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ABSTRACT

An Investigation of Exemplary Teaching Practice of Teachers of Native American Students

by

William Marshall Young

Dr. Jane McCarthy, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

This dissertation traces the historical roots of indigenous education from the violation of treaty rights of the late 1800’s to the staggering rates of non-persistency facing Native American students today. While many factors are outside of the classroom teacher’s scope of influence, teacher candidates should be trained in culturally responsive methods to address factors that are within their control and which can be addressed in the classroom.

The study was conducted using a mixed-methods design employing Creswell’s (2008a) sequential transformative strategy. STS is a multi-phase study with an implicit theoretical lens. In this study the researcher is situated at an intersection between reform of current educational practice using the work of Demmert, Ladson-Billings and Haberman and equity for all students using the work of Villegas, Sheets, and Hermes. The researcher employed a phase I survey instrument to gather data from 122 certified teachers at an elementary, middle, and high school site to examine characteristics of
exemplary teachers. Using data from the first phase the researcher developed an
interview protocol and selected participants for an in-depth qualitative interview.

The researcher, using this study, and the emergent the conceptual model, as a
blueprint, found that four significant implications for teacher education. The four
implications are: relationship building; reframing race and poverty; exposing teacher
candidates’ views of the “other;” and, examination of self through reflection. Classroom
and subsequent academic change for teachers will necessitate their coming to terms with
new strategies. The starting point for reform lies squarely in the preparation of teacher
candidates at the preservice level if reform is to be achieved. The implications for teacher
education presented here contributed to the development of teacher candidates that could
gain the characteristics necessary to use the emergent conceptual model.

This conceptual model recognizes the important of the representative
characteristics of caring educators and is further concerned with the process of how those
characteristics are utilized to impact academic success. A process orientated model is
presented that uses the characteristics of effective teaching, the humanistic, instructional,
and the academic, in concert to ultimately gain the product of persistency and academic
success for Native American students.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Historically, Native American students in the United States have consistently experienced an undervalued education. Native American students, specifically in western South Dakota, are not finding the educational success that their non-Native peers enjoy. To understand this issue this dissertation is a report of a mixed-methods study of exemplary teaching of Native American students. It reexamines the history of education for Native Americans, the preparation of teacher candidates, and the socio-cultural machinations for teacher candidate’s preparation programs for those individuals planning to work with Native American students.

This issue is particularly salient to the researcher both personally as well as professionally as the researcher spent nine years teaching in a multi-ethnic secondary English classroom and has witnessed both the successes and failures of Native American students. Educators purport to want the best for all of their students, but clearly not all Native American students are graduating from high school. Where are these students going and at what cost to society? Obviously no educator wants to shoulder the burden of unsuccessful students.

This dissertation utilizes the mixed-methodology of sequential transformative strategy as a multi-phase study with an implicit theoretical lens designed to investigate what exemplary teachers’ do that may be beneficial in the education of Native American students. This first chapter of the dissertation presents the salient background of the study, outlines the problem of the study, describes the significance of the study, and presents a brief overview of the methodology used in this investigation.
The Historical Roots of Native American Education

The historical roots of modern Indian education in western South Dakota began with the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868. The toll of war, disease and starvation led to the negotiation of manifold treaties, most significantly the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868. This treaty, in the attempt to pacify and placate, granted all of the land stretching from the Missouri River to the Big Horn Mountains to the Sioux. A portion of the treaty read: “No white person or persons shall be permitted to settle upon or occupy any portion of the territory or without consent of the Indians to pass through the same” (Brown, 1970, p. 373). The 1868 agreement at Fort Laramie plainly gave the Sioux all of western South Dakota; however, when gold was discovered in the Black Hills in 1874, the floodgate of prospectors was opened and the treaty was blatantly violated (Cook-Lynn, 2005).

The Sioux, upset by this breach of treaty rights, fought back. After a series of skirmishes on the high plains, the Indians were subdued and forced on to reservations. Spring (1997) wrote that “the reservation system combined with education was considered the best method for dealing with what then Commissioner of Indian Affairs Luke Lea called the ‘wilder tribes’” (p.27). The reservation system was an attempt to deculturalize Native Americans. Deculturalization according to Spring (1997) refers to the stripping away of a people’s culture by replacing it with a new one. The goal of this forced movement onto the reservations was the transformation of a nomadic people into an agrarian society. Clearly tending crops under difficult conditions left little time for war. This transformation has also been referred to as “Acculturation.” Acculturation has been described as the cultural change that occurs when two or more cultures are in persistent contact. A particular kind of acculturation is assimilation, in which one culture
changes significantly more than the other culture, and as a result, comes to resemble it.
Garcia and Alber (1992) stated this process is often established deliberately through force
to maintain control over conquered people, but it can occur voluntarily as well. This
maintenance of control was the method employed by the U.S. government after the
conquest of the Native Americans.

The most important step in replacing the Native culture with the dominant culture
was the assimilation of the Native Americans. The government thought that the best path
toward assimilation was through education, “Education was the means whereby we
emancipated the Indian child from his home, his parents, his extended family, and his
cultural heritage (U.S., 1969, p. 9). It was in effect “an attempt to wash the ‘savage
habits’ and ‘tribal ethic’ out of a child’s mind and substitute a white middle-class value
system in its place” often using boarding schools far from the reservations (U.S., 1969, p. 9).

The first off-reservation boarding school was established in 1879 in Carlisle,
Pennsylvania by Richard Pratt (Spring, 1997). Pratt, a former prison warden turned
Indian educator, has been attributed with the quote that the goal of Indian education was
to “Kill the Indian to save the man” in every student (Churchill, 2004). Furthermore
Spring (1997) credited Pratt with the slogan of the Carlisle Indian School that reflected
the emphasis on changing cultural patterns of Indians: “To civilize the Indian, get him to
civilization. To keep him civilized, let him stay” (p.28). This quote, with the emphasis on
“let him stay,” was clearly evident in that the children usually spent a minimum of eight
continuous years away from their families and communities (Garrett M.T., 1996). The
time spent in off-reservation boarding schools was necessary, in Pratt’s argument, to
immerse “Indians in our civilization and when we get them under [hold] them until they are thoroughly soaked” (Spring, 1997, p. 29). The off-reservation boarding schools according to Riney, (1999) in his book *The Rapid City Indian School*, “were the government’s most powerful weapon against tribes and tribal cultures” (p. 7). Sending students to the off-reservation boarding schools was a major factor in the acculturation effort.

Through the first half the nineteenth century, the idea of assimilation guided curriculum development for Native American education. According to Yazzie (1999), Native American students endured a series of forced introductions to a new “civilized” culture. The replacement of Native languages with English, demand for allegiance to the U.S. government, and destroying Indian customs emerged as the major educational polices during this time (Spring, 1997). For decades, Native American students tried to make sense of what they learned in history, math, and reading lessons, while living in a separate society. Lomawaima (1999) wrote “Children found themselves in difficult, often hostile circumstances, where their own language, religion, culture, behavior, and individualism were under constant, systematic attack” (p. 17). Often the attempt to civilize Indian students was brutal, and even sadistic. Being cognizant of the oppressive conditions, why would some Native American families willingly send their students to the boarding schools?

By the beginning of the boarding school era the open warfare of the prairie was largely over. In a sense, going to school was a substitute for going to war. In a different sense, for the government, too, the school was a way to continue a conflict by other
means. Riney, (1999) wrote about how some Sioux saw the boarding school as an opportunity:

Ota Kte (Luther Standing Bear) remembered his father, Mato Najin (Standing Bear), who had many times told his son the value of bravery on the battlefield. It was better to die young on the battlefield, even away from home, than to suffer old age. Yet Mato Najin had made peace with his enemies and no longer fought. Perhaps taking the chance to go east (to the Carlisle Indian School) would prove Ota Kte’s bravery (p.4).

This is not to say that the Native Americans did not place great value on education. While writing about the Chilocco Indian School of the desert southwest in her book They Called it Prairie Light, Lomawaima (1994) wrote: “In the Indian Territory, education was by and large a desired commodity” (p.19). The Native Americans recognized that education, even under a system that was foreign to them, was an opportunity to show their bravery and a chance to succeed educationally.

The educational polices of the U.S. government described above continued into the 1900s when people started to examine critically what role the U.S. government should play in Indian education. For the first time the U.S. government considered the cultural aspects and educational needs of Native Americans. Efforts to provide an education more respectful of Native American cultures have been sporadic. The first discussion that legitimized cultural considerations in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) school curricula began with the release of The Problem of Indian Administration, better known as the Meriam Report, in 1928 (Yazzie, 1999). The Meriam Report signaled a significant change for the U.S. government’s policies for Indian Education. The report
stated that “the most fundamental need in Indian education was a change in government attitude” (Meriam, 1928, p. 346). Another salient change was the desire of the U.S. government to move away from the boarding school polices and towards a local approach of education. Federal policy after the Meriam report began to stress community day schools as well as the support of Native cultures (Spring, 1997).

Despite the criticism of Native American education after the release of the Meriam report and the subsequent move away from the boarding schools policies, education did not improve markedly. In fact, in some ways it became worse. During the 1940s and 1950s, federal Indian policy was directed at termination of both tribes and reservations (Spring, 1997). Again, the federal policy was moving toward assimilation by attempting to break up tribes and relocate Native Americans to urban settings. A further negative aspect of the relocation effort was its intention to achieve sociocultural integration. Through relocation as an attempt to decrease dependence on the federal government, vast tracts of Native American lands were sold. This plunged Native Americans into deeper poverty (Garrett M.T., 1996). During this time the U.S. Government reduced the tribally held land base from 140 million acres to just under 50 million acres (U.S., 1969). The relocation effort was met with great resistance and Native Americans found an ally in the Kennedy administration in the 1960s.

The relocation effort failed. In 1969 the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare issued the report *Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge* also known as *The Kennedy Report*. Apparently recognizing the errors of the past they reported that the historical literature revealed that the dominant policy of the U.S. government toward the Native Americans had been one of forced assimilation and
the desire to divest the Native Americans of land. The Kennedy report (1969) documented the significant failure of American public education to address Native learners’ needs. The report identified the federal government’s policy of coercive assimilation of American Indians and Alaska Native people as the fundamental cause of this failure. The most significant attribute of the report was the recommendation of “maximum participation and control by Indians in establishing Indian education programs” (Spring, 1997, p. 102). With The Kennedy Report as a spring board schools and programs began to move toward meeting the needs of Native Americans for the first time since colonization.

Strides were being taken to ensure the efficacy and solvency of education for Native American students. One of the first steps was the passage of the Indian Education Act of 1972. The act was aimed toward providing financial assistance to meet the needs of Native American students (Spring, 1997). The next and most important step, according to Spring (1997) was the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975, which gave tribes the power to contract with the U.S. government to run their own education and health programs. This was meaningful not only for the reservation schools but also it allowed Native Americans to influence their education at off-reservation schools.

Ogbu and Simmons (1998) speak of involuntary minorities as people who have been either conquered or enslaved. Native Americans have been both and as such have suffered educationally. This educational deficit has lead to unequal opportunities for the success of Native American students. The intent of this paper is to investigate this inequity.
The Problem Statement

The education afforded to Native Americans has improved but they “continue to be disproportionately affected by poverty, low educational attainment, and access to fewer educational opportunities than other students” (Beaulieu, 2000, p.6). Sheets (2003) criticized “In reality, as U.S. citizens our children are methodically violated in our public schools and their entitlement to equal educational opportunities is criminally denied.” (n.p.). Tippeconnic and Faircloth (2006) wrote “although many American Indian students are successful in school, the reality is that too many are not” (n.p.). Many factors have been illustrative of this fact thus far. Beaulieu (2000) found that Indian students often start school unprepared to learn, their achievement rate is often lower, the dropout rates for Indian students are high, and that few Indian students enter and finish college.

Statistically, 90% of Americans, of all racial backgrounds, graduate from high school (Day & Newburger, 2002). Native American students do not share the same rate of secondary persistency. Moran, Rampey, Dion, and Donahue (2008) reported that Native Americans and Alaska Native students have a dropout rate of 33%, about twice the national average and the highest dropout rate of any United States ethnic or racial group cited. While some Native Americans dropout of school because their needs are not being met, Reyhner (1992) writes that others are “pushed out because they protest, in a variety of ways, how they are being treated” (p. 36). According to Villegas (1988) that act of dropping out may be a form of resistance to the dominant culture and its oppressive conditions in society, although the behavior itself is probably counterproductive in that it can function to disempower minorities further.
With the aforementioned rates of non-persistency for Native American students the researcher is motivated not to continue to document the negative aspects of the seemingly inferior education that Native Americans receive but rather to investigate what exemplary teachers do that may help keep Native American students in the classroom. In order to do that the researcher has formulated the following two research questions.

The Research Questions

1. What characteristics do faculty perceive in successful teachers of Native American students?
2. Which characteristics of exemplary teachers of Native American students are most clearly related to understanding principles of effective teaching of Native American students and effective teaching practices in general?

