level of one's self-efficacy can influence what actions will be initiated and how much effort and persistence will be expended in performing those actions, even in the face of obstacles and failure (Bandura, 1977, 1989, 1997), as well as how much effort and persistence will be expended in taking actions necessary to enhance one's capabilities to reach the desired outcome (Bandura, 1997). Teachers with stronger self-efficacy are open to trying new instructional strategies and to persisting in efforts to implement and follow through with instructional changes (Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guskey, 1984, 1986, 1988; Smylie, 1988; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009), but teachers with lower self-efficacy will not expend much commitment, effort, or persistence toward achieving instructional changes (Bandura, 1997).

In this study, teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (TSELI) refers to the belief teachers have in their capabilities to incorporate literacy instruction into content-area instruction on a consistent basis. The participants who reported putting forth effort and persistence to incorporate literacy instruction were the participants who described actions that are consistent with teachers who have higher teacher self-efficacy for a given task; these participants had a strong enough belief in their capabilities to initiate, continue, and improve upon their efforts. In comparison, the participants who reported less effort, persistence, and commitment toward using their capabilities to integrate literacy instruction on a consistent basis were the participants who described actions that are similar to those of teachers who have lower teacher self-efficacy for a given task.

Thus, from this point forward, the participants whose reported actions were more consistent with teachers who have higher teacher self-efficacy will be described as those participants with higher TSELI: These participants had a strong enough belief in their capabilities to put forth the effort needed to use their capabilities to bring about literacy-instruction integration and to persist in those efforts, on a continuous basis, even in the face of adversity; also, they demonstrated a willingness to improve upon their capabilities to better integrate literacy instruction in the future. In comparison, the participants whose reported actions were more consistent with teachers who have lower teacher self-efficacy will be described from this point forward as those participants with lower TSELI: These participants appeared to have weaker beliefs in their capabilities, as they did not describe expending as much commitment, effort, or persistence as their participant-counterparts, in using their capabilities to bring about literacy-instruction integration on a consistent basis.

Using the above-described characteristics as a guideline, five of the ten participants (Marie, Renee, Mona, Jean, and Jess) demonstrated higher TSELI than the remaining five participants: They had strong enough belief in their capabilities for integrating literacy instruction that they willingly expended the effort and persistence needed to do so, on a continuous basis, even in the face of adversity. A description of how each of the five participants demonstrated higher TSELI follows.

Marie's description of her instructional practices demonstrated that she conscientiously exerts effort to incorporate a variety of literacy-related activities, in all of her classes, on a frequent basis. Also, she persists in her efforts, despite the extra time doing so takes and despite the pushback she has received from students. For example, in

describing how she takes the time to find and chunk the content-related articles that students will read and to create some of the note-taking guides for students to use with their assigned readings, she stated the following: “This takes time on my part because I have to read [the text] myself and come up with questions, but I keep doing it, because it makes students actually read the information.” In addition, she described remaining persistent when she gets pushback from students about reading texts and completing the note-taking guides; she explained that students eventually “get on board” and get better about doing the assignments over time.

Like Marie, Renee’s description of her instructional practices demonstrated that she, too, conscientiously exerts effort to incorporate a variety of literacy-related activities, in all her classes, on a frequent basis, and that she, too, is consistently persistent in her efforts. She strives to give students ongoing practice in developing their reading-comprehension skills, along with their skills in higher-order thinking, inferencing, and articulation of thought, and she takes the time to create many of her own materials, such as annotation guides, for students to use when reading, even though it can be “very time-consuming and laborious on [her] part.” In addition, she remains persistent in her efforts, even when faced with less-motivated students or with struggling readers. For example, she explained that she has to keep pushing students to use higher-order thinking skills and to articulate their thoughts using explanation and supporting evidence, because if she does not remain persistent in this, the less motivated students tend to fall back to regurgitation of textual information instead of making inferences from the information and thinking deeply and critically about it. Her persistence also remains when she is

faced with struggling readers; she provides these students with additional graphic organizers, scaffolding, and guided-reading strategies.

Like Marie and Renee, Mona's description of her instructional practices demonstrated that she exerts great effort and persistence to incorporate literacy instruction. Although Mona only does so in her advanced placement (AP) classes, unlike how Marie and Renee do so in all of their classes (e.g., AP, Honors, and General), Mona strives to emphasize Tier 3 vocabulary during instruction of each lesson, and she strives to engage students in a variety of literacy-related activities throughout the year—activities that give students practice in not only their reading-comprehension skills but also their higher-order thinking skills. In addition, Mona remains persistent in her efforts, despite the extra time needed to find the texts and to develop the lesson plans and their accompanying materials, and she has remained persistent even when she has received pushback from students. As she explained, students gave pushback at first when she began integrating literacy-related assignments, but, over time, students bought-in to her literacy-integration efforts, because she persisted in helping students understand her expectations and succeed. For example, when she first introduced the scientific article assignment, students were overwhelmed by her expectations and by the difficulty level of the article, but once she chunked the article and helped students understand that they only needed to focus on one section at a time, students bought-in and became more confident over time in working with the scientific articles.

Jean, too, described instructional practices that demonstrated great effort and persistence on her part to consistently integrate literacy instruction into her math classes. Like Marie and Renee, Jean described doing so throughout all her classes, and like Mona,

Jean strives to emphasize Tier 3 vocabulary during instruction of each lesson, as well as during student practice activities and assessments. In addition, she strives to engage students in other literacy-related activities throughout the year, and she remains persistent in her efforts, despite the extra time doing so takes, such as the time it takes to create and grade the vocabulary sections of the math tests or the time it takes to grade student writing for articulation of thought. Furthermore, she has remained persistent in her efforts despite the pushback she has received from students, parents, and administrators for emphasizing vocabulary and writing in her math classes. As she explained,

I have gotten a lot of student pushback, particularly on definitions on tests or on the writing assignments for projects, because they want to say, “Well, this is a math test. You're a math teacher. How can you grade on that?” And I say, “Because I'm a teacher. And because I have a degree. And you need to be able to write.” Even my own children that I've taught have said to me, “Well, you're just trying to make it hard.” What they think is that I'm trying to make them feel dumb or that I'm trying to intimidate them or trying to make myself seem smarter. Those are some of the complaints I've had... And I've gotten pushback from administrators and parents, too. I had a parent recently write on a student's homework assignment, “You're making this too hard, unnecessarily, because of your demands on their vocabulary.” And these comments can get very frustrating. You have to be willing. You have to want to do it. You have to feel passionately about making it a focus and know it's the right thing for the kids.

Jean has persisted in her efforts because she believes that what she is doing is for the benefit of her students' future. She feels passionately about making literacy a focus for her math classes and, therefore, persists in her efforts to do so.

Like Jean, Jess' description of her instructional practices demonstrated that she, too, exerts effort and persistence to incorporate literacy instruction into her art classes. Although her efforts are more consistent and frequent in her Art I classes, she strives to include literacy-related activities within all of her art classes, and she remains persistent in her efforts throughout the year, despite the extra time it takes her to create reading passages for her Art I students. Overall, Jess described feeling confident and content with the amount that she brings in literacy instruction; she said that she is "doing well by touching on reading and writing throughout the year."

In addition to Jess, Jean, Mona, Renee, and Marie willingly expending the effort and persistence needed to integrate literacy instruction on a continuous basis, they demonstrated a willingness to improve upon their capabilities to better integrate literacy instruction in the future—another characteristic of teachers with higher teacher self-efficacy for a given task. Marie stated that professional development on literacy-instruction integration in her content area would be valuable to her, so that she could learn more. Renee explained that even though she has received her master's in English language arts and feels "well equipped with strategies to teach literacy" within her history classroom, she "can always learn more" and would "love to learn from other social studies teachers about what they do in their classrooms with literacy." Jean demonstrated a willingness to improve upon her capabilities to incorporate mathematical literacy and writing, and she explained that she would like to discuss her literacy-related instructional

efforts with other math teachers, to get their thoughts on what she does and to get ideas based on what they do.

Mona explained that as she has persisted in her efforts, and as student-pushback has turned into student buy-in and success, her confidence (i.e., her self-efficacy) in her capabilities to integrate literacy instruction has increased, as has her motivation to continue and to expand her literacy-integration efforts. For example, she explained that, next school year, she wants to integrate literacy into her other classes, instead of solely doing so in her AP classes, and she said that she plans to have students do more with the passages in the course textbooks, instead of only reading from outside articles. In addition, Mona's desire to improve upon her capabilities for integrating literacy instruction has been strong enough to motivate her to enroll in a professional development opportunity called *Reading to Learn Scientific Texts*, "a free online course through Stanford University that [would] be offered [over the upcoming] summer on how to teach students how to read in science." She explained that she has decided to take this course because she feels that even though she has "grown a lot" in her literacy-integration efforts, she believes that she still has "a lot more room for improvement," and she wants "to keep learning and improving."

Although Jess is one of the participants who expressed the belief that she could only bring in literacy "at a reasonable level," because of the need to cover art content, she, like Mona, Jean, Renee, and Marie, demonstrated a willingness to improve upon her capabilities to incorporate literacy, because she said that she would like to learn new strategies for incorporating literacy within art, and she said that she would like to learn from other art teachers who have focused on literacy instruction in their classrooms and

have been successful at doing so. She said that she would like their insight into what she could do differently or better. In addition, she mentioned that, eventually, she would like to start grading student writing for accuracy and content, as opposed to how she grades currently, for effort and completion of the assignment; she explained that she would like to receive professional development that could teach her what level of writing to expect of students from each grade level, since her classes are made up of a mixture of ninth through 12th-grade students.

The five participants just described (Jess, Mona, Jean, Renee, and Marie) were the participants whose reported actions were consistent with those of teachers found within research to have higher teacher self-efficacy for a given task. Because these five participants demonstrated a strong enough belief in their capabilities to initiate, continue, and improve upon their literacy-integration efforts, they are described in this study as having higher teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (TSELI). In comparison to these five participants, the remaining five participants of this study (Laura, Rachel, Carla, Lucy, and Elena) described actions that were consistent with those of teachers found within research to have lower teacher self-efficacy for a given task. Therefore, these remaining five participants are described in this study as having lower TSELI: They appeared to have weaker beliefs in their capabilities, as they did not describe expending as much commitment, effort, or persistence as their counterparts did toward using their capabilities to bring about literacy-instruction integration on a consistent basis. This is not to imply that these participants never incorporated literacy instruction. On the contrary, they all did so in various ways, just to a lesser extent than their counterparts. A

description of how the remaining five participants of this study (Laura, Rachel, Carla, Lucy, and Elena) demonstrated lower TSELI follows.

Laura described placing daily effort and persistence in emphasizing Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary within all her classes; for example, she said that she has designed her lessons so that she can expose her students to lesson vocabulary at least three times per lesson. In addition, Laura demonstrated a willingness to improve upon her capabilities to incorporate more vocabulary instruction; for example, she stated, “I’m not sure I’ve found the most successful mode of teaching vocabulary yet, but I try to keep at it,” and she said that professional development related to vocabulary in her content area would be valuable to her. However, Laura did not seem as open to the idea of expanding her literacy-integration efforts passed vocabulary instruction; while she expressed value in including other types of literacy-related activities, her comments consistently led back to concerns about lacking the time to incorporate more, because of the need to cover content.

Rachel described placing daily effort and persistence in emphasizing Tier 3 vocabulary within all her classes. For example, she described intentionally using math terminology in her daily instruction and requiring students to use the terminology in their assignments and assessments, and she explained how she takes the extra time needed to evaluate student work in order to determine frequently missed vocabulary words and concepts, so that she can re-teach and re-quiz students on those words and concepts several times until students have mastered them. In addition, like Jean, Rachel has remained persistent in her efforts despite student pushback related to the assessment of math vocabulary; she explained that students eventually “get on board” and end up telling

her how much they have learned and retained as a result, something she said she “can attest to by reviewing their assessment scores.” Rachel explained that as she has experienced student growth in comprehension and retention of concepts because of her efforts to emphasize vocabulary, she has continued to be motivated to keep up her efforts. However, at no point did Rachel seem motivated to incorporate other types of literacy-related activities into her practices, even though she acknowledged that doing so could be of benefit to her students. She described that she feels pressure to cover course content and standards and, as a result, does not have class time to bring in literacy instruction more than she does. As she explained,

Sometimes I think it would be good, probably more effective, if more literacy instruction could be done in the classrooms, because students really need to see the importance of reading in all classes. But in the math classroom, when I think about all the objectives in the course of study, the things we have to cover, I don't think I could add anymore.... Honestly, I feel like I'm overwhelmed already.

Might it help the students? Probably so, but I don't think I can do it.

Rachel said that if she were to have professional development on how to integrate more literacy instruction, it could be beneficial to her, but then she questioned if what she would learn would be applicable to her content area, and she questioned whether she could fit in anything new, given all the content she must cover. Ultimately, she gave the impression that she is content with what she does and is not motivated to change. For example, she said,

I have found that if I can concentrate on a few things, rather than trying a bunch of different things, that it's not spreading me so thin. So, I really try to work on

ACT, vocabulary, and a lot of review. If I can concentrate and do a really good job with those three things, then I feel really good. So, I don't really do a whole lot of other stuff.

Like Laura and Rachel, Carla described placing an emphasis on Tier 3 vocabulary instruction within all her classes, and like Mona, she described engaging students in the reading of a content-related, nonfiction book, once a year, over a period of several weeks. Although Carla includes vocabulary instruction in her teaching practices, she pinpointed the reading and writing activities involved in using the supplemental book as being the literacy instruction that she integrates. She explained that she incorporated the supplemental book readings and quizzes two years ago, in order to comply with her administrator's expectations for teachers to include literacy instruction within their content area. She said that, at the time, she did not know how to apply literacy within her content area, so she took some time to research information and materials for doing so and came across the supplemental book idea. She put effort into complying with her administrator's expectations and implementing the book, and she continues to persist in incorporating the book once a year, even though there has been a change in principal and the expectation for literacy-instruction integration has lessened as a result. However, by her own admission, Carla has not put forth effort or persistence to include additional literacy-related activities with her students, nor has she expanded use of the supplemental book to her non-honors classes. Also, even though she expressed concern that students seem lacking in their general literacy skills, she did not link her concerns to any actions on her part to help students improve their skills, the way Marie, Renee, and Jess did. Instead, she explained that she does not "know how to do literacy," and she stated that

she is lacking in confidence in what she does do. For example, she explained the following:

Even though I've been doing the book for two years, I am still in a place where I'm still testing the waters with it and trying to get more confident with it. I don't have the same confidence in teaching a book the way an English teacher has; so, I'm still learning how to teach a book well. In fact, I haven't tried this with my general classes yet because I'm still feeling it out with my honors classes.

Carla's lack of confidence (i.e., lack of self-efficacy) in her capabilities to "teach a book well" has hindered her. She has not expanded her literacy-integration efforts to her general classes, and she has not added other types of literacy-related activities to her instructional practices. In addition, she expressed the concern that integrating more literacy instruction would take away from coverage of course content, because, as she explained, "we're slammed as it is." Nevertheless, she stated that she would be willing to incorporate more literacy instruction "if it were required of [her]." She explained that she "would be happy to comply" as long as she were "to be provided with the right professional development," where she could be shown how to incorporate literacy instruction "in a practical way;" with this, she "would not be opposed to bringing in more literacy."