The Professional Significance of the Study

What educators must do is examine the place of culture and teaching practices to best influence the education of Native American students. Whitbeck, Hoyt, Stubben and LaFromboise (2001) argued that traditional culture functions as a protective mechanism when used to guide curriculum. Considering the position of culture, Spring (1999) suggested that “loyalty to their native culture versus accommodation to the dominant culture premised on the belief that neither abandoning one’s own culture nor gaining respect and acceptance will do anything to change the basic political and economic relations in society” (p. 93). A solution seems to be found in the ability of teachers to mitigate social and economic factors influencing poor academic performance by immersing themselves in the communities in which they teach (Demmert, 2001). Tippeconnic (2000) argues that the key to success is two-fold: “first, to hire competent
teachers who know how to teach Indian students; and second, to increase parental and tribal involvement” (p. 38). The emergent question seems to be what do such teachers do differently in their classrooms to foster success for Native American students? It appears that literature provides a road map for the best practice in the education of Native Americans and the role of culture is its roots. This study investigates the characteristics of such teachers as well as their teaching practice.

Whitbeck et al. (2001) examined factors affecting school success for Native American students. The researchers used a socio-cultural lens to investigate the role of traditional culture on academic success. The researchers discovered that the older the child became the lower her/his academic performance. Furthermore, Whitbeck et al. (2001), like Coburn and Nelson (1987), found that maternal warmth, extracurricular activities, a sense of enculturation, and self esteem relate positively to school success. The findings support a growing body of research on Native American cultural traditions supporting Native youth’s school success.

Whitbeck et al. (2001) believe that traditional culture may result in cultural discontinuity that occurs when Native American students find themselves in an environment that contradicts their traditional values. Both teachers and students come to the classroom with expectations about how people should behave (and speak and think and feel) derived largely from their experience outside the classroom (Jordan, 1985). If they come from different cultural backgrounds, they may differ in those expectations on a great many fronts. Traditional cultural imbues children with pride in cultural heritage and gives them the direction they need to negotiate their way through the cultural contradictions (Whitbeck et al., 2001). With the role of traditional culture so plainly
important to school success for Native American children teachers have yet another suggestion on how best to teach their students.

Reyhner’s (1992) research indicates that particularly negative critical factors for Indian students include large schools, uncaring and untrained teachers, passive teaching methods, inappropriate curriculum, inappropriate testing/student retention, tracked classes, and lack of parental involvement. This seems to be consistent with school success in general. The majority of Native American students attend public schools so this challenge to succeed extends to them. It becomes apparent that both teachers and researchers have ideas about what works best for educating Native American students and further more that these ideas are not being implemented successfully.

The issue of persistency at both the secondary and post secondary levels is pivotal to this discussion if society feels strongly about educational equity. Persistency issues come to light early in the educational experience for Native American students. As an ideal this model of schooling is based on a belief in the educatability of all people, the right to education, and the importance of education in maintaining economic and democratic rights (Spring, 1999)

While several issues critical issues have been raised, much work remains to be done. Researchers should continue to investigate the manifold challenges inherent in educating Native American students. “Much of the current diversity scholarship, in spite of its quantity and quality, appears to advance a mindset satisfied with magic, hope, and advocacy-rather than pedagogy” (Sheets 2003, n.p.). It is not enough to know that Native American students have and are experiencing an undervalued education and are failing to persist in staggering numbers at all levels of education. The PK-12 and post secondary
data for Native American achievement, graduation, and persistence rates continue to be an area in dire need of research (Bowman, 2003), but what is done with this knowledge that affects change. Deyhle and Swisher (1997) reported that “research based on cultural strengths and culture integrity has yielded significant sustainable results for some school and communities” (p. 182); however, as Tippeconnic (2000) suggested, “we have not learned how to put this research into practice, or have determined the best ways to prepare teachers or to teach students” (n.p.). Researchers need to continue to ask deep questions to probe for findings that will help to put this research into practice, to prepare teacher candidates and teachers for the struggle to narrow the achievement gap for Native American students.

One of the toughest questions concerns who should ask these questions and who should do this work. Lomawaima and McCarty (2002) asked researchers to consider:

Why do the research? What factors motivate the researcher? Who has set the research goals? Who has the “disciplinary authority to do the research? Who will be involved in conducting the research? Whom does the research serve? How will it benefit the local community?” (n.p.).

Swisher (1996) argued for non-native researchers to step aside in favor of the primacy of Native scholars in conducting research on Native peoples and issues. She attributes to Native researchers the benefits of an insider’s view, commitment, and passion. She further argued “If non-Indian educators have been involved in Indian Education because they believe in Indian people and want them to be empowered, they must now demonstrate that belief by stepping aside (p.85). Many would agree with Swisher’s call to increase the authority of, recognition of, and publication by Native scholars and
researchers, but not all are willing to ask non-Native allies to step aside. These observers suggest that the most “productive research will result from respectful collaboration that does not dichotomize researchers as Native or non-Native but does make the contributions of Native colleagues integral to the design and conduct of the studies” (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002, n.p.). Alternatively, and clearly dismissing the role of non-Natives in the research process, Swisher (1996) argued that non-Native Americans “must begin to question their motives beyond wanting to do something to improve education for Indian people” (p.85), and that “in the spirit of self-determination, Indian people should be the ones to write about Indian education. And if they don’t? So what, there is much work to be done and much to be written about” (p. 85). Rather than being satisfied with the mindset of magic, hope, and advocacy that Sheets (2003) leveled against educators and researchers alike, is the need to embark on deep investigations of best teaching practice for Native American students that ultimately will yield tangible results in the classroom.

Educators need to know what works and how to implement best practices for Native learners. Future research should, according to Bowman (2003), build a new “Native American learning theory that builds on culturally relevant pedagogy, research, and evaluation strategies, which would ultimately inform kindergarten through graduate level educational policies, departments, and organizations” (p. 99-100). Teacher educators need to know how to best prepare teacher candidates as well as in-service teachers to meet the needs of diverse learners. But the investigation alone is not enough. Teachers must use this research to impact Native students’ learning and achievement. While, admittedly, many factors exist that are not within the scope of influence of the
classroom teacher, our teacher candidates must be trained in culturally responsive methods to address those factors that can be addressed in the classroom.

An Overview of the Methodology

The overarching goal for this study was to identify exemplary teachers, defined as teachers who have been identified as being particularly effective in the instruction of Native American students, and furthermore to examine their practice. The study used survey data from 122 respondents at three school levels followed by in-depth interviews of twelve of those teachers. While the methodology for this study will be discussed at length in chapter 3, a brief overview is included here to help the reader further conceptualize the study. The study was conducted as a mixed-methods study employing a sequential transformative strategy. According to Creswell (2008a) sequential transformative strategy is a multi-phase study with an implicit theoretical lens. Creswell (2008a) advocates that the use of sequential transformative strategy to give voice to diverse populations. This mixed-methods approach existed of an initial phase, phase I, a quantitative survey given to a large population of teachers, followed by a second phase, Phase II, an in-depth interview with select teachers. In a basic sequential mixed design, data collected and analyzed from one stage of the study are used to inform the other stage of the investigation (Onwuegbuzie and Johnson, 2006). In this way the researcher gained an understanding from the analysis of the data collected in phase I to better inform phase II.

Now that this study has been introduced in this chapter the following chapters will consist of a review of the relevant literature, chapter II: the methodology of the study,
chapter III; findings of Phase I, chapter IV; findings of Phase II, chapter V; and finally conclusions and implications, chapter VI.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH LITERATURE

The current method of preparing teachers to work in a multi-ethnic teaching situation is less than exemplary because the needs of all learners are not being met. Banks, Cochran-Smith, Moll, Richert, Zeichner, LePage et al. (2005) wrote, “To support democracy, educators must seek to eliminate disparities in educational opportunities among all students, especially those students who have been poorly served by our current system” (p. 233). With this in mind the researcher has developed two primary questions which guide this study: 1) What characteristics do faculties perceive in successful teachers of Native American students; and 2) Which characteristics of exemplary teachers of Native American students are most clearly related to understanding principles of effective teaching of Native American students and effective teaching practices in general?

In order to address these primary questions, several additional and interrelated discussions must be examined in the research literature. The researcher will address these issues in three sections: the first is an overview of education for Native American students, followed by academic persistency for Native American students, and finally teaching and learning for Native American students. This chapter will discuss the search process followed by a research overview of education for Native American students, followed by academic persistency for Native American students, and finally teaching and learning for Native American students.
Overview of Education for Native American Students

The purpose of this review is to survey the available literature related to educational achievement and academic persistency of Native Americans and the teacher preparation of teacher candidates within the educational system to address the research questions. Indigenous cultures are, in Ogbu and Simmon’s (1998) term, “involuntary minorities.” Caste-like or involuntary minorities (Ogbu, 1992) are people who were originally conquered, enslaved, or brought into the United States against their will. Thereafter, these minorities have been subjugated to menial positions and denied access and acceptance into the mainstream, dominant society. As involuntary minorities, Native Americans have faced educational needs which have been largely unmet, educational conditions that are often substandard, and voices for change which have been widely ignored. This literature review will investigate the current state of education for Native Americans in an attempt to understand where, educationally speaking, these cultures are now, the successes and shortcomings of their education to date, and what changes may be necessary for the preparation of teachers who will teach Native American students.

Ogbu and Simmons (1998), in their discussion of voluntary and involuntary minorities, argued that as involuntary minorities Native American students see their economic status, social conditions, and their education, inferior to that of Whites. The children of these minority cultures often feel that they are without a homeland or an identity. They feel as if they are pulled between the culture of their parents and the majority culture of the nation in which they live (Spring, 1999). Carroll (1978) described them as people in the margin between two societies, and he wrote that people living in this cultural limbo develop some distinctive psychological and behavioral traits. They are
likely to have deep feelings of inferiority and become psychologically subservient in the new society.

Often the formal education of the public schools requires the adoption of unfamiliar ways of acting and thinking by Native American children. Moreover, these children are asked to reject the Native American informal education of storytelling, ceremony participation, and ritual observation that teach children how to live in the traditional way. Hodgkinson (1990) explained that given the vast discrepancies that exist between cultures, it should come as no great surprise that Native Americans continue to have the highest dropout rate of any ethnic group in the nation.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reports that Native American 4th grade students score below basic levels in reading, math, and history (Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999). Average scores for Native Americans as reported by Moran, et al. (2008) illustrate that these students were not significantly, statistically different from the scores of their Black or Hispanic peers but were lower than the scores for White and Asian/Pacific Islander students. Clearly schools are not meeting the needs of all learners. Students who do not succeed in school are becoming part of a growing underclass, cut off from productive engagement in society (Banks et al., 2005). Studies illustrate the disparate earnings gap between non-high school graduates and those who complete their secondary education. Day and Newburger (2002) reported that a high school graduate will earn on average $7,000 per year more than a high school dropout. There exists an exponentially larger chasm with a lack of higher education. The completion of a four-year degree will earn the recipient, on average, $26,000 per year more than a high school dropout. Over the course of their lifetime, these earning figures
rise significantly; a student with a four-year degree can expect to make twice the amount of money as the dropout (Day & Newburger, 2002). Several tertiary issues include the myriad of associated social problems also at play. One of the most significant effects is the impact on the next generation and their ability to realize classroom success. Students who have parents who have graduated from high school are more likely to succeed academically as well.

In addition to the staggering rate of non-persistency at the high school level, apparent discrepancies exist due to high stakes testing. In general, according to Fox (1999), American Indians students have traditionally scored exceedingly low on standardized achievement tests. Nichols and Berliner (2007) wrote that the curriculum imposed by high-stakes testing for Native Americans seems to be especially damaging; the curriculum is narrowed and it is also culturally irrelevant for the children it is supposed to educate.

With an intense focus on high-stakes testing teachers feel forced to design curricula that are boring and alien to their students (Nichols & Berliner, 2005). In their book *Collateral Damage*, Nichols and Berliner (2005) stated “it is widely known that if the disaffected or weakest students can be pushed out or schools or allowed to dropout, then the test scores at the school or district that lose these students will go up” (p. 57). If this is the case then schools have a vested interest in the failure of some students. The authors believe that schools are driving out students through a test-oriented curriculum and abandoning the kind of culturally relevant curriculum that might keep them in school, “This will have the effect of increasing the already high dropout rates while at the same time potentially raising the scores at the schools thus making it difficult for school
personnel to address this issue” (p. 72). Educators of conscience cannot afford to allow
the pressure of high-stakes testing, with the attendant threat of fiscal punishment for their
schools to drive students out.

Many unique factors exist, some of which are beyond the scope and influence of
the classroom teacher such as family situations, alcoholism and poverty. Obviously these
outside elements affect classroom and Native students’ educational performance. To
answer the question what works in the successful instruction for teaching Native
American students several related ideas must be considered. Which factors are within the
realm, control, and responsibility of the classroom teacher? What role does education
play in our democracy? How are teacher candidates being prepared to best influence this
at-risk population? How can teachers influence this involuntarily oppressed population
while guiding them toward success? What factors need to be addressed, at the teacher
candidate level, to best educate teachers to best educate Native American students? An
understanding of the history of Indian education is crucial to the dialogue.

Who Are the Students of Native American Education Today

What is the Native American student population in the U.S.? Freeman and Fox
(2005) found that American Indians/Alaska Natives (AI/AN) equal 1.5% of the total U.S.
population with membership comprised of 562 federally recognized tribes. Hodgkinson
(1990) found 50% of the AI/AN population belongs to 10 tribes. Forty-three percent of
American Indian/Alaska Native children under the age of 5 live in poverty. The AI/AN
population is approximately 2.5 million (American Indian/Alaska Native only) or 4.1
million (American Indian/Alaska Native in combination with one or more race), with
37% under the age of 20 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001a; 2001b; Manuelito, 2003). There
are 1.2 million children and youth of school age (5-19 years) about 90% of whom attend public schools (Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999; Manuelito, 2003). Currently, one of every three students is a racial or ethnic minority (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

**Culture in the Native American Classroom**

A discussion of the importance of culture is salient if the overarching goal is to keep Native American students in the classroom and guide them toward graduation. According to Bruner (1996), culture provides the tools for organizing and understanding our worlds in communicable ways. Implicit in the discussion of understanding Native American students is the understanding of poverty and the student’s home environment and their influence on education.

Educators must critically examine culture and teaching practice to best influence the education of Indian students. Whitbeck, Hoyt, Stubben and LaFromboise (2001) stated “Traditional culture may function as a protective mechanism when it is used to guide curriculum” (p. 2). Spring (1999) suggested that the loyalty students have to their native culture is in conflict with accommodation to the dominant culture. Demmert (2001) argued “social and economic factors influencing poor academic performance could be mitigated by teachers that become involved in community activities and spend time with community members” (p. 18). While teachers may be able to mitigate these factors the questions of are they able and/ or willing to do so.

**The School as Hegemonic Structures**

The school is not neutral ground for proving talent. Villegas (1988) illustrated the reality hegemony of education: “As the educational system is currently organized, it functions to maintain the advantage of the socially powerful” (p. 260). To maintain
power a dominant culture emphasizes the history of conquest at the expense of other histories. It is not surprising according to Starnes (2006) “that most schools—even schools on reservations—emphasize a history and culture that does not include American Indians” (p. 185). The advantage of the socially powerful has been preserved at the disastrous affect for non-White students. This is evident in the difficulty inherent in the expectation that the subservient culture must conform to a dominant norm.

Ogbu (1992) argued that one significant reason that the dominant culture has preserved this power is under-girded by a belief that involuntary minorities “have greater difficulty crossing cultural/language boundaries in school than voluntary minorities with primary cultural differences” (p.9). This difficulty occurs because of the nature of the relationship between the minority culture and the dominant White American culture. The cultural differences arose initially to serve boundary-maintaining and coping functions under subordination and have evolved into oppositional qualities of struggle.

Villegas (1988) purported “The problem of academic failure is much more complex than differences between the language of culture of home and school. The differences that create difficulties for both teacher and pupils stem from the struggle for power in society” (p. 262). When writing about the parasitic relationship between the dominant and dominated groups Ogbu (1992) described that dominant groups maintain their position by using power to define what is valued in school and society while dominated groups exert their power by resisting oppressive authority. Solutions to the school problems of minority students according to Villegas, (1988) require political action.
Villegas seems to indicate that the only answer to fighting in the struggle to educate non-White students is through the use of “political action.” This argument would seem to allow educators to throw up their collective hands and absolve themselves of responsibility. This researcher is more inclined to lend support to Pewewardy, Hammer and Cahape (2003) who shifted responsibility for change back to the individuals who are closest to education “Ultimately the attitudes, beliefs, and action of the school must model respect for cultural diversity, celebrate the contributions of diverse groups, and foster understanding and acceptance of racial and ethnic plurality (n.p.).” Again the argument returns to the roles of the individual, the community, and the schools.

Ogbu, (1992) wrote of “multicultural education models and actual programs conveying the impression that educating minority students is a process whereby teachers and schools must change for the benefit of the students” (p. 6). Minority students do not succeed or fail only because of what the schools do or do not do, but also because of the action of the community. The social structure and relationship within the minority communities seems have a significant impact on student’s attitude toward school.

Cajete (1999) believed the mismatch between students’ home environments and the school environment is often identified as the reason for the maladjustment of Native American students to school. Most often the nature of the home environment is pointed to as the main problem. Whitbeck et al. (2001) found that traditional culture may result in cultural discontinuity that occurs when Native American children find themselves in an environment that contradicts their traditional values. If they come from different cultural backgrounds, they may differ in those expectations on a great many fronts (Jordan, 1985). Traditional cultural imbues children with pride in cultural heritage and gives them the
direction they need to negotiate their way through the cultural contradictions (Whitbeck et al., 2001). Thus if educators, schools, and communities can help foster cultural pride Native Americans may have a better opportunity for academic success. The crux is in how that cultural transformation occurs.

Implication of Native American Culture in School

If the infusion of culture, as the research literature suggests, has apparent benefits then educators must transform their teaching practice and the way in which they educate Native American students. Yazzie (1999) pointed to the growing body of research suggesting that better learning occurs when teachers transform their educational practices and the curriculum to reflect the children’s home culture. Today, many Native American youth experience cultural conflicts and difficulties in identity development due to differences between the values and expectations of their tribal traditions and those of mainstream American social and educational systems (Garrett M.T., 1996). Whitbeck et al. (2001) continued their discussion of culture and found that conflict creates discomfort, lowers self-esteem, and fosters a sense of inadequacy that is continually reinforced in a European-American school system.

With this in mind it seems that teachers, when infusing culture into academics can influence achievement. Yagi (1985) wrote, “Teachers’ attitudes about students, knowledge of subject matter, and understanding and knowledge about the culture of students are all shown to promote improved academic performance and student behavior” (p.58). Richardson (1996) agreed: “Teacher attitudes and beliefs, therefore, are important considerations in understanding classroom practices and conducting teacher education
designed to help prospective and in-service teachers develop their thinking and practice” (p. 102).

This understanding of knowledge and culture has benefits for both teacher and student. It can influence positively the interactions between student and learner. This seems to be important also for those students who grow up not learning their tribal culture at in the home. Yazzie (1999) wrote “Every individual’s culture functions as a perceptual lens, shaping a unique worldview. Culture cannot be separated from everyday experiences through processes; it influences social, political, and intellectual activities” (p.84). Bruner (1996) adds that rather than preparation for culture’s way of life, it is a major embodiment of it. “In other words if Indigenous agriculture, jazz music, Broadway theater productions, tribal courts, and medical research are all embodiments of culture, so is schooling” (Yazzie, 1999, p. 84). The implication is that teachers must take into account the culture of their students in order to help them succeed.

The myth of education is that all people have equal access regardless of prosperity or lack thereof. Reyhner (1992) taught a dropout prevention class for Native Americans in Montana. During initial class discussion he found that the students “blamed dysfunctional families and alcohol abuse for the high dropout rate among Indian students” (p. 36). Reyhner further offered “If this allegation is correct, and Indian families and the abuse of alcohol are to be held responsible, then the implication exists that teachers and schools are satisfactory and not in need of change” (p. 36). This would mean that teachers and schools would not need to accept responsibility for academic failure and that the student, or the student’s dysfunctional family would need to shoulder the burden.
What educators could do is examine the place of culture and teaching practices to best influence the education of Native American students. Whitbeck, Hoyt, Stubben and LaFromboise (2001) argued that Traditional culture functions as a protective mechanism when used to guide curriculum. Considering the position of culture Spring (1999) suggested that “loyalty to their native culture versus accommodation to the dominant culture premised on the belief that neither abandoning one’s own culture nor gaining respect and acceptance will do anything to change the basic political and economic relations in society” (p. 93). A solution seems to be found in the ability of teachers to mitigate social and economic factors influencing poor academic performance by immersing themselves in the communities in which they teach (Demmert, 2001). It appears that literature provides a road map for the best practice in the education of Native Americans and the role of culture is its roots.

Whitbeck et al. (2001), in a quantitative study examined factors affecting school success for Native American students. The researchers developed a resiliency model of school success and incorporated a socio-cultural lens to investigate the role of traditional culture on academic success. They drew upon a sample of 196 Native American students from the 5th through 8th grades. These children came from three reservations in the upper Midwest; they also surveyed another 212 Native American students living on or near reservations. They built their study around the measures of age of the student, family structure, education of parents, and orientation toward extra-curricular activities, maternal warmth, and enculturation. The researchers discovered that the older the child became the lower her/his academic performance. This finding supports Haberman (1995) who wrote: “All children begin school in love with learning; most have their curiosities squelched
later on” (p. 33). Furthermore, Whitbeck et al. (2001), like Coburn and Nelson (1987), found that maternal warmth, extracurricular activities, a sense of enculturation, and self-esteem relate positively to school success. The findings support a growing body of research on Native American cultural traditions supporting Native youth’s school success. A potential gap in this area of research is the education of Native American students who are not being educated “on or near” the reservation and how their educational needs may differ from those students who are “on or near.”

Whitbeck et al. (2001) believe that traditional culture may result in cultural discontinuity that occurs when Native American students find themselves in an environment that contradicts their traditional values. Both teachers and students come to the classroom with expectations about how people should behave (and speak and think and feel) derived largely from their experience outside the classroom (Jordan, 1985). If they come from different cultural backgrounds, they may differ in those expectations on a great many fronts. Traditional cultural imbues children with pride in cultural heritage and gives them the direction they need to negotiate their way through the cultural contradictions (Whitbeck et al., 2001). With the role of traditional culture so plainly important to school success for Native American children teachers have yet another suggestion on how best to teach their students.

Academic Persistency for Native American Students

The issue of persistency at both the secondary and post secondary levels is pivotal to this discussion if society feels strongly about educational equity. Persistency issues come to light early in the educational experience for Native American students. Sanders (1987) found that persistency is especially disheartening in light of the fact that as early
as 5th and 6th grade many Native American students begin to withdraw from an educational system that is incompatible with their own social values. “The result is seen in discouraged youths who experience confusion about themselves and their cultural heritage, feel alienated and ashamed of the inability to meet mainstream expectations and norms, and consequently, withdraw altogether” (Sanders, 1987, n.p.). Reyhner’s (1992) research indicates that particularly negative critical factors for Indian students include large schools, uncaring and untrained teachers, passive teaching methods inappropriate curriculum, inappropriate testing/student retention, tracked classes, and lack of parental involvement. This seems to be consistent with school success in general. The majority of Native American students attend public schools so this challenge to succeed extends to them. The desire of Tippeconnic (2000) is not being realized; currently schools do not seem to be reaching out to parents or the community and they are not hiring competent teachers who know how to teach Indian students. There are many additional factors which impact the staggering non-persistency rates for Native Americans.

The curriculum imposed by high-stakes testing for Native Americans seems to be especially damaging. The question becomes how low is too low for standardized testing? Native Americans consistently earned 66 to 74 points lower on the combined verbal and mathematical Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores and 2.0 to 2.2 points lower than the ACT national average (Pavel, 1999). Fox (1999) added “A standardized test is probably a good measure of one’s acculturalization into mainstream society. The fact that successful test performance correlates with socioeconomic status indicates the Indian students are at a disadvantage” (p. 165). Low standardized test scores are common with minority students. Starnes, (2006) found that this “gap in students’ knowledge demonstrates a
commonly recognized phenomenon in the world’s education systems—the stories of history are written by those in power” (p. 185). Not only are Native Americans being taught in systems that are culturally irrelevant and incompatible with their own but also they are being tested in a hegemonic system designed to preserve power.

*Persistency in Secondary Education*

Success in the higher grades is influenced by success in the elementary grades. Using The National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) data, Pavel (1999), found that in 1990 only 26% of Native American students completed their core curricula for high school graduation, a figure that rose only slightly in 1992 to 31%.

Wilson (1991), using an ethnographic methodology, examined the documented disconnect between Lakota Sioux students’ success in elementary reserve schools and their lack of success in the off-reserve mainstream high schools. Through her unique insider-outsider perspective as a researcher who has spent the major part of her adult life living and teaching on Canadian Indian reserves and as a “member of an Indian Band” (p. 371), Wilson provides insight into factors affecting secondary persistency. Wilson’s study included Native students in the elementary and high schools as well as the administration and teachers in those individual settings. Through the utilization of both interviews and observations in both schools, Wilson concluded: “The data gathered in this study, from observations of teachers and students, from interviews with students and teachers, and from the background knowledge of both communities, point out clearly that the students were dealing with the consequences of cultural conflict during the months of transition from the home to the school culture” (p. 371). When educators and school
systems can bridge this gulf of cultural conflict in the schools then academic persistency for Native American students will increase.

The Wilson (1991) study mirrored other work in the field of Native American persistency. Of the 23 students from the reserve who were enrolled in classes at the public high school when the study began, 18 had dropped out by the following April. Over 78% of the Native students had not completed the school year. Of the five who had completed the school year, not one was enrolled in college preparatory coursework. Wilson (1991) concluded that to receive a high school education students were expected to move between two cultures that are vastly different and thus 27 of the high school teachers interviewed indicated that the “Indian students were not prepared for the transition to high school when they came from the reserve” (p. 373). Teachers on the reserve stated that they maintained high expectations for their students and that in this environment their students found academic success. The students achieved high test scores and they were happy and involved in the school. Psychological test scores showed that students were both “intellectually and academically prepared for high school” (p. 374). Furthermore, Wilson (1991) found students’ limitations on academic performance “are consequences of macro structural factors” when they transferred to the off-reserve school (p. 378).