Lucy described incorporating within her Art I classes frequent instruction on Tier 3 vocabulary, as well as weekly readings of content-related passages with accompanying writing components. In addition, she described incorporating into her Art II classes occasional art-related writing assignments, where students "have to break something visual down and then put it into words." However, like Carla, Lucy pinpointed only one

of her described practices as being the literacy instruction that she integrates: the weekly passages that her Art I students read and answer questions about, in relation to famous artists. Also, like Carla, Lucy explained that she only incorporated the weekly readings in order to comply with her administrator's expectations for teachers to include literacy instruction within their content area. She stated that, three years ago, her "principal kept mentioning this expectation," so she spent the next summer creating the weekly passages and questions on famous artists, to meet that requirement. Lucy put effort into complying with her administrator's expectations, and even though there have been changes in principal and administrator expectations for this, she continues to persist in incorporating the weekly lessons. However, beyond this, Lucy did not describe a willingness to increase her effort and persistence to incorporate more literacy instruction. In fact, like Carla, she described a willingness to improve upon her capabilities to do so only if it were required of her; as she explained, she is "a rule follower," so if she were required to bring in more literacy instruction, she would improve herself in that area. Though, she exhibited frustration at this possibility, saying that increasing the amount of literacy instruction in her classes would interfere with the time students have for being creative; in addition, she said that her professional development time would be better spent focusing on content instruction or on visual literacy instruction.

As a former English teacher of over 20 years, Elena has knowledge of a variety of literacy-related instructional practices and activities, but by her own admission, she has done little integration of literacy within her history classes over the two years she has been a history teacher, because she said that she is still developing herself as a history teacher and, therefore, has not "quite figured out literacy in history yet." Also, she said

that she feels pressure to cover a certain amount of content by the end of the school year. Nevertheless, on occasion, she has incorporated Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary instruction. As she explained about her inclusion of vocabulary instruction:

A lot of it for me has been accidental. I've been in the process of explaining something, and then I see some of them looking like, "What?" So, then I go, "Okay, let's look at just this one word. Where else have you seen this word?" Then it registers in them.

She described these times as unplanned, literacy-related, teachable moments; she has seized upon these moments and spontaneously included an emphasis on word origin and vocabulary to help students understand content. She explained that she has received positive feedback from students about the vocabulary instruction. Her positive experiences thus far with integrating vocabulary instruction have motivated her to want to keep persisting in including vocabulary instruction and even to want to be more intentional about doing so within her lessons; she would like to learn from other history teachers how they integrate literacy. In this way, she wants to improve upon her capabilities to integrate literacy instruction into her history classes, starting with a focus on integrating more vocabulary instruction at first.

The five participants just described (Elena, Lucy, Carla, Rachel, and Laura) put effort and persistence into integrating within their content instruction some literacy-related instructional practices and activities (e.g., vocabulary instruction, use of weekly book or passage readings, etc.), and they did so on a consistent basis—except for Elena, whose described actions were not consistent. However, when comparing their reported actions to those of their participant-counterparts within this study (i.e., Marie, Renee,

Mona, Jean, and Jess), these five did not seem to expend as much commitment, effort, and persistence toward integrating literacy instruction as their participant-counterparts, making their reported actions seem more consistent with those of teachers found within research to have lower teacher self-efficacy for a given task. Therefore, these five participants are described in this study as having lower teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (TSELI), and their participant-counterparts are described as having higher TSELI.

Interpretation of the Findings

Further analysis of the data revealed three themes.

Theme 1

The participants who appeared to have the most confidence in their capabilities to integrate literacy instruction (i.e., the most self-efficacy for literacy instruction) demonstrated the most awareness and understanding of how and why to apply literacy to their content-area instruction, reported the most effort and persistence in doing so, and described attributing their beliefs and efforts to awareness-building experiences that included external-teaching experiences and within-classroom experiences.

The participants in this study described as having higher teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (i.e., Marie, Renee, Mona, Jean, and Jess) shared numerous similarities in their awareness and understanding of, beliefs about, and experiences with literacy-instruction integration, and they held strong beliefs in their capabilities to integrate literacy instruction in their content area, as demonstrated by their willingness to expend the effort and persistence needed to do so, on a continuous basis, and by their willingness to improve upon their capabilities to better integrate literacy instruction in the

future. Marie, Renee, and Jean described integrating a variety of literacy-related activities in all of their classes and on a frequent basis, and all three described wanting to learn more and to improve upon their efforts. Mona described integrating a variety of literacy-related activities, on a frequent basis, and even though she explained doing so only within her advanced placement (AP) classes, she said that she plans to expand her efforts to all of her classes, and she wants to improve upon her efforts as well. Jess described integrating a variety of literacy-related activities on a frequent basis in her Art I classes, and while she described doing so less frequently in her Art II and AP Art classes, she said that she makes literacy a priority within her instructional practices and feels good about what she does.

In addition, these five participants demonstrated awareness and understanding of literacy integration in their content area, and they expressed holding the belief that it is their responsibility to provide literacy instruction, for the benefit of their students' future. Also, each of these five participants attributed her literacy-integration efforts and beliefs to at least one external-teaching experience (ETE) and to at least one within-classroom experience (WCE). It was apparent that the described ETEs brought awareness to these participants about the need for literacy instruction and gave them ideas for how to bring it about in their classroom. Furthermore, for Marie, Renee, Jean, and Jess, their described WCEs related to *concerns* further convinced them of the need for literacy-instruction integration within their classroom, as well as created within Marie, Renee, and Jean a desire to implement certain practices that could help students with their literacy-related deficiencies. Likewise, for Mona and Jean, their WCEs related to *student success* further convinced them of the benefits of integrating literacy instruction, which led to a desire to

keep persisting in their efforts. One last similarity among these participants was that Marie, Renee, Jean, and Mona did not reveal any beliefs that appeared to hinder their literacy-integration efforts, and although Jess revealed two beliefs that potentially could have been holding her back to a certain extent (i.e., that she does not have the time to bring in literacy instruction more than she does and that she does not know enough about the instruction and grading of student writing to be influential on students' writing skills), she still was motivated to integrate literacy instruction and to persist in her efforts, as though her understanding of the benefit of literacy-instruction integration to her students was greater than her hindering beliefs.

Theme 2

The participants who appeared to have less confidence in their capabilities to integrate literacy instruction (i.e., less self-efficacy for literacy instruction), in comparison to their participant-counterparts described as having more confidence in their capabilities, demonstrated less awareness and understanding about how or why to apply literacy within their content area, reported less effort and persistence to consistently incorporate literacy instruction, and described holding at least one belief that seemed to be strong enough to hinder their literacy-integration efforts in some way.

The participants in this study described as having lower teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (i.e., Laura, Rachel, Carla, Lucy, and Elena), when compared to the reported actions of their participant-counterparts and when compared to each other, varied in their level of awareness and understanding of, beliefs about, and experiences with literacy-instruction integration, and they held weaker beliefs in their capabilities to integrate literacy instruction in their content area. Although these five participants put

effort and persistence into integrating within their content instruction some literacy-related instructional practices and activities (e.g., vocabulary instruction, use of weekly book or passage readings, etc.) and did so on a consistent basis (except for Elena, whose described actions were not consistent), they did not seem to expend as much commitment, effort, and persistence toward integrating literacy instruction as their participant-counterparts. In addition, while all five of these participants agreed that literacy instruction is important at the secondary-school level for the benefit of their students' future, they varied on their opinion as to whose responsibility it should be to teach literacy. Laura and Elena said that it should be the responsibility of every secondary teacher, regardless of content area. Rachel agreed with this but added to her statement, "but not as much in math." Carla and Lucy, on the other hand, said that primary responsibility should be on the English teachers. Despite variations in this belief, however, all five expressed holding other beliefs that could have been hindering their literacy-integration efforts (e.g., a belief that they do not have enough class time to integrate more literacy instruction due to the need to cover content, feelings that they do not know how to apply literacy in their content area, etc.). In addition, while three of the participants (Laura, Rachel, and Elena) attributed their literacy-integration efforts and beliefs to at least one within-classroom experience (WCE), none of them mentioned an external-teaching experience (ETE). Furthermore, when making comparisons among these five, they varied in their awareness and understanding of the applicability and benefits of literacy-instruction integration within their content area, as well as in their literacy-related beliefs and experiences. These variations can be seen in the following descriptions of Laura and Rachel, Carla and Lucy, and Elena.

Laura and Rachel both appeared to have a strong enough belief in their capabilities to integrate vocabulary instruction on a consistent basis, as demonstrated by their daily effort and persistence in emphasizing vocabulary within all of their classes, and they both demonstrated a willingness to improve upon their efforts to teach vocabulary. However, neither of them seemed open to the idea of incorporating other types of literacy-related activities, even though they both expressed value in doing so; both said that they do not have the time to incorporate literacy more than they do, because of the need to cover content. In addition, both seemed to lack an awareness of how literacy integration could be used to teach content, but Laura further believed that integrating literacy instruction requires a level of creativity within the teacher—creativity that she did not believe she had within her. Moreover, both said that professional development could be valuable to them, but Rachel questioned whether she could fit in anything new, given all the content she must cover and the lack of time she has to do so—again demonstrating her belief that literacy integration could take away from content coverage instead of contributing to it. Ultimately, Rachel gave the impression that she is content with what she does and is not motivated to change. Laura did not give this same impression.

Another set of comparable participants was Carla and Lucy. Carla and Lucy both pinpointed only one of their described practices as being the literacy instruction that they integrate: for Carla it was the inclusion of the supplemental book and for Lucy it was the weekly passages students read. Both participants described having integrated these practices a couple of years ago in order to comply with their administrator's requirements to do so, and they both continue to persist in their efforts, even though they no longer are

required to do so. However, neither of them has taken steps to improve or to expand upon their practices. Both Carla and Lucy said that more literacy-instruction integration would take something away from their class; Carla said it would take away from coverage of content, and Lucy said it would take away from her students' time for being creative. In addition, Carla said that she does not "know how to do literacy," and she stated that she is lacking confidence in what she does. Both Carla and Lucy exhibited a lack of understanding of how literacy-instruction integration can apply to their content area and how it can be used as a tool to teach content. Furthermore, both Carla and Lucy said that they would increase their literacy-integration efforts if it were to be required of them; however, Carla exhibited more of an openness to this idea than Lucy. For example, Carla said that she would comply with increasing her efforts if she were "to be provided with the right professional development," and she explained what type of professional development she believed could be helpful to her. Lucy, on the other hand, said that she would comply with increasing her efforts, but she continued expressing frustration at the thought of doing so. Overall, Carla, like Laura, seemed open to the idea of change as it relates to literacy instruction, whereas, Lucy, like Rachel, seemed resistant to the idea of change.

Elena, the last participant in this group of five, expressed an openness to the idea of learning more about literacy-instruction integration in history and to improving upon her current efforts. Although she was the only one who did not report integrating any type of literacy instruction with any consistency, she exhibited having an awareness as to the benefits of literacy-instruction integration in the classroom, and she demonstrated having vast knowledge of a variety of literacy-related instructional practices and

activities, from her experiences as a former, veteran English teacher. However, she stated that she had not been able to figure out how to apply this knowledge to her history classes; also, she said that she was concerned about literacy integration taking away from coverage of required history content. It was apparent from her description that she was self-efficacious applying her knowledge of literacy instruction when she taught English, but she is inefficacious in applying her knowledge to her history classes. This matched what the research showed: Because teacher self-efficacy is specific to contexts and tasks (Bandura, 1997; Raudenbush, Rowan, & Cheong, 1992; Ross, Cousins, Gadalla, & Hannay, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998), a teacher can feel efficacious in one type of teaching situation, but then under changed circumstances, such as when having to teach a different subject area or when working with a different grouping of students, the same teacher can feel inefficacious (Raudenbush et al., 1992; Ross et al., 1999; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Theme 3

Teacher buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area was a contributing factor to the level of participants' self-efficacy for literacy instruction.

Eight of the 10 participants (i.e., all participants except for Carla and Lucy) described putting forth effort to integrate literacy in some way, after having bought in to the idea of doing so, and they bought in after having realizations about the need for them to integrate literacy in some way, for the benefit of their students. Participants' realizations resulted from one or more awareness-building experiences (ABEs). Below is a synopsis of each participants' ABEs and realizations:

- Marie: Marie explained that her experiences in and knowledge of the business world made her aware of the fact that the literacy skills among people in the current workforce can be quite lacking at times, and this influenced her efforts to integrate literacy instruction into her content area. In addition, she explained that through working with students over the years, she realized that students were lacking in their reading-comprehension, inferencing, and articulation-of-thought skills, and they struggled in their range and knowledge of vocabulary. As a result of these observations, Marie said that she changed her instructional practices to include more emphasis on Tier 2 vocabulary, as well as other literacy-related activities.
- Renee: Renee explained that she has learned from working with students over time that students need help in improving their literacy-related skills (e.g., reading-comprehension skills, inferring skills, etc.); therefore, she consistently makes efforts to integrate literacy-related activities into her instructional practices.
- Mona: Through attending the AP professional development workshops, Mona came to the realization that students need guidance with science vocabulary and reading, and she realized that she should be giving students more opportunities to practice reading. As a result, Mona began implementing literacy-related activities within her AP classes, and she continued to do so over time.
- Jean: Jean described how she “realized early on as a new teacher” that her students were not grasping the new concepts she taught because they could

not remember the meaning of discipline-specific vocabulary taught previously. From this, Jean changed her practices to include an ongoing emphasis on the repetitive use and assessment of math terminology.

- Jess: Jess explained that she gradually came to realize over time that students “do not read and write on their own;” she explained that the more she has noticed this over time, the more motivated she has been to make changes to her instructional practices to include more literacy-related activities. She said that she wants to give students as many opportunities as she can to practice their reading and writing skills in her class, so that they will not “lose those skills” and will be well prepared for life after high school.
- Laura: Laura explained that, as a newer teacher, she realized that students “were not gaining much from [her] lectures because they didn’t understand the vocabulary words [she] was using in the lectures.” As a result, she changed her instructional methods to have students read and “work with the new vocabulary first, prior to the lectures.” The realizations Laura had as a new teacher regarding the need for her to emphasize content vocabulary led her to change her instructional practices to include more vocabulary instruction and to believe that vocabulary instruction should be an important emphasis in all secondary content areas.
- Rachel: Rachel explained that her belief in the importance of developing students’ mathematical literacy came about after realizing that the trouble her students were experiencing in grasping mathematical concepts had to do with their understanding and retention of the math terminology. She said that from

that realization, she began implementing ways to help students retain math vocabulary, and, as a result, she saw growth over time in student understanding and retention of math terminology and, thus, growth in student comprehension of math concepts. Rachel's ongoing experiences with student growth have motivated her to continue her efforts in emphasizing math vocabulary.