Another difficulty for the Native American students is the pressure to compromise. In the school environment and elsewhere, Native American students are oftentimes faced with pressure to compromise their basic cultural values and behaviors in order to successfully meet the expectations and standards of the context (Sanders, 1987). The students became overwhelming frustrated and isolated in their off-reserve schools
which negatively impacted their academic performance. The lack of understanding of cultural conflict on the part of school personnel seemed to contribute to student failure for those students who had previously been successful. Basically, the students in Wilson (1991), came from a nurturing environment with Native teachers and found themselves in a non-Native school without the supportive faculty they were accustomed to in the classroom.

*Post-Secondary Persistency*

The college rate of attrition for Native American students is as high as 85% percent (Huffman, Sill, & Brokenleg, 1986). Jackson, Smith, and Hill (2003), put the college rate of attrition figure at 64%. Many researchers suggest that low post-secondary achievement is directly related to inadequate primary and secondary education (Huffman et al., 1986). Success in college for Sioux students, as well as other Native Americans, appears to be related to cultural identity. The crucial contributing factor for the likelihood of college achievement for the Sioux students is the retention of their traditional cultural identity and heritage (Huffman et al., 1986). Indeed, it is likely that this factor is instrumental in facilitating a strong sense of personal self-identity and confidence among these students. Thus, “traditional Sioux students seem to have a better chance for achievement in college than their non-traditional counterparts” (p. 5). The Huffman et al.’s (1986) finding is counterintuitive to the idea that a more assimilated student would more readily find success.

Pavel (1999), cited NELS:88, and found that Native Americans are less likely to be college bound than other groups of the United States. He added that Native Americans represented 0.8% of the total sample, but only 0.4% of the sample were college bound:
among White (non-Hispanic) students, who represented 74% of the total sample, 80% were college bound. Bowman (2003) adds: “Native Americans are the most underrepresented group in higher education and continue to be virtually voiceless and/or are represented by non-Indians in mainstream research agendas and literature reviews” (p. 98). If Native Americans are in fact, the most underrepresented group in higher education what factors are in play to perpetuate this phenomena?

Carroll (1978) sought to find out what, if any, significant differences exist between traditional and non-traditional Indian students in ACT scores and grade point average (GPA) and if gender differences within these groups were significant. High school preparation was also examined as a factor for academic success. The focus of this study was to discuss the disparate challenges facing two distinct populations of Indian students at the Haskell Indian Junior College. The author’s conceptual framework is rooted in the concept of “cultural marginality,” with the author determining not only which of his research subjects are “marginal,” but also which are “traditional” Indians based on a self-report “Test Student Profile.” The study is “set within the framework of social processes which have gone on historically between Indian communities as a cultural entity and non-Indian communities as a cultural entity” (p. 13). In the fall of 1975, 546 first-year college students entered Haskell Indian Junior College and from this population the sample for this study was drawn (Carroll, 1978). Using both ACT test scores and GPA as measures, the incoming Haskell students were compared with each other as well as with the national averages. The researcher sought to test three hypotheses based on the correlations of ACT composite performance, GPA and the first semester college success for Indian students. Bowman (2003) found Native Americans do not
perform as well as non-Natives on standardized tests at the K-12 level and perform significantly lower on ACT and Advanced Placement tests. Carroll (1978) found dropout rates for traditional males, who are culturally designated as playing a key role in the preservation of tribal ways and traditions, are higher than the dropout rates for any other Haskell group. In Carroll (1978) parents’ educational aspirations were related to GPA for the White sample but were not related in the Native American sample. “The disjunction between non-Indian cultural expectations institutionalized in American higher education and American Indian cultural traditions and ways initially places many American Indians at a disadvantage” (Huffman, 2001, p. 4). The findings indicate that fundamental factors differentiate White and Indian students. For Whites, GPA and parental encouragement relate to college success. The success of Sioux students, on the other hand, seems to be related to cultural identity.

Huffman et al. (1986) took a different tack while investigating college achievement. While earlier studies have offered a variety of explanations for the low academic achievement among Native Americans including inadequate primary and secondary education, low achievement motivation, low competition motivation and low family value on education. Huffman et al. (1986) investigated and compared several of the “social, cultural and aspirational factors related to college achievement” among Sioux and White students (p. 32). They examined the apparent dual operation necessary for Indian students. In other words, to be successful in college, it seems, Native Americans must be able to function in a largely alien culture.

To build their study, Huffman et al. (1986) investigated a population of Native American college students. The sample consisted of 79 Native American students from
the University of South Dakota (USD) and 49 Native American students from Black Hills State College, (BHSC) [now Black Hills State University] for a total of 128 students. A random sample of 38 students (27 from USD and 11 from BHSC) was selected from the population comprising 30% of the total population. The White population consisted of an estimated 3,000 students at USD and 1,500 at BHSC. A random sample of 48 students (32 from USD and 16 from BHSC) was drawn from the total White population. The questionnaires were similar for both Indian and White students with the exception of three items designed to measure Native American “traditionalism.” The analysis of the data yielded several interesting findings. Native American traditionalism was significantly related to college achievement with increased levels of traditionalism equating better academic performance. Lin (1990) found that Indian college students with traditional orientations outperformed students with modern orientations. Traditionally oriented students are able to learn in school, in spite of negative school characteristics, because of the strong personal and group identity rooted in their native cultures (Reyhner, 1992).

Jackson, Smith, and Hill (2003) extend the idea of cultural orientation in their qualitative study. Using analysis of emergent themes from an open-ended interview the researchers documented two levels of themes for college persistency of Native American students. “Surface level” themes are those that seem straightforward (consistent with previous research findings) and “deep themes” that were seemingly more complex (i.e. contradictory or multifaceted)” (p. 553).

The surface level themes include the importance of family, Native American clubs, multicultural offices and other campus support groups. Faculty and staff warmth as
well as college experiences such as Upward Bound seem to aid persistency as does the maintenance of traditional spirituality, self-reliance and traditional cultural roots. The deep themes include an ability to “deal effectively with racism both overtly from peers and covertly through curriculum” (p. 556). A second deep theme is the idea that all of the students surveyed took a “non-linear path to academic success, each of them having attended at least three schools in the process of getting their degrees” (p. 557-558). The final deep theme is paradoxical cultural pressure where students felt “conflicted between success in college and maintaining their identity as a member of the reservation community” (p. 558). Recognition of the themes as discussed in Jackson, Smith, and Hill (2003) help educators gain understanding of their students.

The idea of paradoxical cultural awareness is echoed in the literature. In Tierney (1992), one university president is quoted: “They [Native American students] have a terrible time with acculturation. They grow up without competition and when they come here to a university whose ethic is achievement and competition, it’s tough” (p. 612). At a second institution, according to Tierney (1992) another top level administrator added: “The major problem is that they [Native American students] have a foot in each culture that draws them back to their roots. They are drawn back to their own culture and it’s a difficult transition to make” (p. 612). The idea of students having a foot in two cultures is a common thread in the literature for many involuntary minority communities. This paradoxical cultural pressure can be compounded for the students as they struggle to find their own place in either one, or both cultures.

Huffman (2001) builds on the work of Huffman et al. (1986), with an investigation of perceived cultural incongruities and persistency. Huffman (2001) stated:
“It appears that for some culturally traditional American Indians the difficulties presented by cultural conflict are simply too great to overcome and an early exit from college is the unfortunate result” (p. 1). Despite this concern many Indian students do persist though the resistance of these cultural barriers. Two relatively clearly identifiable theoretical frameworks exist according to Huffman (2001), regarding the cultural conflict associated with the education of minorities in general and Native American students in particular. They are the cultural discontinuity hypothesis and the macro structural explanations. The cultural discontinuity hypothesis emphasizes the “differing and opposing micro-level cultural elements that ultimately impact educational performance” (p. 4) while the macro structural explanations assumes that “social/cultural force beyond the realm of the individual are the source of cultural conflict and, as such, are responsible for the lack of educational success among minority students” (p. 5).

Huffman (2001) identified four “cultural masks” through his qualitative analysis. These masks are rooted in the process in which a person constructs their personal identities. Specifically, the cultural masks include that of: assimilated students, marginalized students, estranged students, and transculturated students. Huffman (2001) built this study from the results of a five-year research project involving in-depth interviews with 69 “predominately” Lakota college students “to explore the personal perspectives of American Indian students on their academic experiences” (p.6).

From a sample population of 232 students 69 consented to take part in the study. An open-ended series of 25 questions guided the interviews. The transcriptions of the interviews along with field notes provided the primary data sources (p.6). Of the 69 students, 26 identified with mainstream culture before coming to the university as
assimilated students. Fifteen were identified as projecting a marginal cultural mask, they were found to hold some assimilationist orientation, but desired identification and affiliation with traditional Indian culture. Seven held strong identification with traditional culture and displayed an aggressive rejection of assimilation. The remaining 21 students, identified as transculturated, also held strong identification with traditional culture but did not aspire for assimilation. Unlike the estranged students the transcultural students used their traditional identity for strength and confidence. “Of the four types of cultural masks identified, the students who projected the transcultural mask and those who project the assimilated masks experienced more favorable graduation and persistence rates” (p. 10). Huffman’s (2001) findings support the idea that transculturated students, known also as culturally traditional American Indians, can achieve academically while maintaining their traditional cultural integrity.

Teaching and Learning for Native American Students

The staggering non-persistency statistics referenced earlier suggest that the needs of Native American students are seemingly not being met at any level. Radical reform is needed to improve education for Native Americans and reduce the rate of non-persistency. Swisher and Tippeconnic (1999) believe that the misconceptions and stereotypes about Native peoples persistent in academic content as well as the attitudes and behaviors of school personnel can only be addressed through teacher preparation and the curricular materials used to train teachers in colleges, universities and school districts. However, Reyhner (1992) does not think that the curricular materials espoused by Swisher and Tippeconnic (1999) will find mainstream access. “Extensive material exists to produce elementary and secondary culturally appropriate curriculum for Indian
students, however there is little incentive for publishers to produce material for the relatively small market that Indian education represents” (Reyhner, 1992, n.p). Not only does the possibility exist that these materials will not reach the overwhelmingly White teaching force, but even if they do they may be met with opposition. Osborne (1996) wrote that although teachers may accept a broad understanding of culturally relevant pedagogy, teachers may find some classroom processes at odds with their current classroom processes. Classroom change for teachers will necessitate their coming to terms with new strategies. The starting point for reform lies squarely in the preparation of teacher candidates at the preservice level if reform is to be achieved.

Challenges in the Successful Instruction of Native American Students

What does the body of research literature tell us about successful instruction for Native American students? Cajete (1999) states: “Successful learning is tied to the degree of personal relevance the student perceives in the educational task” (p. 137). Further clarifying this belief is the idea that motivation toward any pursuit is energized by the individual’s own constellation of personal and sociocultural values. Intrinsically speaking, Bruner (2003) supported this concept with this statement, the “Objective of any act of learning, over and beyond the pleasure it may give, is that it should serve us in the future. Learning should not only take us somewhere; it should allow us later to go further more easily” (p.17). This idea of going further more easily is often difficult for Native students due to many societal factors.

Successful educators understand that another difficulty facing Native American students is the pressure to compromise. In the school environment and elsewhere, Native American students are often faced with pressure to compromise their basic cultural values
and behaviors in order to successfully meet the expectations and standards (Sanders, 1987). The pressure to compromise cultural beliefs takes various forms, presents manifold challenges, and is thwarted by obstacles. The challenges are indeed daunting. Wilson (1991) found: “In the space of one day they [Indian High School students] faced racism, behavior patterns different from their own, alien cultural norms and economic stress” (p. 377). The students in the Wilson (1991) study felt they were treated unequally “We got disqualified before we even knew what the rules of the game were”’ (p. 378) and they were further frustrated by the lack of academic rigor, “The work I am taking now is so simple that it is ridiculous. I took this stuff in about grade four. I look at it now and my mind goes blank. I wasn’t dumb before I got here, but I soon will be if I stay in this place’” (p. 378). The frustration evident in the voices of those students is palpable. Not only are the students clearly bored with the material presented they are further faced with conforming to the alien norms of schooling. Ogbu (1992) wrote of the psychological pressures against “acting White” which often dissuades minority students from striving for academic success. He wrote about the cultural “conflict between loyalty to the minority peer group, which provides a sense of community and security, and the desire to behave in ways that may improve school performance but that the peer group defines as ‘White’” (p. 10). Thus the student not only faces racism from non-Native peers, boredom from irrelevant material, but also pressure from peers not to act “White.”

Traditionally Native Americans orient themselves to the present. This orientation, according to Cajete (1999) stems from the deep philosophical emphasis on being rather than becoming. This philosophical emphasis has changed over the years but vestiges still remain. Given these characteristics, Cajete (1999) cautions educators that the “learning
material should have a sense of immediate relevancy for the time and place of each student‖ (p. 142). The idea of immediacy and relevancy seem to be factors for all learners and not a Native American specific learning style.

Swisher (1994) reported on research findings related to the learning styles of Native American students from the perspective of those groups [presumably Native people] most closely associated with Indian students. Furthermore this study sought to determine the extent of teacher knowledge about learning styles and to determine the extent to which this knowledge is applied in the classroom. Using a conceptual framework based on the relationship between cultural values and learning styles suggests that cultural values influence socialization practices, which in turn influences the ways children prefer to learn. Swisher found that 75% of all respondents indicated that cultural values have a strong to very strong effect on the student’s approach to learning, 57% of American Indians and 68% of non-Indians surveyed believe cultural values affect the ways in which American Indians are comfortable in demonstrating what they have learned (n.p.). This indicates that immediacy, relevancy and cultural values have a place in education, but it does not address the foundational issues of learning styles.

Pewewardy (2002) endeavored to review the literature on AI/AN learning modalities and cognitive styles in order to draw conclusion that serve as indicators as to how educators may provide instruction/learning opportunities that are compatible with AI/AN students’ learning styles. He found “There is no absolute or generic “Indian” learning style” (p. 27) and further that “In addressing the learning styles of AI/AN students, one must be mindful that there are 510 [differs from Freeman and Fox (2005) number of 562] federally recognized American Indian entities, each with its own unique
government and social system” (p. 34). His findings are not surprising in that many of the researchers presented here are not arguing for a single generic learning style to fit all students, but rather they argue for understanding students unique cultures and integrating those cultures into the classroom. One goal of this proposed research is to help fill a gap through understanding what exemplary teachers do to meet the needs of Native American students.

Savvy educators would argue that all learning material should be relevant. But the idea of immediacy is a difficult concept to grasp. This is especially true in an era with mandated curriculum that is wide in scope but often shallow in depth. As educators there are certain curricular issues that might not seem immediately relevant to all learners. Clearly this is where a sense of curiosity and a love of learning is a gift not only for the teacher but also for the student.

Educators need to have the skills to identify the learning needs of all their students. In reform-minded teaching, teachers work to understand the diverse needs of the students in their classroom. This knowledge of the individual learner is important in teaching all students, but research suggests that it is paramount in the education of Native American students. Understanding the individual students means understanding the unique social factors that their students bring with them into the classroom.

Of the unique social factor Native Americans bring into the classroom may be their language. Many Native American students can be classified as being English dominant in their language usage; however some students have encountered in their homes and communities varying degrees of traditionalism in interpreting the natural world. Some identify strongly with both the cultural and linguistic revitalization of their
particular tribal group. These factors have important ramifications for teaching including the idea of language isolating a student or the degree of traditionalism my impact learning either positively or negatively. Though identifying with tribal traditions teachers may be able to build relationships which in turn may strengthen their teaching.

Through the understanding of these cultural realities the reform-minded practitioner can create a better teaching practice. Culturally responsive teaching builds on the strengths that the students bring to school (Banks, et al.). By melding the curriculum with a student’s culture teachers can positively affect student learning. Cajete, (1999) supported that a “student’s core cultural values can act as psychological energizers powering the development of a positive self-image” (p. 139). Hornett (1990) agreed that the import of a positive cultural identity may contribute to a sense of efficacy and self-esteem that may increase academic success. As in other areas of best practice for teaching, it is also important for the individual student to understand not only their own core values but also how best to construct their own knowledge based on their core values.

The body of research literature suggests several areas that seem to help combat the rate of non-persistency of Native American students. Swisher and Tippeconnic (1999), believe a primary focus on research and practice must be the teaching-learning relationships between students and teachers. This relationship is the most basic interaction that takes place in schools each day and one that may determine whether students persist or not. Swisher and Tippeconnic (1999) agreed with Wilson (1991) that a mutually respectful and caring relationship is essential to educational success.
Teacher Preparation and Characteristics

While this review of the research literature has attempted to illustrate what is salient to the individual needs of the Native American learner, it has yet to investigate what is best practice for the teaching of the Native American learner. The new question becomes what does this teaching “look-like” in their teaching practice? While the specific research on effective teaching within the Native American community is limited, the available research is consistent with the research on non-Native teachers Demmert (2001). Yagi (1985) found that “Teacher attitude about students, knowledge of subject matter, and understanding about the culture of students are all shown to promote improved academic performance and student behavior” (p.18). This finding is consistent in both Native as well as non-Native research, but does it not address the issues of non-persistency for Native American students.

The staggering non-persistency statistics referenced earlier in this paper suggest that the needs of Native American students are seemingly not being met at any level and as such radical reform is needed to improve education for Native Americans. Educators have known since the publication of The Kennedy Report (U.S., 1969) that “…programs should include such things as curriculums which recognize the unique character of Indian culture, teacher workshop designed to sensitize teachers to the special problems of Indian students, and provisions for meaningful Indian development in the operations of the school” (p. 135). Swisher and Tippeconnic (1999) offered that the starting point for reform is within the scope of teacher preparation. They wrote: “The misconceptions and stereotype about Native peoples that persist in academic content and attitudes and behaviors of school personnel must be addressed through preservice and in-service
teacher preparation” (p. 303). If teacher education is where the battle lines need to be drawn then reform at that level too is necessary. Reform will need to be based on a redefinition of relationships between student and teacher to engender the culturally relevant support and instruction necessary for the success of Native American students.

*Building Community and Trust in the Education of Native Americans*

The best way for schools to reflect parent and community values and to reduce cultural discontinuity between home and school is to have more Native American involvement in education. This means more parent involvement in the school board, as administrators, and as teachers (Reyhner, 1992). The idea of including all stakeholders will help to alleviate the mistrust in “the system” that minority students often feel. Ogbu and Simmons (1998) wrote: “Because much of the mistrust comes from the community and the students’ parents, teachers will need to work hard to try to enlist parent and community support of their children’s education” (p.182). One key factor is including parents in the educational process. Greater parent involvement can reduce the cultural distance between home and school and “although teachers may advocate that they want parent involvement what they really want is for the parents to ‘get after their students to attend school and study’” (Reyhner, 1992, n.p.). Ogbu and Simmons (1998) would reply that “Teachers need to try to find ways to make their contacts with parents positive by notifying them about their children’s successes rather than limiting their contact to informing parents about the students’ problems” (p.182). Communication is often difficult for Native American parents and teachers for several reasons. Teachers should reach out to parents frequently. If efforts are infrequent, not informative about substantive issues affecting the students’ learning, linguistically inaccessible, or held at times when
working parents cannot attend, opportunities to reduce key barriers to student achievement will be missed (Banks, et al.).

While increased involvement, at all levels is significantly important, the school and the individual classroom teachers maintain a great deal of responsibility for keeping students in the school. As early as 1969, with the publication of Indian Education: A National Tragedy, A National Challenge, educators were told that “Schools must excite and engage learners, provide opportunities for involvement and learning in real-life communities, promote the development of a strong and confident sense of self-rootedness in their unique identity” (U.S., 1969, p.15). Thirty-five years later the challenge is not being met. “Schools treat students as if their lives are insignificant and incidental to learning—as if they are unreal and on hold” (Ladson-Billings, 2005, p. 17-18). Changes in Indian education will not come overnight. An integral part of change is trust. Trust of white dominated institutions for the Native American community has been difficult in the last century or so.

In the case of involuntary minorities, their long history of discrimination, racism, and conflict leads them to distrust white-controlled institutions. The schools are treated with suspicion because the minorities, with justification, believe that the public schools will not educate their children like they educate white children (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 174). The fundamental problem for educators is that many involuntary minorities do not trust “white” institutions such as schools (p. 179-180). Involuntary minorities see the curriculum as an attempt to impose white culture on them (p. 178), and furthermore, they see no justifiable reason for the inferior education—except discrimination. They tend to be
more critical of the school curriculum and mistrustful of teachers and the school than the immigrants (p. 171).

The children of involuntary minority groups, wrote Jordan (1985), “tend to see conforming to the institutional culture of the school as buying into the dominant culture’s frame of references as ‘acting white’; they feel that accepting the school’s culture means abandoning their own” (p. 139). This “Hegemony is not a cohesive force; it is a mode of control that has to be fought for constantly in order to be maintained” (Giroux, 1981, p. 25). Clearly the history of distrust is significant and negatively impacts the education for Native American students. The challenge for the educational community is to both build and maintain trust. Yazzie (1999) wrote: “Learning is complicated by different modes of interaction, which if negative, can lead to distrust. Trust—a major component in behavioral interactions—can grow when teachers understand linguistic aspects of their students’ cultural backgrounds (p. 87). Ogbu and Simmons (1998) wrote: “many involuntary minority students come to school with an ambivalence about the value of education and about conforming to the demands of a “white” institution, building trust needs to be the first priority for teachers” (p. 180). Teachers need to both show Native American students that they are worthy of their trust and begin to bridge the achievement gap.

A method to do both may be found in addressing issues of power in the classroom. To address issues of power in the classroom, consciousness “ought to be raised with students in order to help them seek ways of converting their resistance into constructive political activity.” (Villegas, 1988 p. 262). By addressing the hegemonic structure of schools teachers may begin to help Native American students and
communities build trust with the schools. While it may not be an easy task to change a student’s trust in “the system” as a whole, individual teachers can foster a trusting relationship between themselves and their students. “Teachers need to show students by word and by deed that they believe in their students, that their culture is worthy of respect, and that succeeding in school will leave their identity in tact” (Ogbu and Simmons, 1998 p. 180). Students may learn to trust their teachers when they believe that their teacher holds the student’s best interest at heart and mind, and the student’s identity and self-esteem will not be harmed.

*Teaching Strategies and Teacher Characteristics*

Another area of research that has been undertaken in the field involves cross-cultural teaching strategies and candidacy for teacher preparation programs. Kleinfeld (1979) reported that promoting cross-cultural teaching strategies among prospective teachers is difficult to achieve due to the reluctance of teachers. The research suggests that the quality of teachers and teaching may best be improved by better selection of candidates, instead of by employing cross-cultural strategies in teacher training institutions or by allowing self-selection into programs (Kleinfeld, 1979). It is striking that nearly thirty years ago the idea of culturally-based pedagogy was being discussed and yet persistency rates for Native American students remain low. Kleinfeld (1979) does support the idea that teachers with a demanding, but warm teaching style appear to challenge students to work at higher intellectual levels. A warm, but demanding style is suggested but what other characteristics are important?

What are the teaching characteristics that best benefit Native American students? Demmert (2001) states: “Solid content knowledge, sound pedagogy, an understanding of
cognitive development and the different stages of children, cultural knowledge and an understanding of the students served, and outstanding interpersonal skills are well established characteristics of effective teachers” (p. 21). Coburn and Nelson (1987) in their study of successful Native students found that teacher characteristics were important. Specifically this study looked at how schools have helped their students to find success. After surveying more than 300 Native American high school students in the northwest Coburn and Nelson (1987) found that the majority of these students (61%) liked school a lot and that 77% indicated that teachers had significantly influenced their success. In the students description of these helpful teachers they indicated characteristics that fostered success included: “complimented me when I did well, respected me, caring, listened to me, positive attitude, concerned, honest, provided advice when sought, patient, interesting, open minded, willing to help, encouraging, and held high expectations” (p.3). Silverman and Demmert (1986) studied successful Native leaders. They distributed 43 surveys with a 93% rate of return. Their findings report that 90% of the respondents liked school and 90% were involved in some type of extracurricular school activity. Furthermore, the respondents indicated that the support of community mentors, family, and teachers ranked high in motivating students and keeping them in school (Silverman and Demmert, 1986).

Another area in which teacher candidates can learn to influence and foster academic success is through the development of communication with students. McCarty, Wallace, Lynch and Bennaly (1991) found that in classrooms where students’ ideas are encouraged within the context of their Native language and culture, Native students are found to respond eagerly to questioning. Teachers in schools that serve Indian children
should see themselves as learners who are open to understanding the reasons that children and communities are the way they are, who are willing to discover and consider the differences between school and home cultures, and who are willing to change their ways of teaching to give children a better chance in school and life (Cleary & Peacock, 1998). Additional research suggests that patterns of instruction as well as teacher characteristics help meet the needs for all learners. In their research, Cleary and Peacock (1998) suggest that teachers need to: 

- build trust; to connect with the community; to establish culturally relevant curriculum; to tap intrinsic motivation for learning; to use humor; to establish family support; to provide situations that yield small successes; to make personal connections with students; to use highly engaging, activity-based learning and, in some cases, cooperative learning; to provide role models; to be flexible, fair and consistent; and to provide real audience and purpose for student work (p. 13).

Teachers who have developed the skills to listen to and communicate with their students can impact student respect, build community, and impact achievement. Ogbu and Simmons (1998) support the belief that by doing so “the teacher will build trust by conveying the message that he or she believes students have the intellectual ability to do well and that he or she does not share racist stereotypes about the inferior intellectual abilities of minorities” (p. 182).