- Elena: Elena explained having the realization that students in her history classes were no different than how the students in her English classes used to be. She realized that her history students could benefit from her intentionally including vocabulary instruction of discipline-specific words to help them better understand course content. As a result, she has become more intentional about including vocabulary instruction within her history lessons.

For each of these participants, their ABEs led them to realize the necessity for them to integrate literacy in some way. Through their realization(s), they bought in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in their content area. From their buy-in, they were motivated to use their capabilities to make changes to their instructional practices, to integrate literacy instruction in some way and with persistence. In this way, buy-in to the idea of literacy instruction contributed to participants' self-efficacy for literacy-instruction integration.

Limitations of the Study

Case study research is about exploring the particulars of a case, to gain an in-depth understanding of the case itself; it is not about generalizing beyond the case (Creswell, 2013; Stake, 1995). Therefore, generalizations from this study are limited to the naturalistic generalizations of the readers (Stake, 1995), given the small size of the sample of participants. Because of this, prior to providing my own interpretation of the data within this chapter, I attempted to do as Stake (1995) suggested: to provide readers with enough raw data to be able to form their own interpretations and naturalistic generalizations. Furthermore, in the Implications for Practice section of the next chapter, I have attempted to do as Saldaña (2009) suggested: to progress from the particulars of the case-study set to the general, by implying transfer. Therefore, I have presented a professional development framework that contains five guidelines for school and district leaders to use when creating a professional development program to help their secondary, non-English language arts and non-reading teachers integrate literacy instruction into their content area on a consistent basis. I developed this framework as a way to connect what I learned from this study and from previous research to comparable teachers and situations outside of this study.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Despite the need for secondary teachers to integrate literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis, sustained implementation of literacy-instruction integration can be limited or inconsistent among some secondary teachers of non-reading and non-English languages arts subject areas, due to low teacher self-efficacy for doing so. I conducted this study to gain a deeper understanding of the existence and characteristics of this phenomenon. The following central question and subquestions guided this research study.

- Central Question: Among the study participants, what are the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis?
- Subquestion 1: What similarities and differences exist among participants' understanding of literacy-instruction integration as it relates to their content area?
- Subquestion 2: What similarities and differences exist among the ways in which participants incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction, as well as among the extent to which they do so?

- Subquestion 3: What beliefs and experiences have contributed to, or have hindered, participants' understanding and implementation of literacy-instruction integration?

During the analysis process of the data, I found patterns within the data and developed from those patterns answers to the research central question and subquestions, as well as three themes. From this information, I created a professional development framework that contains five guidelines for school and district leaders to use, when creating a professional development program to help their secondary, non-English language arts and non-reading teachers integrate literacy instruction into their content area on a consistent basis. This professional development framework will be presented later in this chapter, after a presentation of an overview of the findings and how those findings compare to existing self-efficacy research.

Overview of the Findings

In answering the research subquestions, it appeared that participants were quite similar in their understanding of, use of, beliefs about, and experiences with literacy-instruction integration in the content area. For example, all 10 participants defined literacy-instruction integration in the content area as involving the inclusion of reading and writing activities related to topics within their content area, and the majority (eight of the 10) defined it as involving the inclusion of content-vocabulary instruction as well. Also, the majority of the participants (nine of the 10) incorporated some type of literacy instruction into every lesson, through use of content-related, vocabulary-building activities and/or through use of reading and writing activities related to topics within their content area, and over half of those participants (six of the nine) incorporated additional

literacy-related activities at various times of the year. In addition, all 10 participants believed that high school students need practice in literacy, because they will need strong literacy skills in the future, and the majority of the participants (eight of the 10) believed that it is every teacher's responsibility to teach literacy, regardless of content area.

Furthermore, six of the 10 participants revealed holding at least one belief that could be hindering their literacy-instruction integration efforts. For example, five of the six revealed the belief that they do not have time to bring in literacy instruction more than they do, because of the need to cover course content, and three of the six revealed that they feel lacking in some way and, therefore, cannot integrate literacy instruction more than they do. However, although over half of the participants revealed holding at least one hindering belief, the majority of the participants (eight of the 10) revealed having at least one awareness-building experience (ABE) in their past that has contributed to their literacy-integration efforts. All eight revealed having at least one within-classroom experience (WCE), an experience that occurred while teaching and working with students, and five of the eight revealed having at least one external-teaching experience (ETE), an experience that occurred separate from participants' teaching experiences and time spent with students, in addition to experiencing at least one WCE.

While several similarities among the participants surfaced, in terms of their understanding of, use of, beliefs about, and experiences with literacy-instruction integration in the content area, further analysis of the data revealed several key differences among the participants, in relation to the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction, the focus of the central research question of this study. As explained in Chapter 4, five of the 10 participants demonstrated characteristics that

were similar to teachers found in research to have higher teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction. These participants were the ones who appeared to have a strong enough belief in their capabilities to put forth the effort needed to use their capabilities to bring about literacy-instruction integration and to persist in those efforts, on a continuous basis, even in the face of adversity; also, these participants demonstrated a willingness to improve upon their capabilities to better integrate literacy instruction in the future. However, the remaining five participants demonstrated characteristics that were more similar to teachers found in research to have lower teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction. These were the participants who appeared to have weaker beliefs in their capabilities, as they did not describe expending as much commitment, effort, or persistence as their participant-counterparts, in using their capabilities to bring about literacy-instruction on a consistent basis.

Further analysis of the findings revealed three themes. First, the participants in the study who appeared to have the most confidence in their capabilities to integrate literacy instruction (i.e., the most self-efficacy for literacy instruction) demonstrated the most awareness and understanding of how and why to apply literacy to their content-area instruction, reported the most effort and persistence in doing so, and described attributing their beliefs and efforts to ABEs that included ETEs and WCEs. Second, the participants who appeared to have less confidence in their capabilities to integrate literacy instruction (i.e., less self-efficacy for literacy instruction), in comparison to their participant-counterparts described as having more confidence in their capabilities, demonstrated less awareness and understanding about how or why to apply literacy within their content area, reported less effort and persistence to consistently incorporate literacy instruction,

and described holding at least one belief that seemed to be strong enough to hinder their literacy-integration efforts in some way. Last, teacher buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area was a contributing factor to the level of participants' self-efficacy for literacy instruction. The five participants in the study with the most teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (TSELI) appeared to have bought-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration, after meaningful experiences that made them aware of the need for literacy-instruction integration within their content area. The five participants with less TSELI than their counterparts had not had the same extent of experiences and had not fully bought-in to the idea.

Comparison of the Findings to Self-Efficacy Research

Several findings of this study aligned with aspects of self-efficacy research discussed in Chapter 2. For example, according to research, middle school and high school teachers of non-reading or non-English language arts subject areas often express low self-efficacy for incorporating literacy instruction into their content instruction (Barry, 2002; Bean, 2000; Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990). This was the case for half of the participants in this study (Laura, Rachel, Elena, Carla, and Lucy); they expressed lower self-efficacy for literacy instruction when compared to their participant-counterparts. In addition, according to research, a contributing factor to feelings of inefficacy for literacy-instruction integration among secondary teachers has been their deeply held personal beliefs about literacy instruction and student literacy development (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; Ness,

2007; O'Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006). The reported personal beliefs of secondary teachers have included (a) that they have insufficient knowledge and understanding of the applicability of literacy within their subject area (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Park & Osborne, 2006; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012); (b) that what they have learned related to literacy instruction in the content area thus far has been useless, time consuming, and/or incongruent with their instructional preferences for teaching their subject area (Moje, 2008; O'Brien et al., 1995); (c) that more literacy-instruction integration would take away from coverage of content and would be a waste of instructional time (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; McConachie et al., 2006; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Ness, 2007; Park & Osborne, 2006; Schoenbach & Greenleaf, 2000; Shuman, 1975; Thibodeau, 2008); and (d) that literacy instruction is the responsibility of the English teachers only (Bintz, 1997; Hall, 2005; Moore et al., 1999; O'Brien et al., 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006; Spencer, Garcia-Simpson, Carter, & Boon, 2008). Findings in this study revealed that six of the 10 participants (Jess, Laura, Rachel, Carla, Lucy, and Elena) revealed holding similar beliefs. Findings included (a) Carla and Elena explicitly stating that they do not know how to apply literacy to their subject area; (b) Rachel, Laura, and Carla explaining that previous professional development related to literacy instruction in the their content area has been useless to them; (c) Jess, Laura, Carla, Rachel, and Elena stating that including literacy instruction more than they do would take time away from coverage of content, while Lucy stated that it would take away from her students' experiences in her class; and (d) Lucy and Carla explicitly stating their belief that literacy-instruction integration is primarily the responsibility of English teachers.

These assumptions and deeply held beliefs about literacy instruction can hinder teachers' potential progress toward literacy-instruction incorporation in their classrooms (Barry, 2002; Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Moore et al., 1999; Ness, 2007; O'Brien et al., 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006). This could be seen in five of the six participants who described having these types of beliefs. For example, even though Laura and Rachel expressed value in incorporating other literacy-related activities (in addition to the vocabulary instruction they do), both participants circled back to the belief that incorporating more literacy would take more time away from instruction of course content. This belief held them back. Also, Carla's beliefs that she does not know how to teach literacy and that including more literacy instruction would take away from content coverage have hindered her in that she has not expanded her literacy integration passed the use of the supplemental book, and she has not expanded use of the book to her non-honors classes.

However, even though half of the participants allowed their beliefs to hinder the extent to which they integrated literacy, the other half of the participants (Marie, Renee, Mona, Jean, and Jess)—those described as having higher teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (TSELI), when compared to their participant-counterparts—had strong enough beliefs in their capabilities to make attempts toward integrating literacy. As research has indicated, teachers with strong self-efficacy are open to trying new instructional strategies (Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988) and to persisting in efforts to implement and follow through with instructional changes (Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guskey, 1984, 1986, 1988; Smylie, 1988; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). The teachers

with higher TSELI experienced increases in their self-efficacy, and, as Bandura (1997) explained, when one's self-efficacy increases, one's effort and persistence in performing a given task also is likely to increase, which, in turn, can lead to better performance and, eventually, to proficiency in performing the task. This was the case for the five with higher TSELI, especially for Mona and Jean. Mona and Jean appeared to be the most self-efficacious of the five, and one common contributing factor between them was outside-district professional development. According to research, when a teacher is provided with appropriate professional development support, his or her self-efficacy for a situation can become increased (Cantrell et al., 2009; Greenleaf & Shoenbach, 2004; Guskey, 1988, 1989; Ross, 1998; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009), as a result of the teacher becoming more confident over time that he or she can accomplish a given task (Ross, 1998; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Mona and Jean both explained how helpful their professional development experiences were to them.

While several findings of this study aligned with aspects of self-efficacy research discussed in Chapter 2, there was one finding that previous self-efficacy research did not emphasize: the importance of a teacher's buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area, before the teacher can act upon her literacy integration with any persistence. As noted in Chapter 4, eight of the 10 participants (i.e., all participants except for Carla and Lucy) described putting forth effort to integrate literacy in some way, after having bought in to the idea of doing so. Each of these participants bought in after having realizations about the need to integrate literacy for the benefit of the students. Participants' realizations resulted from one or more awareness-building

experiences (ABEs). Thus, participants' ABEs led them to realize the necessity for them to integrate literacy in some way. Through their realization(s), they bought in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in their content area. From their buy-in, they were motivated to use their capabilities to make changes to their instructional practices, to integrate literacy instruction in some way and with persistence. In this way, buy-in to the idea of literacy instruction contributed to participants' self-efficacy for literacy-instruction integration. The more that secondary teachers can experience meaningful ABEs related to literacy-instruction integration, the more they may buy-in to the idea of integrating literacy with their content instruction and then act upon that idea with persistence and consistency.

Implications for Practice

Five of the 10 participants of this study demonstrated having teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (TSELI), as indicated by their awareness and understanding of how and why to apply literacy to their content-area instruction, as well as by their effort and persistence in doing so. Still, the fact remains that the other half of participants did not demonstrate having as much TSELI as their participant-counterparts, which aligns with research that some secondary teachers often express low TSELI (Barry, 2002; Bean, 2000; Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990) and, therefore, do not implement literacy instruction on a consistent basis. However, the five participants who demonstrated the most self-efficacy for literacy-instruction integration and, thus, the most persistence in their literacy-integration efforts described having meaningful awareness-building experiences (ABEs) in their past that led to realizations and to them buying-in

to, and then acting upon, the idea of literacy-instruction integration. If more secondary teachers could experience meaningful ABEs related to literacy-instruction integration in the content area, more of them potentially could buy-in to the idea and then act upon it with persistence and consistency.

Bandura (1997) explained that established self-efficacy for a given situation will remain enduring and resistant to change, unless compelling evidence is presented to strongly challenge it. This compelling evidence could occur during professional development, as it is possible to challenge and change an experienced teacher's deeply embedded self-efficacy with appropriate professional development support (Cantrell et al., 2009; Greenleaf & Shoenbach, 2004; Guskey, 1988, 1989; Ross, 1998; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). School and district leaders could help give their secondary teachers meaningful, literacy-related awareness-building experiences (ABEs) through ongoing and focused professional development (PD) opportunities. However, it would not be enough to provide teachers with ABEs through PD opportunities; their TSELI would need to be developed and supported as well through PD. According to research, teacher self-efficacy is context and task specific (Bandura, 1997; Raudenbush, Rowan, & Cheong, 1992; Ross, Cousins, Gadalla, & Hannay, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998); therefore, it is crucial to include within PD experiences specific features that directly attend to the self-efficacy of teachers for a given task, in order to increase the potential for sustained changes in teacher practices for that task (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guo, Connor, Yang, Roehrig, & Morrison, 2012; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

Professional Development Framework

The following framework contains five guidelines for school and district leaders to use when creating a PD program to help their secondary, non-English language arts and non-reading teachers integrate literacy instruction into their content area on a more consistent basis. By following this framework, PD has the potential (a) to increase teacher buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration, by creating for teachers meaningful ABEs that will build teachers' awareness and understanding of what literacy-instruction integration in the content area means and why it is important for secondary teachers of all content areas to integrate it, and (b) to increase teachers' consistency in and persistence with their literacy-integration efforts, over time, by providing teachers with PD opportunities that address, develop, and enhance their self-efficacy for literacy instruction, on an ongoing basis and in a focused way. This framework is the result of combining previous self-efficacy research with the findings of this study and with the suggestions participants of this study made for how to increase teacher buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration in the content area.