Less tangible characteristics that effective teachers personify are more difficult to quantify. These characteristics, according to Cajete (1999), comprise elements such as an understanding of the values, religion, community, and social contexts of their students.
These factors Cajete (1999) believed are “essential to understanding the way in which teaching/learning activities affect students. In addition, the styles of nonverbal communication used in classrooms and the social context of the school itself play important roles in the shaping of student perceptions of education” (p. 150). This shows the importance of building and maintaining relationships with students can foster greater academic success. Starnes (2006) adds that “An informal, ‘culturally friendly’ classroom in which ‘teachers act as facilitators’ is conducive to Native students’ learning. Moreover, findings support the use of democratic principles and ‘democratic consequences’ as effective classroom management styles” (p. 385). The idea of developing democratic principles within the classroom is yet another avenue toward success that may be developed within the scope of teacher preparation.

Like their non-Native counterparts, both parental and community involvements are important for educational success. Tippeconnic (1999) supported this statement of community building and partnership. Parental and tribal involvements connect communities to schools at both the college and the K-12 levels. “When community involvement is high, the school becomes a focal point and is involved in the reconstitution of community life” (p. 45). To build a sense of involvement through community building and partnership the act of gaining trust must first be demonstrated.

Research suggests that teachers need to show students that “they believe in their students, that their culture is worthy of respect, and that succeeding in school will leave their identity in tact” (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 180). After the long period under which involuntary minorities in general and Native Americans in particular have suffered under the hegemonic system of education building and maintaining trust will be difficult.
The Argument for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

Despite the difficult obstacles presented in this paper, a solid research in best practice may exist to help Native American students make sustainable educational gains. This work may be difficult, but it is of paramount importance if the goal is to narrow the achievement gap. It is a course of action that will prove to be difficult to implement and perhaps even more difficult to sustain but it is achievable. Richardson (1996) stated: “Significant teacher change can only occur if teachers are engaged in “personal exploration, experimentation, and reflection” (p. 104). One method of change is found in culturally relevant pedagogy. The phrase “culturally based pedagogy” is one that has emerged in the literature under several appellations. Ladson-Billings (1995a) in her work, traced the various labels including “culturally appropriate” (Au & Jordan, 1981), ‘culturally congruent’ (Mohatt & Erickson, 1981), ‘culturally responsive’ (Cazden & Leggett, 1981; Erickson & Mohatt, 1982), and ‘culturally compatible’” (Jordan 1985; Vogt, Jordan & Tharp, 1987) cited in (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p.159). It is known as “culturally relevant” in Klug & Whitfield (2003).

Ogbu and Simmons (1998), use the term “culturally responsive instruction” defined as “Culturally responsive or appropriate instruction is instruction that acknowledges and accommodates students’ culture, language, and learning styles in the curriculum and classroom” (p. 180). The concept behind being “culturally relevant” is rooted in an attempt to bridge the gap of educational success between the dominant White culture and the apparent lack of success for non-White students. “Culturally responsive teaching uses a child’s culture to build a bridge to success in school achievement” (Pewewardy, Hammer and Cahape, 2003 n.p.).
The historical roots of culturally relevant pedagogy “grew during the late 1980s and early 1990s as a result of rapidly rising diversity in U.S. classrooms and concern over the lack of success of many ethnic/minority students despite years of education reform” (Pewewardy, Hammer and Cahape, 2003 n.p.). One voice has been especially strong in the research literature of culturally relevant pedagogy.

No substantive discussion of culturally relevant pedagogy can be held without the inclusion of Ladson-Billings (1995a) who stated “culturally relevant pedagogy rests on three criteria: (a) students must experience academic success; (b) students must develop and/or maintain cultural competence; and (c) students must develop critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order” (p. 160).” Ogbu, (1992) in his work argued that teachers need to learn about the students’ cultural backgrounds and through this knowledge organize both their classrooms and their programs to help students. Ladson-Billings (1995a), declared that culturally relevant teaching is a pedagogy of opposition and that “Culturally relevant teachers and students are expected to “engage the world and others critically” (p. 162), and Lipman, (1995) added that “Culturally relevant teachers understand the political nature of schooling and help students see their role in the community, the nation, and the world” (p. 203). These are the precise lines drawn to combat the hegemonic system which helps to perpetuate non-persistency for Native American students.

A second important attribute of culturally responsive education is the setting of high standards regardless of race or socioeconomic status. Ladson-Billings (1997) confirmed this statement in light of teacher expectations for learners. “Students treated as competent are likely to demonstrate competence. Much of the literature on teacher
expectations of student achievement helps us understand that when teachers believe in students’ abilities, the students are likely to be successful” (p. 703). Often educators set their expectations for minority students too low and therefore students suffer. When teachers have these low expectations for student performance, students will meet them. Ladson-Billings (1997) wrote “when teachers believe that because of their race, social class, or personal economic situations, students may not be intellectually able, student performance (and how it is assessed) confirms those beliefs (p.703). Ogbu and Simmons (1998) argue that teachers should have clearly stated high standards and expect students to meet those standards. By setting high expectations and building the trust necessary to reach those standards teachers can offer students the possibility of success.

Ogbu (1992) on the other hand, puts the responsibility for success squarely on the shoulders of the community and the shoulders of the students “Multicultural education generally ignores the minority students’ own responsibility for their academic performance” (p. 6), and “Minority communities must teach the children to recognize and accept the responsibility for their school adjustment and academic performance” (p. 12).

Often educators set their expectation too low and students suffer. Bradbury (2007) found a fundamental reason for a lack of achievement on the part of Native American students is lowered standards on the part of students, parents, teachers, administration, and society. In other words, “American Indian children underachieve because those with a vested interest in their education have simply lowered standards to a point that under achievement is more likely than not” (p.6). Bradbury (2007) points out that lowered expectations lead to decreases in academic performance, tolerance of misbehavior, an absence of classroom decorum, and decreased academic rigor.
Despite the current social inequities, hegemony, and hostile classroom environments, students must develop and hone their academic skills in order to persist. “The way those skills are developed may vary, but all students need literacy, numeracy, technological, social, and political skills in order to be active participants in a democracy” (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p.160).

In a very real social justice lens Ladson-Billings (1995a) poses the question “If school is about preparing students for active citizenship, what better citizenship tool than the ability to critically analyze society?” (p. 162). If Native American students critically analyze society they may choose persistency, rather than non-persistency as a way to promote social justice.

The question now becomes if culturally relevant teaching can help students persist, while at the same time combat hegemony; how do teachers use culturally relevant teaching in their practice? What does it “look-like” in the classroom? Pewewardy (1993) asserted that one of the reasons Indian children experience difficulty in schools is that educators traditionally have attempted to insert culture into the education instead of inserting education into the culture. In contrast Ladson-Billings (1995a) stated “Culturally relevant teachers utilize students’ culture as a vehicle for learning” (p. 161). “Culturally responsive teachers not only know their students well, they use what they know about their students to give them access to learning” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 27).

Pewewardy, Hammer and Cahape (2003) warned that this type of teaching cannot be approached as a recipe or series of steps that teachers can follow to be effective with American Indian and Alaska Native students, but rather it relies on teachers’
development of certain dispositions toward learners and a more holistic approach to curriculum and instruction. Thus, culturally relevant teaching requires that teachers attend to students’ academic needs, not merely make them “feel good.” Ladson-Billings (1995a) writes “The trick of culturally relevant teaching is to get the students to “choose” academic excellence” p.160). While Ladson-Billings states that teachers need to use the “trick” for students to “choose” academic excellence other researchers including Reyhner (1992) firmly believe that teachers of Native American students need to have special training in instructional methodologies.

These methodologies should prove to be effective with Native American students. Furthermore they need to reflect Native American history and cultures and to build on the cultural values that Indian parents give their children. This will produce a strong positive sense of identity in their students. The research literature is disjointed in the best methods for teachers. Pewewardy, Hammer and Cahape (2003) tempered his argument in that he believes that “Teachers need not be experts in Native culture to provide an inclusive atmosphere in the classrooms (n.p.).” While perhaps not needing to be an expert in another culture, teachers do need to know how to examine their own cultural assumptions to understand how these shape their starting points for practice (Banks et al., 2005). This researcher argues that each of these voices advocates for the same basic principle. Ladson-Billings (1995b) wants students to be in a classroom environment that fosters the same (Bruner, 2003) intrinsic motivation for learning. Reyhner (1992) wants teacher candidates to “have special training” in methods that are effective. Pewewardy, Hammer and Cahape (2003) believe that a bridge between both lenses exists, and that lens can be presented as strategies for culturally based instruction, the importance of role models, and
the importance of standards. Do exemplary teachers for Native American students embody these ideals?

While there may be no recipe or series of steps that teachers can follow Pewewardy, Hammer and Cahape (2003) offered the vast body of research literature does give teacher candidates several salient suggestions. Banks et al. (2005) argued that “in the classrooms of culturally responsive teachers, the methods of instruction and assessment, the curriculum, and the classroom climate work together to support the academic achievement of all students” (p. 245). Other researchers support the inclusion of more opportunities for visual and oral learning styles which can be introduced (Swisher, 1994; Garrett M. W. 1995); culturally relevant materials should be used when possible (Reyhner, 1992; Garrett M. W. 1995); and the use of mentors such as elders from the community can be used to enhance academic performance for Native American students (1998; Garrett M. W. 1995). Ogbu and Simmons (1998) offer additional insight on the importance of role model both within and outside of the classroom in culturally responsive education. “For many involuntary minorities, academically and economically successful role models are particularly important because they come from communities where, due to poverty and discrimination, there are not enough successful role models” (p.182). Mentors are important in student motivation to succeed in school as well as in providing at-risk students positive adults to admire and emulate. Successful minorities who are seen as having abandoned their cultural identity to succeed in the “white world” will not be very useful role models (p. 182). That said the “role models” need to be chosen carefully to best influence Native American students with the goal of academic persistency
Contradictions to Culturally Based Pedagogy

Hermes (2005) poses some interesting challenges to the idea of culturally based pedagogy as a panacea for the ills of educating students. Hermes believes that “effective theory in Native American education needs to include the understanding of oppression as both cultural and economic” (p. 110). Using the boarding school era as a benchmark Hermes systematically dismisses the apparent value of culturally based pedagogy. “The culture-based movement in Indian education was a response to the boarding-school era and the tremendous loss of culture and language that subsequent generations of Native people suffered” (p. 97). In her work, Hermes (2005) stated that the distance between culture and academics was sometimes too wide for students to grasp. She further argued that cultural curriculums do not always address the socioeconomic inequality of Native American nor community or familial dysfunction.

Hermes (2005) argued that poverty plays a more significant role in school success than culture. She wrote that “Often ‘culture’ in education is expected to remedy complex and deep-seated social problems” (p.96-97). Hermes (2005) finds that “for the teachers [in her research] more powerful that cultural knowledge was their knowledge of the big pictures—the context of socioeconomic and cultural oppression of Native Americans” (p. 109), and that the successful teachers were those who were cognizant of oppression, cultural change, and their own cultural identity. In terms of theory, the understanding of failure in Native American education, according to Hermes (2005) “should be expanded to include both the contribution of critical theorists that state structural inequality affects school performance and the suggestions of sociolinguists that inclusion of culture and cultural patterns of communication could help performance” (p. 110).
Who Are the Teachers and How are They Being Prepared in Colleges of Education

If educators continue to get inadequate or inappropriate training in colleges of education, then local teacher training programs need to provide school staff with information on what works in Indian education and information about the language, history, and culture of Indian students (Reyhner 1992). Sleeter (2000) speaks about the mismatch between who chooses to go into teacher education and who is in the public schools. “A large proportion of White, middle-class teacher candidates bring attitudes, beliefs, experiences and knowledge bases that do not equip them to teach well in culturally diverse classrooms” (p. 238). Currently there are over 35,000 full-time, regular instructors in the colleges of education across the U.S.; of these, 88% are White (Ladson-Billings, 2001).

As institutions, predominately White universities generally reflect the same attitudes and experiences of predominately White teacher candidates, and it is difficult to change these universities as it is to change the people in them (Sleeter, 2000). “The tragedy is that too few teachers have been exposed during their teacher education programs to appropriate conceptualizations of teaching for students from groups that we as a society have marginalized or normalized” (Osborne, 1996, p.286). Teachers must recognize that involuntary minority children come to school with cultural and language frames that are not only different from but probably oppositional to those of the mainstream school (Ogbu, 1992). The disconnection between diversity ideologies and teacher preparation and/or between teacher preparation and diversity issues is widespread (Sheets, 2003). Again, at least part of the answer seems to be found within the colleges of education. Colleges of education seem to face a dichotomy: either prepare more Native
American teacher candidates or learn how to prepare teacher candidates to teach students who are not the same race as the teacher candidate. If there is a degree of transferability with this proposed research study this is where it may be found.

A logical way to address the needs of cultural literacy in U.S. schools is to develop a larger cohort of Native teachers (Manuelito, 2003). Reyhner (1992) supports the concept for more Indian teachers who will stand as role models for their children. These instructors would offer students a unique cultural knowledge and would maintain the ability to identify with the problems their students face. Native teachers enhance the teacher-student relationship for Native youth and increase the desire of students to remain in school (Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999). While educating a stronger Indigenous teaching core may influence student success and persistency, the reality is this is not happening. Insufficient numbers of Native postsecondary students are graduating to meet the high demand for Native teachers. In public schools with high Native American enrollment, 16% of teachers are Native American (Manuelito, 2003). This number is significantly lower in many areas. For the last 30 years tribal universities, tribal colleges in partnership with nearby universities, and state universities and colleges have provided Native teachers preparation programs. Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) cannot, however, bear the major responsibility of developing Native teachers because each institution typically graduates less than 20 teachers annually (Manuelito, 2003).

Another way to educate culturally responsive teachers may be to incorporate more Native American studies courses into the teacher education programs, where colleges and universities are training teachers to serve in schools with Indian students (Bergstrom, Cleary, & Peacock, 2003). Villegas & Lucas (2002) argued that although these courses
are important in preparing teachers for diverse classrooms they do not do enough and
cultural strategies should be infused, holistically, throughout the curriculum in the
preparation of teacher candidates. Teacher candidates need to study the history and
culture of Indian children including their values, stories, music, and myths as well as
racism (Pewewardy, 2002). After a careful study of Native American culture and
education teachers may be more prepared to build relationships with their students which
may help Native American students to persist academically.

The Problems with Research in the Field

Numerous problems have been found in the research literature concerning how to
successfully instruct Native American students. Sheets (2003) wrote that the “problem in
the research lies in that “diversity ideologies are primarily conceptual; and unsupported
by the empirical research needed to improve the actual schooling experiences of children
from underrepresented groups” (n.p.). Brayboy and Deyhle (2000) advocated that
researchers need move the issue of race from the borders of the work and reposition it
into the center. While Sheets (2003) does not question the intentions of individual
scholars, she has stated that “in the field of education, I fail to understand the usefulness
of any scholarship that concentrates on societal problems, positions children of color as
objects of oppression, and implies that changes in attitudes translate to achievement
outcomes for children in public school classrooms” n.p.). Solutions to the problems
embedded in its inclusive nature or in its failure to minimize the theory-to-practice gap
are rarely addressed. “The research literature shows that an out-of-control, unrestricted
field allows scholars to conceptualize social justice and equity/multicultural education to
reflect their personal philosophies, theoretical frameworks, and research agendas” (Sheets, 2003 n.p.).

Conclusion

While clearly these highly educated, yet disparate voices have each produced some very important research on this topic several gaps remain to be investigated. Those gaps have been illuminated and this proposed research endeavors to fill some of them. This proposed study will seek to answer the questions: 1) What are the teaching faculty perceptions of the characteristics of successful teachers for Native American students; and, 2) What are the practices of exemplary teachers in classrooms with Native American students.

In conclusion, although the obstacles for narrowing the achievement gap for Native American students are numerous and those challenges are clearly daunting, this review of the research literature suggests that the answers may be in the preparation of teachers. Reflective, well-trained, culturally responsive, community building educators can make a significant difference in the lives of Native American youth. The impact of this model of a gifted, culturally sensitive educator has the capacity to not only narrow the achievement gap and raise the rate of persistency among Native American students, but also they have within their grasp the ability to positively change an entire culture.

In order to achieve the goal of this model of gifted, culturally sensitive educator, we need to be able to identify the characteristics and strategies they embody and better understand what these exemplary educators do in their classrooms. This research study is necessary to bridge that gap. While this section has outlined the field in terms of a research overview for Native American students, the research literature discussing
persistency, and finally the research literature of teaching and learning for Native American students, a discussion is not enough. A call to action is necessary. To provide that call the researcher proposes a methodology to investigate salient questions to directly impact student learning through the investigation of exemplary teachers. The method of this proposed study will follow in the third section of this paper.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The crux of the current investigation was to identify exemplary practices of teachers who teach Native American students. This is the “what are you going to do?” question of Bogdan and Biklen (2007). The “what” is the investigation of school teaching faculties to identify and investigate exemplary teachers for Native American students? Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) write: “what is most fundamental is the research question—research methods should follow research questions in a way that offers the best chance to obtain useful answers (p.17-18).”

In the related pilot study, the researcher examined several salient aspects of Indigenous education at the research site. Questions included: How are teacher candidates (overwhelmingly White) being prepared to teach in a setting that has a population of 20% non-White students?; What are the successes and shortcomings of programs geared toward reducing the dropout rate and increasing persistency?; What are the characteristics of teachers who find success in this setting?; What issues of race exist at the sites and what are the impacts of racism?; and finally, What is success? As a result the researcher has gleaned a basic foundation for this research.

Starting with the inception of programs to current practice and the successes and shortcomings of programs, the researcher has gained a general understanding of the issues of education, race and racism at the site. All of the previous studies were primarily qualitative in nature. This background positions the researcher in an ideal situation (Bogdan and Biklen, 2007) that favors some familiarity in field. The researcher has been able to investigate the preparation, practices, and the characteristics of teachers.
The overarching goal of this study was to identify exemplary teachers, defined as teachers who are identified as being particularly effective in the instruction of Native American students, and furthermore to examine their “teacher” characteristics. What does their work look like? How were they prepared to teach? What makes them exemplary? The body of literature is replete with examples of the shortcomings and outright failures of schools seeming inability to educate Native students, but what seems to be missing are the stories of the successful teachers that could have a degree of transferability to other teaching and learning situations. With this in mind the researcher’s implied theoretical framework is situated in a space between reform and equity (see Figure 1).

It should be noted that the researcher has obtained approval for this study through the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) on May 23, 2008 (see Appendix 1). The University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed and approved this study. Approval was granted before the investigation started. Additionally, the researcher obtained and filed with OPRS relevant Facility Authorization documents (see Appendix 1) signed by the Assistant Superintendent at the research site and the building level administrators.
Brayboy & Deyhle (2000) pose the challenge of asking why the work is being done and who will benefit from the results. In this study the challenge will be addressed by eliciting the voices of teachers deemed exemplary by their peers in educating Native students. Creswell (2008a) advocates the use of sequential transformative strategy as a mixed-methods approach to give voice to diverse populations. Sequential transformative strategy is a multi-phase approach with an implicit theoretical lens, which is presented in the introduction of the study, and “shapes a directional research question aimed at exploring a problem, creates sensitivity to collecting data from marginalized or underrepresented groups, and ends with a call to action (Creswell, 2008a, p. 212).” The goal of sequential transformative strategy, “whether it be a conceptual framework, a specific ideology, or advocacy, is more important in guiding the study than the use of methods alone (Creswell, 2008a, p. 212).”

This study was conducted using an initial phase (Phase I,) survey to gather demographic data, identify characteristics of exemplary teachers, as well as identify exemplary teachers (see Appendix 2). Building from Phase I, Phase II, consisted of an in-depth, open-ended interview of select exemplary teachers at each school site (see Appendix 3). Future Native American students may benefit from teacher’s understanding of what exemplary teachers do differently to ensure students’ success. That transferability could be used at the teacher candidate level to introduce teacher candidates to practices that engender achievement.

The data have been collected primarily through two tools: a quantitative survey, and an in-depth qualitative interview. Additionally, through the qualitative interview, the researcher gained access to additional sources including informal interviews, field notes,
emails and related documents. Creswell (2007) advocated that the backbone of qualitative research project is an extensive collection of data from multiple sources of information. While this is indeed a research project the researcher supports the qualitative design description offered by Bogdan and Biklen (2007) who wrote “the proposal is not the blueprint for what you will do, rather it points you in the direction you will travel” (p.78). What follows is the direction that has been traveled.

This study was conducted in two distinct phases building a mixed method study in the vein of Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) who find value in combining elements of qualitative and quantitative work. Mixed research involves the mixing of quantitative and qualitative methods or paradigms characteristics in research studies (Onwuegbuzie and Johnson, 2006), and is the systematic combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in research or evaluation (Chen, 2006, p.75). The value in mixed methods in this approach may produce converging evidence, presumably more compelling than might have been produced by any single method alone (Yin, 2006). Bazeley (2006) argues that “multiple research methods are essential arsenal for researchers who attempt studies on “what works” in education (p. 64).”

This study was conducted in two complementary phases. Complementary signifies that the approach is meant to include the strengths of qualitative and quantitative research. “Sequential mixed designs are designs in which there are at least two strands that occur chronologically (QUAN→QUAL or QUAL→QUAN) (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2006, p. 20). In this study the researcher uses the designation “quan → QUAL” which indicates that while the quan was collected first it is subordinate to the dominant QUAL (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). “Qualitative dominant mixed methods research is the type
of mixed methods research in which one relies on a qualitative, constructivist-
postconstructivist-critical view of the research process, while concurrently recognizing
that the addition of quantitative data and approaches are likely to benefit most research
projects (Johnson, R., Onwuegbuzie, A., & Turner, L., 2007 p. 124).” In a basic
sequential mixed design, data collected and analyzed from one Phase of the study are
used to inform the other Phase of the investigation (Onwuegbuzie and Johnson, 2006).

The remainder of Chapter 3 will outline the research design. First the research
design for phase I will be discussed. In this section phase I is introduced followed by the
description of the participants, data sources and method of data analysis. This section is
followed by a discussion of phase II along with the requisite discussions of their
participants, data sources and method of data analysis.

Phase I: Questionnaire for Faculty

Phase I consisted of a “type 2” questionnaire in the spirit of Johnson and Turner
(2003). Type 2 data collection utilizes a mixed questionnaire; a self-report instrument
including a “mixture of completely open- and closed-ended items (p. 304). This mixture
was helpful in that the researcher was able to gain a great quantity of demographic data as
well as deep insight into the subject community. As mentioned previously this study is
designed sequentially. In this design, it is the phase I step, the questionnaire that
theoretically drives the project and thus was conducted first, with the second phase used
to resolve problems/issues uncovered by the first study or to provide a logical extension
from the first study (Morse, 2003 p. 199).”

One particularly salient aspect to the survey was the ranking of exemplary teacher
characteristics and/or practices. This was accomplished in two ways: in the first, the
survey asked the respondent to list five (or more) items that they believe to be the characteristics and/or practices of good teachers; later in the survey the researcher provided similar items from the body of research literature. This second category was ranked by the respondents. Some of likert questions in the phase I survey may appear to be designed to achieve responses indicating a higher level of importance. The purpose here is not to necessarily compare individual questions across the survey, but rather to compare rating averages within the questions. This comparison within the individual questions allows the researcher to examine how the respondent’s ratings within the questions are reconciled within the literature. In other words, are the teachers in the field comparable in their characters and beliefs about teaching with the research literature?

The strength of the survey is that it not only provided a deep pool of what teachers believe are important characteristics and/or practices, but also helped to inform and fuel selection for phase II, interviews. The overarching goal of phase I was two-fold: 1) it allowed for the entire subject pool to identify and rank characteristics and/or practices of good teaching; and 2) it provide salient information for the identification of teachers considered to be exemplary.

**Phase I: Participants**

The eligible participants consisted of certified teachers. The phase I questionnaire was distributed to the certified teaching faculties of three schools in a mid-size community in the upper Midwest. The research site is identified by the U.S. Department of Education as a currently operational, regular school district, located in a small city (U.S. Department of Education). According to 2006-2007 data the district has 25 schools, slightly under 13,000 students and 811 certified teachers (U.S. Department of Education).
As anticipated the researcher received a significant response rate to the Phase I survey. This is in part due to the researcher’s emic position as discussed in Chapter 3, as well as strong support from the building level administrators at each of the three research sites. The overall survey response rate was 58% for the total sample. The highest response rate came from Sage Creek Elementary school site at 93%. This tremendous response rate may be attributed to the fact the building level administrator not only sent reminder emails to the staff, but also granted the staff time to complete the survey during a building in-service day. The response rate at Pasque Middle School was 64%. Again, the building level administrator sent the staff reminder emails and expressed support for this project. At Western High School site the response rate was 43%. The researcher speculates that the lower response rate at Western may be attributed to the fact that the teaching faculty had been asked to fill out several other (unrelated) surveys during this same time period. Overall a very good rate of response which is in part attributed to the researcher’s emic position and the result of developing and fostering relationships with the school sites.

Three school sites in this district were selected due to their proportionally high rate of enrollment by Native American students in an off-reservation school district. The school district is the second largest in the state with a total enrollment of 12,901 students, of that number 2,460 (19.1%) are Native American. The district has 15 elementary schools, five middle schools, two high schools and one alternative high school. The elementary school enrollment is 409 students of which 240 (58.6%) are Native American. The middle school site has a total enrollment of 522 students with 298 (57.1%) Native American. The high school site has 2098 total students enrolled with 374 (17.8%) Native American.
Americans enrolled. The Sage Creek Elementary School is located in a neighborhood that is considered to be a high-poverty area as evidenced by 88% of its population is eligible for free or reduced lunch (U.S. Department of Education). Percentage of free and reduced lunch is a common indicator of poverty (U.S. Department of Education). At the school site 61% of the student body is Native American. The school is brand new having replaced its namesake structure approximately two years ago. The new school combines both the elementary school as well as a community center. In an effort to integrate the school and the community this dual purpose facility has become the trend in the school district of late.