Guideline 1: For group sessions, the audience, presenter, and information all need to be from within and relevant to the same subject area, not just the same discipline area. According to the participants of this study, too often, the audience is made up of teachers from all different subject areas (as stated by Jess, Carla, Renee, Jean, and Elena), the presenter is a teacher from a different subject area than those in the audience (Jess, Renee, Elena, and Laura), and the information presented is broad or is not applicable or practical for specific content areas (Jess, Elena, Laura, Rachel, Carla, Renee, and Jean). For example, Jess said that, too often, "elective teachers get thrown in

with other content areas, and the information is so broad and generalized because the presenter is trying to reach everybody, and then no one gets anything specifically useful out of it.” In addition, Laura said that, in the past, literacy-related professional development has not been helpful to her, because it has always been led by English teachers or reading teachers who “are so removed from [her] content area” that they do not introduce applicable or practical ideas for use within her discipline. She said that it ends up being a waste of time. She explained that it would be useful to her, and to other science teachers, if they were to be presented with professional development that was designed “especially for science teachers.” However, Carla took this notion a step further when she explained that professional development would be most beneficial to her if she could learn from teachers who teach her specific subject area within the science discipline. She explained that it is not always useful to meet with a mix of science teachers, and, as an example, she said, “Even though Biology is a huge part of Anatomy, Biology [content] isn’t always going to apply to what a teacher is trying to get accomplished in the Anatomy classroom.” She said that opportunities to learn from and to collaborate with teachers from within her specific area of science would boost her confidence in teaching literacy. In fact, half of the participants of this study (Renee, Laura, Jess, Elena, and Carla) referred to the need for learning from and collaborating with same-subject teachers, not just same content-area teachers. Therefore, when dividing teachers for group sessions, teachers need to be divided not just by discipline area but, when possible, by subject area; in addition, the presenter needs to be an experienced teacher from within that subject area, and the information presented needs to be practical and applicable to that specific subject area.

Guideline 2: Professional development should include sources of self-efficacy information. Bandura (1977, 1986, 1989, 1997) named four sources of information as being influential on one's self-efficacy: performance mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological/affective states. Professional development (PD) experiences should provide teachers with these sources (Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Timperley & Phillips, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). In the Cantrell and Hughes (2008) study and in the Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) study, both described in Chapter 2, PD experiences related to Bandura's sources of self-efficacy information contributed to increases in teachers' self-efficacy for literacy instruction.

Verbal persuasion. PD should include opportunities for verbal persuasion, where someone credible to the teacher verbally communicates information that serves to persuade the teacher that he or she can be successful and should persist in developing his or her skills (Bandura, 1997). By teachers already being in same-subject groups and with a same-subject presenter (that is, if Guideline 1 of this framework has been followed), the same-subject presenter will be a credible person to the teachers, and the presenter can use verbal persuasion to help build teachers' awareness and understanding of what literacy-instruction integration in that subject area means and why it is important for teachers to integrate it. Building teachers' awareness and understanding is a key step toward equipping teachers with knowledge that can strengthen their buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration, which can strengthen their motivation to make attempts (or to continue making attempts) to integrate literacy.

One suggestion for building teachers' awareness and understanding through verbal persuasion is to give teachers information that will help them to realize that literacy-instruction integration in their subject area would be beneficial to their students' future. As explained in Chapter 1, significant developments in technology and the globalization of labor markets throughout the past 50 years have steadily heightened the complexity level of the literacy skills needed of those in the workforce (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Carnevale, 1991; Levy & Murnane, 2013; Rosenberg, 1992; Selingo, 2018; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Stephens, 2017; Walker, 1999; Zygoris-Coe, 2012). As a result, students graduating from high school must possess advanced levels of literacy skills, if they are to fully participate, confidently compete, and successfully achieve in college, career, and life (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Daggett & Pedinotti, 2014; Lesaux, 2017; Levy & Murnane, 2013; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; National Center for Literacy Education [NCLE], 2013; Selingo, 2018; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Stephens, 2017; Zygoris-Coe, 2012). Equipped with this knowledge, half of the participants of this study (Marie, Renee, Jean, Jess, and Elena) emphasized that PD needs to help teachers realize that they have a responsibility to offer students practice in literacy, to help prepare them for their future. The following comment from Renee is an example of information that could be eye-opening to teachers:

Students will be required to be literate on a variety of levels after graduating high school. Therefore, it is especially important that all teachers, core and noncore, expose students to opportunities to exercise their literacy skills. However, many of our students will not be pursuing a career after graduation that requires reading fiction; therefore, you might argue that non- [English language arts] teachers

shoulder [more] responsibility in literacy education to equip students to read real-world, relevant texts.

Renee suggested having business and industry leaders talk to teachers about what students will need to be able to do in the business world, as it relates to reading and writing. She said that hearing this perspective could be very beneficial to teachers because some teachers, including herself, have never been a part of the business world and do not know what literacy-related skills students need practice in and developed.

Furthermore, as part of building teachers' awareness about the benefit of literacy-instruction integration to students' future, it could be helpful to include, within the verbal-persuasion sections of PD, comments such as those below from Mona and Elena, for the teachers who tend to believe that most of the responsibility to give students practice in literacy should be on the teachers of reading and English language arts. Mona stated,

If I had to teach an English lesson, I would not be able to do it. I don't know how I'm supposed to expect an English teacher to teach the science-content part of reading. They're not qualified for that....I'm the specialist in science content, so I need to help [students].

Elena stated,

If we leave it up to just the English teachers, literacy instruction might not happen to the extent it should because there are so many standards to cover in English. You have the writing standards and the language standards and the reading-informational-texts standards versus the reading-fiction standards. It's unbelievable.

Comments such as these might not be helpful if presented by themselves, but they could be helpful if presented as the basis of group discussion, for example, just to get teachers talking with each other about the validity of the comments.

The previous suggestions are just a few ways to use the verbal-persuasion phase of PD to build teachers' awareness and understanding about the benefit of literacy-instruction integration to students' future. In addition, the verbal-persuasion phase can be used to help teachers realize that literacy-instruction integration in their subject area would be beneficial to helping students grasp course content. Half of the participants (Marie, Renee, Mona, Jean, and Elena) emphasized two points about this. They said that more teachers would buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration if they understood that literacy can be a tool for teaching content, rather than a separate activity that takes time away from instruction of content. However, they further explained that teachers cannot use literacy as a tool for teaching content if students do not understand content-related texts when they read; therefore, the participants emphasized that teachers need help realizing that their students need guidance when reading content-related texts. For example, Marie and Renee explained that, over time, they realized that students are lacking in their reading-comprehension and inferencing skills, as well as in their range and knowledge of general vocabulary. Mona said that she realized that students need "strategies and ways to...break down information and to gain knowledge from that information." Jean and Elena realized that spending time on vocabulary instruction helped students better comprehend discipline-specific content and texts, and it helped them make connections across concepts.

One related PD suggestion at this point is to include a PD exercise that helps teachers become aware of their own past experiences with students, as those experiences relate to student literacy. For example, through individual reflection and journaling and/or through group discussion, the exercise needs to help teachers remember if they have ever had experiences where they have observed students lacking in certain literacy-related skills in their class and were surprised or concerned by it—experiences such as those described by Marie, Renee, Rachel, and Carla. Marie explained that “students will read a paragraph and just go, ‘I don't get it,’ and [she will] say, ‘Well, what don't you get? Do you not understand the vocabulary?’ and they'll say, ‘I don't know; I just don't understand it.” Renee explained frustration that students will “just copy and copy from the textbook, and then when [she] confront[s] them and say[s], ‘What does that mean?’ they don't know; they can't articulate it to [her]. They just copied from the book without comprehending what they read.” Rachel explained that she had noticed that her math students seemed to have a limited vocabulary in general, so much so that “they [could not] relate to some of the passages on the ACT” or could not understand word problems. Carla explained that she has been “floored by [students'] writing at times....Students just spit back the same information instead of putting it in their own words.”

The goal behind helping teachers become aware of their own similar past experiences is to personalize the PD topic for them by bringing to mind the times when they have noticed that students need help with the vocabulary or with comprehending a discipline-specific text or with articulating their thoughts orally or in written form, etc. According to half of the participants of this study, helping teachers remember these experiences will make literacy-related PD more meaningful for teachers, which, in turn,

will increase the chances of teacher buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration. In addition, by helping teachers become more aware of their own within-classroom experiences (WCEs), this may be enough to create a desire within some of them to implement literacy-related instructional changes and to follow through with those instructional changes, as was the case for six of the participants of this study (Jess, Renee, Marie, Jean, Laura, and Rachel). However, this awareness-building exercise may not be strong enough to cause teachers to implement changes; some teachers—like Carla, who described having concerns about students lacking in general literacy skills but did nothing to help them improve, because she did not know what to do—will need additional support, such as those described next, to help them buy-in to and act upon the idea of literacy-instruction integration.

Vicarious experiences. PD should include vicarious experiences, which are experiences that give teachers the opportunity to observe someone else successfully performing a task; this has the potential to increase a teacher's self-efficacy because observing the success of the other person can help the teacher to feel more confident that he or she, too, is capable of a successful performance of that task, under similar circumstances (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997). However, in using a vicarious experience in PD, the person being observed must be someone credible and similar to the observer, or the potential of the vicarious experience to influence teacher self-efficacy will be low (Bandura, 1986). As explained in the Verbal Persuasion section, if Guideline 1 of this framework has been followed, then, by teachers already being in same-subject groups and with a same-subject presenter, the presenter will be credible and similar to the teachers.

Use of vicarious experiences in PD not only has the potential to increase a teacher's self-efficacy but also has the potential to increase a teacher's buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration, which also can increase a teacher's self-efficacy. Participants of this study emphasized that more teacher buy-in would occur with teachers not just being told to integrate literacy but being shown how to integrate it. Over half of the participants (Renee, Mona, Jess, Rachel, Carla, and Elena) suggested the need for teachers to watch demonstrations of a teacher—preferably a same-subject teacher—teaching students with practical literacy strategies relevant to their specific subject area. In fact, Elena suggested the idea of teachers watching a pre-recorded demonstration of a same-subject teacher applying a literacy strategy with local students. She said, “Let’s take these four [students] and film them and their teacher doing a close-reading activity with a document that’s about history, for example.... And then let’s hear [the students] talk about how the [activity] helped them comprehend the reading.” According to Elena, this type of demonstration would help teachers because they could see not only how a same-subject teacher uses a literacy strategy to teach course material but also how beneficial to the students the literacy strategy can be in helping students learn course content.

Mastery experiences. Although vicarious experiences and verbal persuasion have potential to influence teacher self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), PD experiences that consist only of one or both of these sources will not be as effective in leading teachers toward sustained improvement in efficacy and change implementation as what PD opportunities with mastery experiences will be (Bandura, 1997; Guskey, 1986; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Therefore, PD experiences must lead into mastery experiences.

Mastery experiences can have the most direct influence (Bandura, 1997), because when an individual perceives that he or she has succeeded in performing a task, the person will expect to be successful in that task again (Bandura, 1986); this perception of success increases the individual's self-efficacy about his or her capabilities to execute those actions for that task again (Bandura, 1986, 1997).

The mastery experiences mentioned in the self-efficacy studies described in Chapter 2 (i.e., Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009) offer good suggestions for giving teachers limited mastery experiences within groups, as well as giving teachers individualized mastery experiences. For example, in both studies, limited mastery experiences involved teachers working collaboratively to plan lessons and to share ideas; individualized mastery experiences involved participants working one-on-one with a coach. In the Cantrell and Hughes (2008) study, a coach worked on site once a month with teachers, both as a facilitator at team-planning meetings and as an individual guide and model for each teacher; Cantrell and Hughes found that teachers' self-efficacy for literacy instruction improved when teachers observed their coaches successfully using new literacy strategies with their students. In the Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) study, coaching occurred weeks after the initial workshop, and it involved a whole-group review session with a coach and then, on two occasions, teachers met one-on-one with the coach in their own classroom with their students. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster found that 90% of the participants in their study who received all four treatments (i.e., verbal persuasion through a lecture workshop, vicarious experience through watching a demonstration, limited mastery experience through the collaborative planning session, and individualized mastery experience through the one-on-one

coaching) experienced high increases in their teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster added that the participants who received the coaching also received additional and individualized verbal persuasion from their coach, as well as an additional vicarious experience if their coach modeled literacy with their students.

While none of the 10 participants of this case study stated that they had ever received coaching, Mona's description of her PD experiences demonstrated that she received limited mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, and verbal persuasion. This is important to note because, out of all the participants, Mona was the teacher whose narrative demonstrated the most growth in teacher buy-in and self-efficacy for literacy-instruction integration. A review of Mona's experiences serves as a good example of how beneficial PD experiences can be to a teacher when they involve all of Bandura's (1977, 1986, 1997) sources of self-efficacy information, including the last of the four sources, physiological/affective states, which involves the psychological and emotional feelings of excitement that one can experience when attempting a task; the produced emotions can contribute to one's beliefs about his or her capabilities to perform the task again. Below is a synopsis of Mona's narrative.

Mona explained that it took her a while to buy-in to the idea of integrating literacy within her content area; she said that she used to be a "pure lecturer" and that she "was never into helping [students] with reading," because she "didn't think it was part of [her] job," but she said that, gradually, her beliefs and instructional practices regarding literacy-instruction integration changed, after her experiences with the PD workshops that she attended over a two-year period. During this time, she learned what literacy in science entails, why it is important, and strategies for bringing it about in the classroom.

She said that she came to the realization that students need guidance with science vocabulary and reading and that she should be giving students more opportunities to practice reading. Mona described these realizations as being very profound for her. Also during this time, she received experiences that contributed to her self-efficacy for literacy instruction. She received verbal persuasion (through someone credible to her verbally communicating that she could be successful in integrating literacy in science), vicarious experiences (through watching demonstrations of other teachers successfully integrating literacy in science), and limited mastery experiences (through being given time to collaborate with other teachers and to practice teaching the strategies). All of this contributed to Mona's beliefs about her capabilities to attempt the strategies in her classroom. The awareness and understanding that Mona developed from the PD workshops gave her the confidence to attempt to integrate literacy instruction and to persist in her initial efforts. As she persisted, student pushback turned into student buy-in and success. This contributed to positive feelings and excitement about her efforts, which further increased her self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction, to the point where she has been motivated to persist in and to expand upon her literacy-integration efforts.

Guideline 3: PD should directly address teachers' beliefs and assumptions about literacy instruction. As explained in Chapter 2, deeply held beliefs have contributed to teachers' feelings of inefficacy for literacy instruction and, therefore, have hindered teachers' potential progress toward literacy-instruction integration in their classrooms (Barry, 2002; Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; McCoss-Yergian & Krepps, 2010; Moje, 2008; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999;

Ness, 2007; O'Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995; Park & Osborne, 2006). Experiences that directly address the teachers' beliefs and assumptions about literacy instruction can contribute to higher levels of self-efficacy (Cantrell et al., 2009; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Timperley & Phillips, 2003). Cantrell, Burns, and Callaway (2009) suggested that PD include an activity designed to help determine teachers' specific beliefs and the extent to which they think those beliefs could enhance or hinder teachers' willingness to implement literacy instruction. Another suggestion could be to include an activity where, after each verbal-persuasion, vicarious-experience, or mastery-experience session, teachers reflect upon how what they have heard, seen, or practiced has added to or has changed their personal beliefs, concerns, misunderstandings, or assumptions about literacy-instruction integration. Then, teachers could share their thoughts with the presenter, either through journaling or through a one-on-one conversation, or they could share their thoughts with each other in a group discussion. Giving teachers these kinds of opportunities could help them to become more aware of anything that has been holding (or might continue to hold) them back in their literacy-integration efforts.

Guideline 4: Time must be carefully factored in to the PD program. Several participants of this study mentioned *time* as a key element for helping teachers buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration. They explained that teachers need time to digest PD information (as stated by Elena and Rachel), to collaborate with same-subject teachers (Carla and Elena), to plan and create new lessons (Mona, Rachel and Elena), and to practice what they have learned (Mona and Rachel). The last one is especially important, because teachers need time for their self-efficacy in literacy-instruction integration to increase, through effort, persistence, and experiences of success. By giving

teachers the time they need to practice, the chances of teachers reaching proficiency in their literacy-integration efforts and, in turn, sustaining those efforts over time will be greater.

Guideline 5: The PD program must be consistent and ongoing over time.

Several participants of this study stated that, too often, professional-development topics change from meeting to meeting or from year to year. Mona, Elena, and Laura stressed the importance of the PD theme staying consistent over a long period of time, so that teachers could have time to learn, practice, and grow. Cantrell and Hughes (2008) found significant increases in participants' teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction after a year-long PD program designed to include ongoing support for teachers in their efforts to implement and to become proficient with content-related literacy instruction. In this case study, Mona said that because she experienced PD that was focused on literacy integration, over a two-year time period, she had the time she needed to be able to practice what she was learning, to work through challenges, and to experience successes—successes that, in turn, helped her to feel more confident in her capabilities and motivated her to keep trying. Likewise, Jean said that the three-year time span of representing her school district in attending the state-level PD trainings and then conducting the turn-around trainings for math teachers in her district and across the state gave her the time she needed to learn from the workshops and to conduct her own research; this led her not only to have a deeper understanding of the information but also to practice and experiment with what she was learning, which led her to experience success. These experiences motivated her to keep going and to keep growing in her

literacy-integration efforts. Having time to persist in one's efforts, in a focused way, is crucial to growing in and eventually sustaining one's efforts.

Recommendations for Future Research

To enhance the research in the area of teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction (TSELI) as it pertains to high school teachers, I recommend the following. First, the 10 participants of this study were all female. While this was not intentional, it could have had a bearing on the results of this study. Therefore, future research could explore TSELI as it relates to a group of high school teachers who are male. In addition, seven participants of this study were teachers of core subject areas (i.e., math, science, and history), while only three participants were teachers of non-core subject areas (i.e., art and business education). Thus, future research could explore the TSELI among a group of teachers that includes more teachers of non-core subject areas. Furthermore, in relation to the professional development framework I presented, one suggestion for future research is to implement a professional development program based on the guidelines presented in the framework and then to conduct interviews and observations with teachers, in an effort to explore the development of their TSELI over time. Another related suggestion is to investigate whether or not potential increases in teachers' TSELI have an effect on student reading achievement.

Conclusion

Offering secondary teachers ongoing professional-development support that addresses and nurtures their teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction will increase the potential for teachers (a) to buy-in to the idea of literacy-instruction integration, (b) to put

effort and persistence into implementing literacy instruction, and (c) to sustain their efforts over time. By more secondary teachers sustaining their literacy-integration efforts, secondary students will have more opportunities to practice and advance their literacy skills over time, increasing the chances of students being better prepared to meet the literacy-related demands that will be required of them in college, career, and life.

REFERENCES

- ACT. (2017). The condition of college & career readiness 2017 [PDF document]. Retrieved from www.act.org/content/dam/act/unsecured/documents/cccr2017/CCCR_National_2017.pdf
- ACT. (2018). The condition of college & career readiness 2018 [PDF document]. Retrieved from www.act.org/content/dam/act/secured/documents/cccr2018/National-CCCR-2018.pdf
- Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 17*(2), 86-95. doi: 10.1177/088840649401700203
- Alvermann, D. E., & Moore, D. W. (1991). Secondary school reading. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 951–983). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Anderson, R. N., Greene, M. L., & Loewen, P. S. (1988). Relationships among teachers' and students' thinking skills, sense of efficacy, and student achievement. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 34*(2), 148–165.

- Armor, D., Conry-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A., ...
Zellman, G. (1976). *Analysis of the school preferred reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools* (Report No. R-2007-LAUSD). Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED130243>
- Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development* (Vol. 6, pp. 1-60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117–148. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.
- Barry, A. L. (2002). Reading strategies teachers say they use. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46(2), 132-141.
- Bean, T. W. (2000). Reading in the content areas: Social constructivist dimensions. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 629–644). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction*. New York, NY: Guilford.

- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2008). *Creating robust vocabulary: Frequently asked questions and extended examples*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Berman, P., McLaughlin, M. W., Bass, G., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1977). *Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation* (Report No. R-1589/7-HEW). Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED140432>
- Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. E. (2006). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Bintz, W. P. (1997). Exploring reading nightmares for middle and secondary school teachers. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 41(1), 12–24.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Brozo, W. G., Moorman, G., Meyer, C., & Stewart, T. (2013). Content area reading and disciplinary literacy: A case for the radical center. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(5), 353-357. doi:10.1002/JAAL.153
- Cantrell, S. C., Burns, L. D., & Callaway, P. (2009). Middle- and high-school content area teachers' perceptions about literacy teaching and learning. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 48, 76-94. doi:10.1080/19388070802434899
- Cantrell, S. C., & Hughes, H. K. (2008). Teacher efficacy and content literacy implementation: An exploration of the effects of extended professional development with coaching. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 40, 95–127. doi:10.1080/10862960802070442

- Carlson, J. A. (2010). Avoiding traps in member checking. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(5), 1102-1113.
- Carnevale, A. P. (1991). *America and the new economy* [Monograph]. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/>
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2006). Teacher-student matching and the assessment of teacher effectiveness. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 41(4), 778–820.
- Collins, D. (2000). *Achieving your vision of professional development: How to assess your needs and get what you want*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED446060>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(3), 124-130.
- Daggett, W. R., & Pedinotti, J. A. (2014). *Reading skills and the career readiness gap: A study of high school students' preparedness for college and career* [PDF document]. Retrieved from International Center for Leadership in Education website: http://www.leadered.com/pdf/Reading_Skills_and_the_Career_Readiness_Gap_2015.pdf

- DeMonte, J. (2013). *High-quality professional development for teachers: Supporting teacher training to improve student learning* [PDF document]. Retrieved from <http://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/DeMonteLearning4Teachers-1.pdf>
- Fogarty, R., & Pete, B. (2007). *From staff room to classroom: A guide for planning and coaching professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207-226.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 569–582. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.76.4.569
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Greenleaf, C., & Schoenbach, R. (2004). Building capacity for the responsive teaching of reading in the academic disciplines: Strategic inquiry designs for middle and high school teachers' professional development. In D. Strickland & M. Kamil (Eds.), *Improving reading achievement through professional development* (pp. 97–127). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Greenleaf, C. L., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. L. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(1), 79–129.

- Guo, Y., Connor, C. M., Yang, Y., Roehrig, A. D., & Morrison, F. J. (2012). The effects of teacher qualification, teacher self-efficacy, and classroom practices on fifth graders' literacy outcomes. *The Elementary School Journal*, *113*(1), 3-24.
- Guo, Y., Piasta, S. B., Justice, L. M., & Kaderavek, J. N. (2010). Relations among preschool teachers' self-efficacy, classroom quality and children's language and literacy gains. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*, 1094–1103.
- Guskey, T. R. (1984). The influence of change in instructional effectiveness upon the affective characteristics of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *21*(2), 245–259.
- Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher*, *15*(5), 5–12.
- Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *4*(1), 63–69. doi:10.1016/0742-051X(88)90025-X
- Guskey, T. R. (1989). Attitude and perceptual change in teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *13*(4), 439-453. doi: 10.1016/0883-0355(89)90039-6
- Hall, L. A. (2005). Teachers and content area reading: Attitudes, beliefs and change. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *21*(4), 403-414. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.009
- Henson, R. K. (2002). From adolescent angst to adulthood: Substantive implications and measurement dilemmas in the development of teacher efficacy research. *Educational Psychologist*, *37*(3), 137-150.

- Holzberger, D., Philipp, A., & Kunter, M. (2013). How teachers' self-efficacy is related to instructional quality: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(3), 774–786. doi:10.1037/a0032198
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(2), 129-169.
- Killion, J. (2013). *Establishing time for professional learning* [PDF document]. Retrieved from <http://www.literacyinlearningexchange.org/establishing-time-professional-learning>
- Klassen, R. M., Tze, V. M. C., Betts, S. M., & Gordon, K. A. (2011). Teacher efficacy research 1998 –2009: Signs of progress or unfulfilled promise? *Educational Psychology Review, 23*, 21– 43. doi:10.1007/s10648-010-9141-8
- Learning Forward. (2011). *Standards for professional learning*. Oxford, OH: Author.
- Lent, R. W., & Hackett, G. (1987). Career self-efficacy: Empirical status and future directions [Monograph]. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30*, 347-382.
- Lesaux, N. K. (2017, November). NYS next generation learning standards: Leading advanced literacies instruction for the 21st century. PowerPoint presented at the meeting of the New York State Education Department, Saratoga Springs, NY. Retrieved from <http://www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/programs/curriculum-instruction/nys-next-gen-standards-keynote-11-30-17-conference.pdf>
- Levy, F., & Murnane, R. (2013, July). Dancing with robots: Human skills for computerized work. *Next, 19*. Retrieved from <https://www.thirdway.org/report/dancing-with-robots-human-skills-for-computerized-work>

- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McConachie, S., Hall, M., Resnick, L., Ravi, A. K., Bill, V. L., Bintz, J., & Taylor, J. A. (2006). Task, text, and talk: Literacy for all subjects. *Educational Leadership*, 64(2), 8-14.
- McCoss-Yergian, T., & Krepps, L. (2010). Do teacher attitudes impact literacy strategy implementation in content area classrooms? *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 4, 1-18. Retrieved from Academic and Business Research Institute website: www.aabri.com/manuscripts/10519.pdf
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. S. (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self- and task-related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to junior high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(2), 247-258.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 96-107.

- Moore, D. W., Bean, T. W., Birdyshaw, D., Rycik, J. A. (1999). Adolescent literacy: A position statement for the Commission on Adolescent Literacy of the International Reading Association. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 43(1), 97-112.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *The condition of education 2017* (NCES Publication No. 2017144). Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017144.pdf>
- National Center for Literacy Education. (2013). *Remodeling literacy learning: Making room for what works* [PDF document]. Retrieved from National Council of Teachers of English website: <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/NCLE/2013-NCLE-Report.pdf>
- National Center for Literacy Education. (2014). *Remodeling literacy learning together: Paths to standards implementation* [PDF document]. Retrieved from National Council of Teachers of English website: <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/NCLE/2014-NCLE-Report.pdf>
- National Center for Literacy Education. (2015). *Summary of findings: NCLE 2015 national survey on college- and career-ready literacy standards and collaborative professional learning* [PDF document]. Retrieved from National Council of Teachers of English website: <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/NCLE/2015-NCLE-Report-Summary.pdf>
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education website: <https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html>

- National Council of Teachers of English, James R. Squire Office of Policy Research. (2007). *Adolescent literacy: A policy research brief*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/policy-research/briefs>
- National Council of Teachers of English, James R. Squire Office of Policy Research. (2011). *Reading and writing across the curriculum: A policy research brief*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/policy-research/briefs>
- Ness, M. (2007). Reading comprehension strategies in secondary content-area classrooms. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(3), 229-231.
- O'Brien, D. G., & Stewart, R. A. (1990). Preservice teachers' perspectives on why every teacher is not a teacher of reading: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 22(2), 101-129.
- O'Brien, D. G., & Stewart, R. A. (1992). Resistance to content area reading instruction: Dimensions and solutions. In E. K. Dishner, T. W. Bean, J. E. Readence, & D. W. Moore (Eds.), *Reading in content areas: Improving classroom instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 30-40). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- O'Brien, D. G., Stewart, R. A., & Moje, E. B. (1995). Why content literacy is difficult to infuse into the secondary school: Complexities of curriculum, pedagogy, and school culture. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 442-463.
- Pajares, F. (1995, April). *Self-efficacy in academic settings*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Pajares, F. (2002). *Self-efficacy beliefs in academic contexts: An outline*. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from University of Kentucky website: <https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/efftalk.html>

- Park, T. D., & Osborne, E. (2006). Agriscience teachers' attitudes toward implementation of content area reading strategies. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 47*(4), 39-51.
- Ratekin, N., Simpson, M. L., Alvermann, D. E., & Dishner, E. K. (1985). Why teachers resist content reading instruction. *Journal of Reading, 28*(5), 432-437.
- Raudenbush, S. W., Rowan, B., & Cheong, Y. F. (1992). Contextual effects on the self-perceived efficacy of high school teachers. *Sociology of Education, 65*, 150-167.
- Rev. (n.d.). *Transcriptions: How it works*. Retrieved from <https://www.rev.com/transcription/how-it-works>
- Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica, 73*(2), 417-458.
- Rosenberg, S. (1992). Illiteracy: An economic and human tragedy. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 3*(4), 389-392.
- Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effects of coaching on student achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education, 17*(1), 51-65.
- Ross, J. A. (1994). The impact of an in-service to promote cooperative learning on the stability of teacher efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*(4), 381-394.
- Ross, J. A. (1998). Antecedents and consequences of teacher efficacy. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching* (Vol. 7, pp. 49-74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ross, J. A., Cousins, J. B., Gadalla, T., & Hannay, L. (1999). Administrative assignment of teachers in restructuring secondary schools: The effect of out-of-field course responsibility on teacher efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(5), 782-804. doi:10.1177/00131619921968824

- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schoenbach, R., & Greenleaf, C. (2000, March). *Tapping teachers' reading expertise: Generative professional development with middle and high school content-area teachers*. Paper presented at the National Center on Education and the Economy Secondary Reading Symposium, San Francisco, CA.
- Selingo, J. (2018, March). The third education revolution. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/03/the-third-education-revolution/556091/>
- Shanahan, T. (2018, April 15). Knowing and reading--what can we do to make sure kids know enough to comprehend [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://shanahanonliteracy.com/blog/knowing-and-reading-what-can-we-do-to-make-sure-kids-know-enough-to-comprehend#sthash.2XFqujcE.2cOdVB9B.dpbs>
- Shanahan, C., & Shanahan, T. (2014). The implications of disciplinary literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 57(8), 628-631. doi:10.1002/jaal.297
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 40-59.
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2012). What is disciplinary literacy and why does it matter? *Topics in Language Disorders*, 32(1), 7-18.
doi:10.1097/TLD.0b013e318244557a
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2017). Disciplinary literacy: Just the facts. *Educational Leadership*, 74(5), 18-22.

- Shuman, R. B. (1975). A school-wide attack on reading problems. *The Clearing House*, 49(2), 76-80.
- Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. *American Educational Research Journal*, 25, 1–30.
- Sparks, D. (2002). *Designing powerful professional development for teachers and principals*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED470239>
- Spencer, V. G., Garcia-Simpson, C., Carter, B. B., & Boon, R. T. (2008). If you teach – you teach reading. *International Journal of Special Education*, 23(2), 1-7.
- Spor, M. W., & Schneider, B. K. (1998). Content reading strategies: What teachers know, use, and want to learn. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 38(3), 221-231.
doi:10.1080/19388079909558291
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stein, M. K., & Wang, M. C. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4(2), 171–187.
doi:10.1016/0742-051X(88)90016-9
- Stephens, R. (2017). *Automate this: Building the perfect 21st century worker*. Retrieved from Third Way website: <https://www.thirdway.org/report/automate-this-building-the-perfect-21st-century-worker>
- Thibodeau, G. M. (2008). A content literacy collaborative study group: High school teachers take charge of their professional learning. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(1), 54-64. doi:10.1598/JAAL.52.1.6

- Timperley, H. S., & Phillips, G. (2003). Changing and sustaining teachers' expectations through professional development in literacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(6), 627–641. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(03)00058-1
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Johnson, D. (2004, April). *Teacher's sense of efficacy for literacy instruction*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Johnson, D. (2011). Exploring literacy teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Potential sources at play. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(4), 751-761. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.12.005
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & McMaster, P. (2009). Sources of self-efficacy: Four professional development formats and their relationship to self-efficacy and implementation of a new teaching strategy. *The Elementary School Journal, 110*(2), 228-245. doi:10.1086/605771
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783-805. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202–248.
- Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the literature and future directions. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(4), 751-796. doi: 10.3102/0034654308321456
- Vacca, R. T. (2002). From efficient decoders to strategic readers. *Educational Leadership, 60*(3), 6-11.

- Walker, D. (1999). Technology and literacy: Raising the bar. *Educational Leadership*, 57(2), 18-21.
- Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., & Adamson, F. (2010). *Professional development in the United States: Trends and challenges* [PDF document]. Retrieved from Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education website:
<https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/publications/pubs/89>
- Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad* [PDF document]. Retrieved from Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education website:
<https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/publications/pubs/187>
- Wexler, N. (2018, April). Why American students haven't gotten better at reading in 20 years. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from
<https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/04/-american-students-reading/557915/>
- Williamson, G. L. (2008). A text readability continuum for postsecondary readiness. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 19(4), 602-632.
- Woolfolk, A. E., Rosoff, B., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about managing students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 6(2), 137–148.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zygouris-Coe, V. I. (2012). Disciplinary literacy and the common core state standards.

Topics in Language Disorders, 32(1), 35-50.

doi:10.1097/TLD.0b013e31824561a2

APPENDIX A

**EMAIL REQUESTING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT
STUDY WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT**

February 16, 2018

Hi, [REDACTED],

I'm the Spanish teacher at [REDACTED]. I have been working toward receiving an Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction through Louisiana Tech University. I just received university approval to begin conducting my dissertation study, and I'm contacting you to request permission to conduct my study within this school district.

For your review, I've attached to this email information regarding my study. Basically, I would like to interview 12 teachers at [REDACTED] High School regarding their self-efficacy for incorporating literacy instruction into their content area. Questions will be related to teachers' beliefs about and professional development experiences with literacy instruction. Interviews would be conducted one-on-one, at each teacher's convenience, and they would last thirty minutes to an hour. A brief follow-up interview may be requested of teachers. Upon completion of the interviews, I will use teachers' responses to help contribute to the development of a professional development framework that will offer guidelines for strengthening teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction among high school teachers. The results of my study will be published in my dissertation and can be available to any participant upon request.

I have chosen [REDACTED] as the public-school district for my study because I am familiar with the professional development efforts that the district has offered to secondary teachers in recent years, to help us incorporate more literacy instruction within our content areas. In addition, I have chosen [REDACTED] as the school for my study, because it has the largest faculty in the district, and I am needing to interview teachers of math, social studies, science, world language education, career and technical education, health education, and art education. Before contacting teachers for possible participation, I would request permission from the principal, [REDACTED].

If you need further information from me regarding my study, I will be happy to provide it. I would greatly appreciate approval of this request, and I thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Melissa Baker

APPENDIX B

HUMAN USE APPROVAL LETTER



LOUISIANA TECH
UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

OFFICE OF SPONSORED PROJECTS

TO: Ms. Georgina Melissa Baker and Dr. Lynne Nielsen

FROM: Dr. Richard Kordal, Director of Intellectual Property & Commercialization
(OIPC) *RJK*
rkordal@latech.edu

SUBJECT: HUMAN USE COMMITTEE REVIEW

DATE: February 15, 2018

In order to facilitate your project, an EXPEDITED REVIEW has been done for your proposed study entitled:

**“High School Teacher Self-efficacy for Literacy Instruction:
A Case Study”**

HUC 18-093

The proposed study’s revised procedures were found to provide reasonable and adequate safeguards against possible risks involving human subjects. The information to be collected may be personal in nature or implication. Therefore, diligent care needs to be taken to protect the privacy of the participants and to assure that the data are kept confidential. Informed consent is a critical part of the research process. The subjects must be informed that their participation is voluntary. It is important that consent materials be presented in a language understandable to every participant. If you have participants in your study whose first language is not English, be sure that informed consent materials are adequately explained or translated. Since your reviewed project appears to do no damage to the participants, the Human Use Committee grants approval of the involvement of human subjects as outlined.

Projects should be renewed annually. *This approval was finalized on February 15, 2018 and this project will need to receive a continuation review by the IRB if the project continues beyond*

February 15, 2019. ANY CHANGES to your protocol procedures, including minor changes, should be reported immediately to the IRB for approval before implementation. Projects involving NIH funds require annual education training to be documented. For more information regarding this, contact the Office of Sponsored Projects.

You are requested to maintain written records of your procedures, data collected, and subjects involved. These records will need to be available upon request during the conduct of the study and retained by the university for three years after the conclusion of the study. If changes occur in recruiting of subjects, informed consent process or in your research protocol, or if unanticipated problems should arise it is the Researchers responsibility to notify the Office of Sponsored Projects or IRB in writing. The project should be discontinued until modifications can be reviewed and approved.

Please be aware that you are responsible for reporting any adverse events or unanticipated problems.

A MEMBER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA SYSTEM

P.O. BOX 3092 • RUSTON, LA 71272 • TEL: (318) 257-5075 • FAX: (318) 257-5079

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

HUMAN SUBJECTS CONSENT FORM

The following information is a summary of the study in which you are being asked to participate. Please read this information before signing the statement on the next page.

TITLE OF PROJECT:

High School Teacher Self-Efficacy for Literacy Instruction: A Case Study

PURPOSE OF STUDY/PROJECT:

The purpose of this case study is to explore the sense of teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction that currently exists among a group of high school teachers in Alabama; this exploration will include an investigation into the factors that have contributed to that sense of self-efficacy, as those factors relate to teachers' beliefs about, and their professional development experiences with, literacy instruction in their content area. In addition, an analysis of this exploration will contribute to the development of a professional development framework that will offer guidelines for strengthening teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction among high school teachers.

SUBJECTS:

Participants for the study will consist of approximately 12 high school teachers of math, social studies, science, career and technical education, and art education. (The exact number of participants will be confirmed once data saturation has been achieved.) All participants will work within the same high school, in a public school district in the state of Alabama. The group of teachers chosen will be based on teachers' responses to the preliminary questionnaire and how those responses meet the criteria of selection.

PROCEDURE:

Willing teachers of math, social studies, science, career and technical education, and art education will complete the preliminary questionnaire, and those whose responses meet the criteria of selection will be chosen for one-on-one interviews with the researcher. Interviews will be semi-structured, with a series of open-ended questions regarding participants' professional development experiences with, and their beliefs about, literacy instruction in the content area. Interviews will last thirty to forty-five minutes and will be audio recorded for transcription and data-analysis purposes. In some cases, a brief follow-up interview may be requested of a participant. All information collected will be analyzed for themes, in order to develop and finalize a professional development framework for strengthening teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction among high school teachers.

Measures will be in place to protect the privacy of participants and the confidentiality of data. Direct identifiers, such as the names of participants, the subjects they teach, and the names of the school and school district, will be removed from data. Physical documents related to the study will be kept in a secure location, and all electronic documents will be kept on the researcher's personal computer, which will be password-protected.

BENEFITS/COMPENSATION:

Results from this study will contribute to existing research on teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction among high school teachers, as well as contribute to the field of Education, by offering a professional development framework designed specifically to address, increase, and support teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction.

RISKS, DISCOMFORTS, ALTERNATIVE TREATMENTS:

This research study follows a sound research design, and measures are being taken to ensure that breach of confidentiality does not happen. Should any participant become uncomfortable while participating in the study, he or she may stop participation at any time. While it is not anticipated that a participant should be harmed or distressed by participating in this study, Louisiana Tech University is not able to offer financial compensation nor to absorb the costs of medical treatment should a participant become distressed or injured during or as a result of participation in this research.

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

I, _____, attest with my signature below that I have read and understood the description of the study, "High School Teacher Self-Efficacy for Literacy Instruction: A Case Study," and its purposes and methods. I understand that my participation in this research is strictly voluntary and my participation or refusal to participate in this study will not affect my relationship with Louisiana Tech University or with my employer in any way. Further, I understand that I may withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any questions without penalty. Upon completion of the study, I understand that the results will be freely available to me upon request. I understand that the results of the shared information will be confidential, accessible only to the principal investigators, myself, or a legally appointed representative. I have not been requested to waive nor do I waive any of my rights related to participating in this study.

Signature of Participant

Date

CONTACT INFORMATION: The principal investigator listed below may be reached to answer questions about the research, subjects' rights, or related matters:

G. Melissa Baker, Doctoral Candidate, Ed.D., Curriculum and Instruction

Members of the Human Use Committee of Louisiana Tech University may also be contacted if a problem cannot be discussed with the experimenters:

Dr. Richard Kordal, Director of Intellectual Properties (318) 257-2484
rkordal@latech.edu

APPENDIX D

**EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS REQUESTING
THEIR PARTICIPATION**

March 5, 2018

Subject: Requesting Your Participation in My Study

Hi! I am Melissa Baker, and I was a Spanish teacher at ██████ High School from 2003-2009. Currently, I am teaching Spanish at ██████ High School, but I am writing to you today not as a fellow colleague of ██████ but as a doctoral student. I am working toward receiving a doctorate degree in Curriculum and Instruction through Louisiana Tech University, and I am in the final stage of my program, the dissertation-writing stage. For my dissertation, I will be conducting a case study, and I would like to request your help in this endeavor, as a possible participant in my study. I have chosen ██████ High School as the location for my study because it has the largest faculty in our school district, and I have chosen you, specifically, as a possible participant, because of the particular subject(s) you teach and because of the number of years you have been a teacher within the county. ██████ has given me permission to contact you regarding this request.

Purpose and Procedures of the Study

The purpose of my study is to explore the teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction that currently exists among a group of high school teachers in Alabama. I am needing to interview willing high school teachers of math, social studies, science, art education (e.g., Art, Theatre, Art Survey), and career and technical education (e.g., Career Prep). Questions asked of participants would be related to their beliefs about, and professional development experiences with, literacy-instruction integration in their content area. Should you be willing to participate in this study, your participation would consist of 1 to 3 steps, depending on your meeting of certain criteria.

- Step 1 would consist of you completing a brief preliminary questionnaire online, by Tuesday, March 13th. You would be asked demographic-type questions, as well as questions about your professional opinions and practices related to literacy instruction. The questionnaire should not take you any longer than 15-20 minutes to complete, at most.
- Step 2 would only apply to those of you whose questionnaire responses meet certain criteria. This step would consist of you participating in a one-on-one interview with me, scheduled at your convenience (e.g., after school, during your planning period, on the weekend, etc.). The interview would last between 30 and 45 minutes and would be audio recorded for transcription and data-analysis purposes. Here are two example interview questions: *What is your perception of the value of, or problems with, explicitly integrating literacy instruction into your content-area instruction? What professional development experiences have you had as they relate to literacy-instruction integration in your content area?*
- Step 3 would consist of a brief follow-up interview (10-15 minutes), only if needed. The intent of the follow-up interview would be for me to get clarification on information given during the initial interview or to request further information.

Upon completion of all interviews, I will use teachers' responses to help contribute to the development of a professional development framework that will offer guidelines for strengthening and supporting teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction among high school

teachers of math, social studies, science, and elective content areas. The results of my study will be published in my dissertation and will be available to participants upon request.

Voluntary Nature of the Study, Privacy, and Confidentiality

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. You are under no obligation to participate and should not feel pressured to do so. Should you decide to participate, you may stop participation at any time without penalty. In addition, I pledge to all participants that measures will be in place to protect the privacy of participants and the confidentiality of data. Direct identifiers, such as your name, the subject(s) you teach, and the names of ██████████ High School and ██████████ will be removed from data. Physical documents related to this study will be kept in a secure location, and all electronic documents will be kept on my personal computer, which is password-protected. Furthermore, I assure you that at no time will you or your responses be judged in any way. The information you provide will be greatly appreciated and respected, and it will not be used for any purposes outside of this study.

What To Do Next

- Please take some time to consider whether you would be willing and available to be a part of this study. The link to the preliminary questionnaire is below. Please feel free to browse the questionnaire, to aid you in making your decision. (If the link does not work, please copy and paste it into your internet browser.) Note: The first section of the questionnaire is the Participant Consent Form to which you would need to click “Yes” to see the rest of the questionnaire; however, clicking “Yes” will not automatically commit you to participation. A questionnaire will not become an official part of the study until it has been completed in full and submitted by you at the end of it.
- **Should you decide to participate in the study, please complete the preliminary questionnaire in full and submit it no later than Tuesday, March 13th.**
- **Link to Preliminary Questionnaire:** <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/DH8FKJ8>

Contact Information

If you have any questions for me, please feel free to email or call me at ██████████ or ██████████. I can also be reached through my university email address at ██████████. In addition, if you would like to speak with a member of the Louisiana Tech University Human Use Committee, regarding your rights as a participant, you may contact Dr. Richard Kordal, Director of Intellectual Properties, at (318) 257-2484 or at rkordal@latech.edu.

I sincerely appreciate your time and consideration of this request.

Melissa Baker
Doctoral Candidate
Louisiana Tech University

APPENDIX E

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONNAIRE AND RATIONALE

Preliminary Questionnaire

1. Welcome!

Welcome to the Preliminary Questionnaire for the research study "High School Teacher Self-Efficacy for Literacy Instruction." Thank you in advance for your time!

Preliminary Questionnaire

2. Participant Consent Form

The following information is a summary of the study in which you are being asked to participate. Providing you with this information is part of a process called "Informed Consent," to allow you to understand the study before deciding whether to take part.

INFORMED CONSENT (Part 1 of 3)

TITLE OF STUDY: High School Teacher Self-Efficacy for Literacy Instruction: A Case Study

PURPOSE OF STUDY: The purpose of this case study is to explore the sense of teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction that currently exists among a group of high school teachers in Alabama; this exploration will include an investigation into the factors that have contributed to that sense of self-efficacy, as those factors relate to teachers' beliefs about, and their professional development experiences with, literacy instruction in their content area. In addition, an analysis of this exploration will contribute to the development of a professional development framework that will offer guidelines for strengthening teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction among high school teachers.

SUBJECTS: Participants for the study will consist of approximately 12 high school teachers of math, social studies, science, career and technical education, and art education. (The exact number of participants will be confirmed once data saturation has been achieved.) All participants will work within the same high school, in a public-school district in the state of Alabama. The group of teachers chosen will be based on teachers' responses to the preliminary questionnaire and how those responses meet the criteria of selection.

INFORMED CONSENT (Part 2 of 3)

PROCEDURES: Willing teachers of math, social studies, science, career and technical education, and art education will complete the preliminary questionnaire, and those whose responses meet the criteria of selection will be chosen for one-on-one interviews with the researcher. Interviews will be semi-structured, with a series of open-ended questions regarding participants' professional development experiences with, and their beliefs about, literacy instruction in the content area. Interviews will last thirty to forty-five minutes and will be audio recorded for transcription and data-analysis purposes. In some cases, a brief follow-up interview may be requested of a participant. All information collected will be analyzed for themes, in order to develop a professional development framework for strengthening teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction among high school teachers. Measures will be in place to protect the privacy of participants and the confidentiality of data. Direct identifiers, such as the names of participants, the subjects they teach, and the names of the school and school district, will be removed from data. Physical documents related to the study will be kept in a secure location, and all electronic documents will be kept on the researcher's personal computer, which will be password-protected.

BENEFITS/COMPENSATION: Results from this study will contribute to existing research on teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction among high school teachers, as well as contribute to the field of Education, by offering a professional development framework designed specifically to address, increase, and support teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction.

RISKS/DISCOMFORTS: This research study follows a sound research design, and measures are being taken to ensure that breach of confidentiality does not happen. Should any participant become uncomfortable while participating in the study, he or she may stop participation at any time. While it is not anticipated that a participant should be harmed or distressed by participating in this study, Louisiana Tech University is not able to offer financial compensation nor to absorb the costs of medical treatment should a participant become distressed or injured during or as a result of participation in this research.

* 1. INFORMED CONSENT (Part 3 of 3)

Participant Consent Form: Statement of Consent

By clicking "Yes" below, I confirm the following:

- I have read and understood the description of the study, its purposes, and its methods.
- I understand that my participation in this research is strictly voluntary and that my participation or refusal to participate in this study will not affect my relationship with my employer or with Louisiana Tech University in any way.
- I understand that I may withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any questions without penalty.
- I understand that, upon completion of the study, the results will be freely available to me upon request.
- I understand that the results of the shared information will be confidential, accessible only to the principal investigator, myself, or a legally appointed representative.
- I have not been requested to waive, nor do I waive, any of my rights related to participating in this study.

Yes

No

Preliminary Questionnaire

3. Demographic Information and Teaching History

2. What is your gender?

Female

Male

Prefer not to respond

3. What is your age?

21-29

30-39

40-49

50-59

60-69

70 or older

Prefer not to respond

4. What is the highest educational degree you have obtained? (Leave blank if you prefer not to respond.)

5. Including this school year, how many years total have you been teaching? (Leave blank if you prefer not to respond.)

6. Including this school year, how many years total have you taught in... (Leave blank if you prefer not to respond.)

a public-school setting?

a private-school setting?

Other? (Please specify type of setting and number of years in this setting.)

7. Including this school year, how many years total have you taught in... (Leave blank if you prefer not to respond.)

a middle-school setting?

a high-school setting?

Other? (Please specify type of setting and number of years in this setting.)

Preliminary Questionnaire

4. Teaching History (Continued)

8. Including this school year, how many years total have you taught within your current school district of employment? (Leave blank if you prefer not to respond.)

9. Does the total number of years that you have been employed within your current school district represent a consecutive number of years.

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to respond

10. Including this school year, how many years total have you been teaching within your current school of employment? (Leave blank if you prefer not to respond.)

Preliminary Questionnaire

5. Teaching History (Continued)

11. What grades are you teaching this year? (Choose all that apply.)

- 9th

 12th
 10th

 Other (Please specify below)
 11th

 Prefer not to respond

Please specify if "Other"

12. For each course you are teaching THIS year, please give the name of the course and the total number of years you have experience in teaching this particular course throughout your teaching career.

Examples:

Spanish I, 14 years

Spanish II, 11 years

(Leave blank if you prefer not to respond.)

Course 1:	<input type="text"/>
Course 2:	<input type="text"/>
Course 3:	<input type="text"/>
Course 4:	<input type="text"/>
Course 5:	<input type="text"/>
Course 6:	<input type="text"/>

Preliminary Questionnaire

6. Teaching History (Continued)

13. What other courses do you have experience teaching that are NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS SCHOOL YEAR? Again, please give the name of the course and the total number of years you have experience teaching it. (Leave blank if you prefer not to respond.)

Course 1:	<input type="text"/>
Course 2:	<input type="text"/>
Course 3:	<input type="text"/>
Course 4:	<input type="text"/>
Course 5:	<input type="text"/>
Course 6:	<input type="text"/>
Course 7:	<input type="text"/>
Course 8:	<input type="text"/>
Course 9:	<input type="text"/>
Course 10:	<input type="text"/>

Preliminary Questionnaire

7. Professional Opinions and Practices

14. Choose the response you feel best answers this question: *Whose responsibility should it be to teach explicit literacy instruction to students at the secondary-school level?*

- An English Teacher
 No one should be teaching literacy at the secondary-school level.
- All core-subject teachers
 Prefer not to respond
- All teachers of all subject areas (Core and Noncore)
- Other (Please specify in general terms; no names of individuals)

15. Optional: Briefly explain your answer to Question 14.

16. Complete the statement by choosing all responses you feel apply: *Professional development related to explicit literacy instruction in the content area would be...*

- Valuable to me
- Applicable to my subject area
- Useful
- Useless
- Not applicable to my subject area
- A waste of my time
- Prefer not to respond

17. Optional: Briefly explain your answer to Question 16.

Preliminary Questionnaire

8. Professional Opinions and Practices (Continued)

18. Choose your level of agreement with this statement: *In general, students at the secondary-school level should receive explicit literacy instruction, as they did at the elementary-school level?*

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Prefer not to respond

19. Optional: Briefly explain your answer to Question 18.

Preliminary Questionnaire

9. Professional Opinions and Practices (Continued)

20. Identify how much you believe you can handle each of the following situations within your classroom.

	Nothing/Not at all	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal	Prefer not to respond
How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in their school work?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How much can you do to get students to follow classroom rules?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How well can you help your students acquire and practice literacy skills in general?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How well can you deal with student literacy difficulties?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Preliminary Questionnaire

10. Professional Opinions and Practices (Continued)

21. Choose your level of agreement with this statement: *I have adequate knowledge, skills, and disposition to teach my content area.*

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Strongly Agree | <input type="radio"/> Disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Agree | <input type="radio"/> Strongly Disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Neutral | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to respond |

22. Choose your level of agreement with this statement: *I have adequate knowledge, skills, and disposition to consistently incorporate literacy instruction into my content-area instruction.*

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Strongly Agree | <input type="radio"/> Disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Agree | <input type="radio"/> Strongly Disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Neutral | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to respond |

23. Optional: Briefly explain your answers to Questions 21 and/or 22.

Preliminary Questionnaire

11. Information for Possible Interview

You are almost finished! Upon submission of your questionnaire, the researcher of this study will review your questionnaire responses and will determine if you are needed for the Interview portion of the study. Please provide the following information, should an interview be requested of you.

24. How would you prefer to be contacted?

- Email
- Phone
- Either method is fine

* 25. Contact Information

Name:

Email Address (leave blank if prefer not to be contacted this way):

Phone Number (leave blank if prefer not to be contacted this way):

26. Interviews will be conducted at some point before March 22nd. They will be scheduled at your convenience and will last between 30 and 45 minutes. When would you prefer to be interviewed?

- During my planning period
- After school
- In the evening
- On the weekend
- Other (please specify)

27. If you chose the answer response "During my planning period" in Question 26, which planning period do you have?

- 1st Period
- 2nd Period
- 3rd Period
- 4th Period
- 5th Period
- 6th Period
- 7th Period

28. Are there any dates between now and March 22nd that you know will not be convenient for you to be interviewed? If so, please specify below; if not, leave blank.

Preliminary Questionnaire

12. Information for Possible Interview (Continued)

29. LAST QUESTION! Interviews will be audio recorded for transcription and data-analysis purposes. The audio recording will be transcribed by a third-party, professional transcriber. To conceal your identity from the professional transcriber, please specify a different first name for the researcher to use as a pseudonym for you, when referring to you during the interview and throughout the written results of the study.

Preliminary Questionnaire

13. FINISHED!

This concludes the Preliminary Questionnaire. PLEASE CLICK THE "SUBMIT" BUTTON BELOW TO SUBMIT YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE. Your time is greatly appreciated, and your information will be kept confidential at all times. Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns regarding this questionnaire:



Rationale Behind Preliminary Questionnaire

The following is an explanation of the rationale behind the questions asked on the questionnaire and how the questions were designed to help bring about study participants who met the criteria of selection.

The preliminary questionnaire contains four main sections: Participant Consent, Demographic Information and Teaching History, Professional Opinions and Practices, and Information for Possible Interview. In the first section, responders are given information from the participant consent form and are asked to click whether or not they give their consent to participate in the study. For those who give consent, they are taken to the second section of the questionnaire. This second section asks for demographic information and for information regarding their teaching history. First, responders are asked to provide their gender, age, and highest educational degree obtained. Then, they are asked for the number of years they have been teaching. Even though Tschannen-Moran and Johnson (2011) found no significant impact on self-efficacy for literacy instruction from participants' years of experience, I wanted to interview teachers with at least five years of teaching experience, since within the first few years of teaching, teachers are going through a period of adjustment (Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005), where they are establishing their role as teachers and developing their instructional-performance and classroom-management skills (Fuller, 1969; Kagan, 1992), as well as their problem-solving skills (Kagan, 1992). According to Kagan (1992), beginning teachers start their career with beliefs about themselves as teachers and with beliefs about students and school in general. The situations they experience in the beginning years (i.e., their first, second, and third years of teaching) force teachers to uncover, confront,

confirm, and/or modify their beliefs. Their identity as a teacher is recreated and improved throughout those first few years, and, eventually, they are established enough to be able to shift their focus from developing themselves as teachers to developing their students' skills and achievement (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2006; Rivkin et al., 2005). To demonstrate, Clotfelter, Ladd, and Vigdor (2006) found that students of teachers with six or more years of experience scored higher on standardized math and reading tests than students with teachers who had five years of experience or less. Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain (2005) found similar results in students' scores but in students who had teachers with more than three years of experience. Therefore, because beginning teachers become more effective as teachers after three to five years of experience, I wanted to find teachers who had at least five years of experience, to help to ensure that participants had had time to develop their self-efficacy for teaching in general, as well as their self-efficacy for teaching within their content area.

In addition to asking respondents the number of years they have been teaching, the questionnaire asks them the number of years they have taught within a public-, private-, or other-school setting, as well as about the number of years they have taught within a middle-school setting, a high-school setting, and/or a setting at any other level. These are asked to ensure selection of participants who have experience mainly from within a public, high school setting. By looking for experienced teachers whose experience has mainly been in a public, high school setting, I was attempting to achieve some homogeneity among the sample of participants. Next within this second section, responders are asked about their current teaching situation. First, they are asked how many years they have been teaching within their school district and school, because I was

looking for experienced teachers who have been at their current school since at least the 2013-2014 school year—the first of two school years when district leaders placed a strong professional-development emphasis on literacy-instruction integration within all content areas and grade levels. Next, responders are asked what grade level(s) and subject area(s) they are currently teaching. For each subject area, responders are asked to give the name of the subject and the total number of years they have been teaching that subject (at their current school and elsewhere, combined). In addition, responders are asked about other subject areas they have experience teaching, that are not applicable to this school year; again, they are asked to provide the name of the subject area(s) and the total number of years they have experience in that/those area(s). This information was collected to know all areas in which responders have experience, to ensure selection of participants whose experience is mainly in teaching math, social studies, science, career and technical education, or art education.

The third section of the preliminary questionnaire asks responders about their professional opinions and practices. Responders are asked whose responsibility they believe it should be to explicitly teach literacy at the secondary level; also, they are asked how useful they believe professional development on explicit literacy instruction in their content area would be to them. In addition, responders are asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement that students at the secondary-school level should receive explicit literacy instruction, as they did at the elementary-school level. This series of questions was helpful to me in selecting participants, because respondents' answers gave me an idea of whether or not they value the idea of literacy development among secondary students. It was necessary for me to find participants who valued this idea,

because during the interview, I am going to ask the participant if he or she incorporates explicit literacy instruction into his or her content-area instruction. The potential that the participant will say that he or she does not, or does so very little, is high, given the research on teacher resistance to literacy instruction explained earlier. Therefore, before the interview, I need to feel confident that even if the participant were to say that he or she does not incorporate literacy instruction into content-area instruction, the participant would still be able to help me understand why this is the case and would be open to discussing the issue further, rather than stating that literacy development for secondary students is not necessary and having nothing more to say than what I have already learned from the research presented in Chapter 2.

Furthermore, within the third section of the questionnaire, responders are asked eight questions about their beliefs in themselves as teachers to handle various teaching situations. The first six teaching situations are related to student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management; the last two questions are related to literacy-instruction integration. For each question, responders are asked to identify how much they believe they can handle each situation by choosing that they believe they can *do nothing, do very little, have some influence, do quite a bit, or do a great deal*. I included the first six questions to informally gage responders' sense of self-efficacy for teaching in general and the last two questions informally gage their sense of self-efficacy for literacy-instruction integration. The first six questions and all of the response choices come from the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), but the scale is not being used in this study as designed; instead only six of the scale's 24 questions are used, to find potential participants who display a stronger sense

of self-efficacy as a teacher. I will think of a responder as appearing to have a stronger sense of self-efficacy for teaching in general, if he or she mainly answers the first six questions by choosing *quite a bit* or *a great deal*. Teachers who appear this way will be eligible as potential participants. I am looking to interview participants who have a stronger sense of teacher self-efficacy to begin with, to be able to gain an understanding of participants' self-efficacy (or lack thereof) for literacy instruction, without having to be overly concerned that the participants' self-efficacy for teaching is influencing his or her self-efficacy for literacy instruction to a large extent. Also, I will compare the responder's answers for these six questions to their answers for the last two questions related to literacy instruction. I would like to see if there is a difference in responses between the way the first six questions are answered and the way the last two questions are answered. If there is a difference, I will mention this during the interview to get participants' thoughts on why they believe there is a difference. In fact, I am ending the third section of the preliminary questionnaire with two more questions that are designed to see if there is a difference between the teacher's self-efficacy for teaching in general and the teacher's self-efficacy for literacy instruction. Responders are being asked to indicate their level of agreement with these questions: *I have adequate knowledge, skills, and disposition to teach my content area* and *I have adequate knowledge, skills, and disposition to consistently incorporate literacy instruction into my content-area instruction*. I did this to see if the answers were similar or different, to then have them elaborate upon that during the interview.

The final section of the preliminary questionnaire asks responders for contact information should I choose them for the interview portion of the study. The last part of

this section asks them to provide a pseudonym for me to use during the interview and throughout the written results, since the audio recording of the interview will be transcribed by a third-party, professional transcriber.

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS

Subject: Quick Follow-Up to Request for Participation

Hi Teachers,

I wanted to send a quick follow-up email to the request I sent to you on Monday. I really appreciate you taking the time to consider whether or not to participate. Also, if you are having any doubts about participating, it may help you to have a better understanding of why I chose "literacy instruction" as the center of my research study.

You see, I've been a Spanish teacher for 16 years, and throughout my career, I've been encouraged by administrators to incorporate as much literacy instruction as possible within my content area. This task has always been a challenge to me. Even though the topics covered at professional development workshops (like "literacy standards," "literacy across the curriculum," "close-reading instruction," "Tier 2 academic vocabulary," and "How to increase students' ACT scores") have sounded like great ideas to implement, I haven't been able to put these ideas into practice on a consistent basis...for a variety of reasons. I have often wondered if other teachers (of non-English language arts content areas) have experienced the same dilemma that I have in trying to find the balance between including literacy instruction while mainly keeping the focus on topics within my Spanish content area.

So, all of this is what led me toward choosing this area of focus for my research study. I'm basically just looking for teachers' perspectives on questions such as *Do you incorporate literacy instruction consistently? If so, how/how often? What challenges/successes have you had? If you don't incorporate it consistently, why do you think that is?* Any information you could give me would be very helpful to me.

Please feel free to email me if you have any questions and thank you again for your consideration and time!

Sincerely,
Melissa

Melissa Baker
Doctoral Candidate, Louisiana Tech University
Spanish Teacher, [REDACTED] High School

APPENDIX G

PERSONALIZED EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS

Subject: Hey, Mr. [REDACTED]!

Hey, Mr. [REDACTED]! Hope you're doing well! I was just wondering if you've had a chance yet to consider being a part of my study. Is participating in it something you're interested in doing, or do you need to take a pass on this request? I assure you that I COMPLETELY UNDERSTAND if you're too busy right now!! No pressure; I promise! :) I'm just needing to know your decision either way; I have to secure a specific number of participants within a specific time frame, so knowing your intentions (to participate or not) would be very helpful and much appreciated. Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,
Melissa

APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interview Guide

Pseudonym _____

Date/Time/Location _____

1. Initial Comments Before Beginning Interview

- Thank you so much for your time!
- This should not last more than 45 minutes.
- Is it okay to audio record this?
- Is it okay to take notes during this?

2. Introduction Statements

- I'm trying to get an understanding of each participant's perspective on and experiences with integrating literacy instruction into their content area.
- I will ask you several open-ended questions.
- Just as a reminder:
 - Your participation is voluntary
 - You can refuse to answer any questions you'd like, without penalty
 - You can withdraw from the study at any time, without penalty.
 - Measures are in place to protect your privacy and the confidentiality of information you give.
 - Results of the study can be available to you upon your request
- Do you have any questions?

3. **GIVE CONSENT FORM TO BE SIGNED AND GIVE PARTICIPANT A COPY**

4. Ask Interview Questions

- First, have participants elaborate upon their answers to Questions 14 through 23 on the Preliminary Questionnaire
- Next, use any of the questions on the next page as a guide for asking about topics not covered during the previous discussion

5. At the End of the Interview

- Would it be possible to contact you for a follow-up interview if needed?
- Please email or call me if you want to add to your responses after reflecting on the interview.
- Thank you for your time!!

Questions to ask AFTER discussion on participant's responses to Questions 14 through 23 on the Preliminary Questionnaire (Use any of these questions as a guide for asking about topics not covered during the previous discussion.)

Ask: Are you currently required or held accountable in your school to include literacy instruction within your content instruction?

- **If yes,**
 - Describe how you do it.
 - To what extent and how often?
 - How confident do you feel in your abilities to do so, in comparison to your level of confidence as a (name of content area) teacher?
 - How do you feel about this being a requirement in your school?
 - Is doing so worth your time?
 - Is doing so valuable to your students?
 - What successes/challenges have you encountered in doing so?
 - What has supported your efforts?
 - What professional development experiences or previous training have you had that relate to literacy-instruction integration?
 - How often?
 - Were they helpful?
 - Did they include collaboration, coaching, modeling, demonstrations?
 - Did they attend to your beliefs about literacy instruction?
- **If no:**
 - Ask: Do you include it anyway?
 - If yes,
 - (Ask all of the above)
 - If no,
 - If you were told that you had to start including literacy instruction within your content instruction immediately, how confident are you that you could do so easily?
 - Explain.
 - If participant needs prompting, ask
 - How well can you help your students acquire and practice literacy skills in general?
 - Would there be a difference in your confidence level to incorporate literacy instruction, in comparison to your level of confidence as a (name of content area) teacher?
 - How would you feel about this becoming a requirement at your school?
 - Would incorporating literacy instruction be worth your time?
 - Would incorporating literacy instruction be valuable to your students?
 - What problems do you feel could arise in incorporating literacy instruction?
 - Describe your level of interest in adjusting your instructional practices to increase explicit literacy instruction.
 - How would your current work environment foster or inhibit the integration of literacy in your classroom?
 - What professional development experiences or previous training have you had that relate to literacy-instruction integration?
 - How often?
 - Were they helpful?
 - Did they include collaboration, coaching, modeling, demonstration?
 - Did they attend to your beliefs about literacy instruction?

APPENDIX I

RESEARCHER'S MEMO FORM

Memo # _____	Date _____
Based on (<i>description of data</i>):	
Memo Notes:	
Suggested Next Steps and Reminders:	
Related Self-Reflection of the Researcher: <i>Is it possible that my assumptions, perspectives, biases, experiences, etc. could have influenced my interpretation of these data in any way?</i>	

APPENDIX J

**LIST OF CODES AND CATEGORIES AFTER
CODING ALL TRANSCRIPTS**

Codes	Categories
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy instruction involves types of activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reading activities ○ Basic writing activities ○ Writing using higher-order thinking skills ○ Vocabulary instruction (Tier 3) ○ Vocabulary instruction (Tier2) • Sees literacy instruction as a separate entity from content instruction 	<p style="text-align: center;">Definition of literacy/literacy instruction</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-class reading/writing • In-class writing • Projects • Outside-class supplemental reading and comprehension quizzes • Introduction to content instruction through reading and writing component • Vocabulary instruction (Tier 3) • Vocabulary instruction (Tier 2) • Grading • Incorporates into every lesson • Incorporates at various times of the year 	<p style="text-align: center;">What she does to bring in literacy instruction and how often</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance • Students won't do it on their own • Prior experiences before teaching • Outside PD • All students need practice for future • All teachers have responsibility • Only English teachers are responsible • Experiences with student success/buy-in • Values literacy instruction in all content areas • Values the idea of literacy instruction 	<p style="text-align: center;">What she believes in? / Why she does as she does? (Where desire/knowledge came from to implement literacy instruction...)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time • Coverage of content • Concerns about students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students lack in general literacy skills ○ Students have poor writing skills ○ Students regurgitate information/don't think deeply ○ Students lack in vocabulary knowledge • Pushback from students, parents, and/or administrators • Feels lack of confidence /training 	<p style="text-align: center;">Challenges to implementation/Concerns</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of accountability/no follow-up • Takes own time (Self-initiated PD) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To create own materials ○ To find material to incorporate literacy instruction ○ To go to other teachers about literacy instruction ○ To learn about literacy instruction • PD that has not helped <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information problem: too vague, not relevant, too general ○ Lack of support from administration ○ Lecture style ○ No time to practice and digest information 	<p>Current PD/Accountability</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be with other subject-area teachers • Help teachers realize... • Give plenty of time for... • Demonstrations / Show practical and applicable ideas • Consistent theme over time • Subject-specific information 	<p>PD suggestions to help teachers get on board/follow through</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD on literacy-instruction integration would be valuable to her • Struggling readers: thoughts, feelings, concerns, tactics with • If were held accountable for including literacy instruction... 	<p>Other??</p>

APPENDIX K

FINAL LIST OF REVISED CODES AND CATEGORIES

AFTER FURTHER ANALYSIS

Codes	Categories
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What she does to integrate literacy instruction and how often (includes all codes from before, as subcodes) • Definition of literacy/literacy instruction (includes all codes from before, as subcodes) 	<p style="text-align: center;">What she does to integrate literacy instruction</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes important for students' future • Believes all teachers have a responsibility • To comply 	<p style="text-align: center;">Why she does what she does</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside PD (led to realizations and changes in practices) • Prior to teaching work experience • Own school experience as a student • Concerns that have developed within her throughout teaching career (as a result of working with students...concerns like students lacking in general literacy skills, students preferring behavior such as the teacher just telling student the answers, and students lacking in vocab knowledge) • Experiences with student success • Experiences of study buy-in 	<p style="text-align: center;">Influences on beliefs and literacy-integration efforts</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No time because feels need to cover content • Does not know enough (feels is lacking in creativity and feels unsure of how to do literacy) • Literacy instruction is a separate entity form content instruction • Literacy is responsibility of English teacher only 	<p style="text-align: center;">Beliefs that hinder</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed value in literacy-instruction integration, but time constraint • Expressed value in literacy-instruction integration, but too much content to cover • Expressed value in literacy-instruction integration, but it is mainly up to English teachers 	<p style="text-align: center;">Expressed value in literacy-instruction integration, but...</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants to improve • Wants to improve...with conditions (would improve: if were held accountable, if were given meaningful PD, if were required to) 	<p>Wants to grow and improve</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in instructional practices because of concerns, experiences with students, and realizations about students and vocab • Changes in beliefs because of experiences with students • Change in amount of persistence; now wants to keep persisting in efforts and growing 	<p>Influences leading to change</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of accountability/no follow-up • Characteristics of PD that have not/do not help (such as info not applicable to content area, lack of admin. support, info too general to reach anyone when putting mix of subjects together, lecture style, no time to practice and digest info, info not relevant or vague) 	<p>Current setting/PD</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject-specific information • Time to experience on own • Demonstrations 	<p>Characteristics of PD experiences that led to change in teacher's beliefs and practices</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration (better communicating the importance of it in every content area, offering PD, holding teachers accountable, making literacy a consistent focus) • Consistent theme over time • Help teachers realize... (that they can start with just one strategy, that students are not understanding what they're reading and need guidance, that students need practice in literacy for their future, that integrating literacy does not have to take long, that content can be taught through literacy instruction, that it is something they can do) 	<p>Suggestions for teacher buy-in</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make PD meaningful to teacher (with same-subject presenter, subject-specific information, demonstrations, time to experience, time to practice, time to plan/create, time to digest, time with same-subject colleagues to collaborate) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External-teaching experiences (ETEs): experiences teachers described that occurred separate from their teaching experiences and time spent with students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outside PD (led to realizations and changes in practices) ○ Prior to teaching work experience ○ Own school experience as a student • Within-classroom experiences (WCEs): experiences teachers described that occurred while teaching and working with students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerns that have developed within her throughout teaching career (as a result of working with students...concerns like students lacking in general literacy skills and vocab knowledge) • Experiences with student success 	<p style="text-align: center;">Awareness-building experiences (Influences on beliefs and literacy-integration efforts)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influences on beliefs and literacy-integration efforts • Suggestions for teacher buy-in • Influences leading to change • Characteristics of PD experiences that led to change in teacher's beliefs and practices 	<p style="text-align: center;">Characteristics for PD framework</p>

APPENDIX L

CONNECTIONS BETWEEN RESEARCH QUESTIONS, STUDY FINDINGS, AND CATEGORIES/PATTERNS

Research Question	Study Findings	Categories/Patterns that Led to the Findings
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Subquestion 1:</u> What similarities and differences exist among participants' understanding of literacy-instruction integration as it relates to their content area?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 10 participants define literacy-instruction integration in the content area as involving the inclusion of reading and writing activities related to topics within their content area. • The majority (eight of the ten) define it as involving the inclusion of content-vocabulary instruction as well. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Definition of literacy-instruction integration</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Subquestion 2:</u> What similarities and differences exist among the ways in which participants incorporate literacy instruction into content instruction, as well as among the extent to which they do so?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the participants (nine of the 10) incorporate some type of literacy instruction into every lesson, through use of content-related, vocabulary-building activities and/or through use of reading and writing activities related to topics within their content area. • Over half of the participants (six of the ten) incorporate additional literacy-related activities at various times of the year. 	<p style="text-align: center;">What she does to integrate literacy instruction and how often</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Subquestion 3:</u> What beliefs and experiences have contributed to, or have hindered, participants' understanding and implementation of literacy-instruction integration?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 10 participants believe that high school students need practice in literacy, because they will need strong literacy skills in the future. • The majority of the participants (eight of the 10) believe that it is every teacher's responsibility to teach literacy, regardless of content area. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Beliefs about literacy-instruction integration</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six participants revealed holding at least one belief that could be hindering their literacy-instruction integration efforts. • Five of the six revealed the belief that they do not have time to bring in literacy instruction more than they do, because they need to cover course content. • Three of the six revealed that they feel lacking in some way and, therefore, cannot integrate literacy instruction more than they do. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Beliefs that hinder teacher efforts to integrate literacy instruction</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the participants (eight of the 10) revealed having at least one awareness-building experience in their past that has contributed to their literacy-integration efforts. • All eight revealed having at least one within-classroom experience (WCE). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seven of the eight had at least one WCE related to concerns. ○ Four of the eight had at least one WCE related to student success. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Awareness-building experiences that contributed to teacher efforts to integrate literacy instruction / Influences on beliefs and literacy-integration efforts</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five of the eight revealed having at least one external-teaching experience, in addition to experiencing at least one WCE. 	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Central Question:</u> Among the study participants, what are the breadth and depth of teacher self-efficacy for integrating literacy instruction into content instruction on a consistent basis?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five of the 10 participants demonstrated characteristics similar to teachers found in research to have higher teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction. (These were the ones who appeared to have a strong enough belief in their capabilities to put forth the effort needed to use their capabilities to bring about literacy-instruction integration and to persist in those efforts, on a continuous basis, even in the face of adversity; also, they demonstrated a willingness to improve upon their capabilities to better integrate literacy instruction in the future.) 	<p>Previous codes and categories compared to existing research</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The remaining five participants demonstrated characteristics more similar to teachers found in research to have lower teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction. (These were the teachers who appeared to have weaker beliefs in their capabilities, as they did not describe expending as much commitment, effort, or persistence as their participant-counterparts, in using their capabilities to bring about literacy-instruction on a consistent basis.) 	<p>Previous codes and categories compared to existing research</p>