Some discrepancies exist in the statistics between those available from the Institute of Education Sciences/NCES (U.S. Department of Education), the school district itself, the state of South Dakota and those data supplied by the individual school sites. For example at Sage Creek, the district data states that there are 375 students enrolled at the site (RCAS.org), the South Dakota State Department of Education claims that there are 334 students enrolled (SD DOE), the Institute of Education Sciences/NCES states that there are 312 students enrolled (U.S. Department of Education) and the school secretary told the researcher that currently the school enrolls 409 students (J. Silbernagel, personal communication, April, 2009). The school sites have the most current data and that is generally what the researcher has used unless otherwise cited. It should be noted that all school names are identified using a pseudonym. According to Institute of Education Sciences the school sites have a significant percentage of Native American students enrolled.
**Sage Creek Elementary Demographics**

According to data furnished by the school there are currently 409 students enrolled at Sage Creek. Of the 409, 240 are identified as Native American. The school employs 42 certified teachers in grades pre-K through fifth grade. The certified teaching staff is comprised of two pre-k teachers, three kindergarten teachers, three grade one teachers, and two teachers each for grades two through five. The remainder of the certified teaching faculty is comprised of teachers working as literacy and math specialists, special education teachers, librarians, physical education teachers, and music teachers.

**Pasque Middle School Demographics**

Pasque Middle School is also situated in what is considered to be a high-poverty area with 80% of its population qualifying for free or reduced lunch (U.S. Department of Education). Again discrepancies exist with the enrollment data at Pasque Middle School. The district data states that there are 488 students enrolled at the site (RCAS.org), the South Dakota State Department of Education claims that there are 493 students enrolled (SD DOE), the Institute of Education Sciences/NCES states that there are 485 students enrolled (U.S. Department of Education) and the school secretary told the researcher that currently the school enrolls 522 students (A. Walker, personal communication, April, 2009). The school currently has 522 students enrolled in grades six through eight. Of the 522 students 298 (57%) are identified as Native American. Pasque Middle School has 51 certified teachers including those who teach in “cores” of math, English, social studies, and science, as well as those who teach in “encores” such as music, physical education,
computers etc, and other teachers such as special educators, math and literacy coaches, and speech teachers (A. Walker, personal communication, April, 2009).

Western High School Demographics

Western Plains High School is the largest high school in the state with 2286 students enrolled (C. Furchner, personal communication, April, 2009). Western Plains High School has 130 certified teachers (M. Hennies, personal communication, April, 2009). Again discrepancies exist between the data from the school, district, state, and U.S. government. The school as cited above states that there are 2286 students currently enrolled. The district claims 1985 students enrolled (RCAS.org), the state claims 1862 students (SD DOE), and the U.S. Government 2239 students (U.S. Department of Education). At the high school site 16% of the student body is Native American and the school qualifies 24% of its population for free or reduced lunch (U.S. Department of Education). The school is a traditional high school with grades 9-12. There have been both attempts at “coring” ninth grade students in a middle school model as well as alternative programs geared toward underachieving students.

The researcher had anticipated a high rate of return as both the school district and the individual building principals have expressed support for this work. The researcher embodies an emic position and considers himself as an insider in that he has taught in the district for nine years. Furthermore the researcher is keenly aware of the need to be continually cognizant of “how those we study view us as well as how we view them” (Brayboy & Deyhle, 2000, p. 163), and therefore worked diligently to continue building and nurturing relationships at the research sites.
The researcher encouraged participation by placing notes in the mailboxes of all of the teachers at the school sites reminding them to consider the survey. The first note included a UNLV pencil and approximately one week later the researcher repeated this with a note and “smarties” candies. This simple gesture seemed to be appreciated by the respondents.

The research sites for this study consist of one elementary school, one middle school, and one high school. The three schools were selected as research sites because they collectively serve the largest percentage of Native American students in the school district. The researcher gained access to the school district through the office of the assistant superintendent. Furthermore, access was granted to the individual school sites through the building principals. The permission of the assistant superintendent and/or building principals, did not in anyway take away individual teachers right to informed consent.

Phase I: Data Sources and Analysis

Phase I questionnaires were distributed directly from the individual building principals via the school district email. The email contained a recruitment letter (Appendix 1). Finally the email contained a link to SurveyMonkey.com. The actual questionnaire (Appendix 2) was hosted by SurveyMonkey.com and focused primarily on demographic material, such as age, gender, length of teaching tenure, and credentials as well as questions related to teacher characteristics. Marshall and Rossman (2006) encourage the use of surveys if the researcher seeks to get a small amount of information from a large number of people. The most salient questions on the instrument ask the respondents to consider teaching characteristics that will be used to identify teachers for
follow-up interviews. This identification piece, along with teachers indicating that they are willing to answer more questions later, is the arguably the most important data from the Phase I questionnaire. According to Creswell (2008b) surveys can describe “attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics (p. 388)” of the sample population, that can be beneficial to inform the interview for phase II.

Sequential mixed designs answer exploratory and confirmatory questions chronologically in a pre-specified order (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2006, p. 22). It will provide the focus and the respondents for phase II. The conclusions that are made on the basis of the results of the first strand lead to formulation of questions, data collection, and data analysis for the next strand (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2006, p. 20). It also provides justification, indeed the necessity, for a mixed methods approach since “the results of the first study are needed to plan the next study then it is clear that the two projects should be conducted sequentially (Morse, J. in Chapter 7 of Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003 p. 205).” With this approach the data analysis begins before all the data are collected thus the sequential mixed model. “Multiple approaches to data collection, analysis, and inference are employed in a sequence approach and provide conceptual and/or methodological grounds for the next one in the chain (Onwuegbuzie and Johnson, 2006 p. 53). To solicit methodological congruence the quantitative study will be completed prior to the initiation of the qualitative study (Morse, J. in Chapter 7 of Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003 p. 205). By using sequential triangulation (Morse, 2003) these projects are conducted one after another to further inquiry, with the first project informing the nature of the second. These may or may not use a different method from the first project. (Morse, 2003).
The collected surveys were downloaded into Excel spreadsheets for tabulation and analysis. Additional spreadsheets were built for the teachers who indicated that they were willing to consent to follow-up interviews. The researcher next generated a spreadsheet with the recommended teachers to contact for in-depth qualitative interviews (phase II). The initial spreadsheets consisted of all of the teachers at each site who agreed to answer additional questions later (survey question 32). That list included 29 respondents at the high school site, 17 respondents at the middle school level, and 13 respondents at the elementary site. In order to reduce these numbers to a manageable level the researcher revisited the data and made critical decisions to limit the number of in-depth interviews. It is important to note that the numbers represented here do not necessarily indicated that all of the respondents were “exemplary,” but rather that they indicated a willingness to be interviewed.

At the high school level the first cut was the elimination of teachers who had been a part of the aforementioned previous studies, this cut eliminated all of the English teachers. The potential pool now contained 22 possible respondents. Four additional cuts were made to teachers who teach special needs students leaving 18 potential informants. Both administrators who happened to complete the survey as well as school counselors were excluded from the list leaving the potential pool of respondents at 15. Question 14 of the survey asks “Approximately how many of your students are Native American?” Five teachers were eliminated from the potential pool due to low numbers of Native American students in their classroom. Interestingly these were foreign language teachers. Of the ten potential respondents remaining, three were personal friends of the researcher.
Seidman (2006) cautions against interviewing friends and thus they were eliminated as well. The potential respondent pool was now at seven.

The researcher next sent an email to the principal of Western High school with a list of 19 names for potential interviews. Since the researcher had previously determined that many respondents on that list would not be considered due to the aforementioned cuts, the researcher sought to see who the principal would recommend as well as preserve the anonymity of the respondents by not indicating whether or not the list contained people who had either completed the phase I survey or, in fact, consented to follow up interviews. The principal selected five potential respondents. Of those five, two were personal friends of the researcher while the remaining three were potential respondents that the researcher too was considering. The researcher, armed with a list of potential respondents sent email invitations to six teachers and began to schedule interviews.

Seventeen respondents at Pasque Middle school indicated that they would be willing to consent to follow-up interviews. Again, cuts needed to be made. The first cut was the elimination of teachers whom had been a part of the aforementioned previous studies, this cut eliminated one English teacher. The potential pool now contained 16 possible respondents. One administrator happened to complete the survey and was cut, leaving the potential pool of respondents at 15.

The researcher next sent an email to the high school principal with a list of 16 names for potential interviews. Again, since the researcher had previously determined that many respondents on that list would not be considered due to the aforementioned cuts, the researcher sought to see who the principal would recommend as well as preserve the anonymity of the respondents by not indicating whether or not the list contained
people who had either completed the phase I survey or, in fact, consented to follow up interviews. The principal selected eight potential respondents. Of those eight, two were personal friends of the researcher and thus eliminated. The researcher, with a list of six potential respondents sent email invitations to six high school teachers and began to schedule interviews.

Thirteen respondents at the elementary school level indicated that they would be willing to consent to follow-up interviews. Eliminations at this level were comparatively easy. One administrator and one counselor happened to complete the survey and were cut, leaving the potential pool of respondents at 11. Since this school site has 58.6% Native American enrollment no cuts were made to the potential pool due to low numbers of Native American students in their classroom. One “support person” was cut as was one personal friend, and two counselors, leaving the potential pool of respondents at 7.

The researcher next sent an email to the Sage Creek principal with a list of 13 names for potential interviews. Again, since the researcher had previously determined that many respondents on that list would not be considered due to the aforementioned cuts, the researcher sought to see who the principal would recommend as well as preserve the anonymity of the respondents by not indicating whether or not the list contained people who had either completed the Phase I survey or, in fact, consented to follow up interviews. The principal selected five potential respondents. Of those five, one was a personal friend of the researcher and thus eliminated. The researcher, with a list of five potential respondents sent email invitations to these teachers and began to schedule interviews.
Phase II: In-depth Interview of Exemplary Faculty

The primary purpose of this study was to understand, on a fundamental level, what exemplary teachers for Native American students do to help foster success. In order to understand what these teachers do it was important to understand who these teachers are. Seidman (2006) writes that “at the root of in-depth interviewing is an interest in understanding the lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience (p. 9).

While the interview is potentially the most significant of these data sources in that it explored the practice of the exemplary teachers and in essence, drove the study, it still is primarily self report. Yin (2003) writes that triangulation of data is “a major strength of case study research (p. 97).” Through the data generated in phase I, the researcher determined, based on the data, and principal’s recommendations which teachers’ practice at each school site would be investigated through the in-depth, personal interviews. Spradley (1980) writes that researchers use observation to make cultural inferences. In an interview situation the researcher not only interacts with the participant but also is an observer of the environment. “We observe what people do (cultural behavior); we observe things people make or use (cultural artifacts); and we listen to what people say (speech messages) (p. 10).” In this fieldwork, the in-depth personal interviews served to not only help inform the researcher and make visible an insider (emic) perspective, but also to help triangulate the data from each Phase.

Phase II: Participants

Tashakkori & Teddlie (2003) write “the second strand of the study is conducted either to confirm/disconfirm the inferences of the first strand or to provide further
explanation for findings from the first strand (p. 715).” The researcher had originally anticipated interviewing two teachers from each school site. Ultimately the researcher was able to conduct 12 interviews; four each at each school site. These interviews were collected using the interview protocol (Appendix 3) and were digitally recorded. The interviews were transcribed by a transcriber using Sony Digital Voice 3 software.

Phase II: Data Sources and Analysis

The primary data source for phase II was the in-depth interview of the exemplary teachers. The researcher relied on a combination of audio recording and field notes. Audio recording will allowed the researcher to focus on the cultural behavior and cultural artifacts while allow the recording to capture the speech messages and thus seems to be more effective than relying solely on field notes alone. The researcher employed the audio recording device to record the conversation as thoroughly as possible. By using a digital recording device the researcher was able to download the audio onto a laptop and utilize the Sony Digital Voice 3 software to aid with in the transcription. While using a digital recorder the researcher found no need for the use of an external microphone to ensure the highest quality sound. Each interview (Appendix 3) was approximately 1 to 1.5 hours in length and transcribed professionally. A copy of the Transcriber’s Confidentiality Agreement is on file with OPRS.

The classroom audio has been transcribed and coded using open-coding to break down, examine, compare, conceptualize, and categorize the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The data sources for phase II was limited to two teachers at each site based on the analysis of phase I. As mentioned previously, the researcher used the data from phase I to develop the interview protocol for phase II. After each of the twelve interviews was
transcribed the researcher sent a copy via email to the participant to verify the accuracy of the transcription. Additionally, the researcher asked each participant to assign themselves a pseudonym as well as suggest a name for their particular teaching site.

One of the most salient features was a discussion of the characteristics of good teachers developed by the subject pool through the questionnaire. The use of the note cards with the characteristics of good teaching acted not only as a departure point for conversation, but also appeared to assuage teacher’s fear of speaking about themselves. For example, rather than saying to a respondent; “you were identified by your peers as being exemplary, why do you think this is the case;” the researcher stated “One of the characteristics of good teaching is X. Do you agree with that assumption? Imagine that I am a brand new first year teacher, how could you help me to learn to do that in my classroom?” This protocol seemed to be very effective in the generation of rich data.

In the model of Merriam (2002) preliminary data analysis has been conducted after each interview and data has been coded and recoded according to the constant comparative method to search for emerging themes. This coding was done while the researcher continually revisited the data from earlier phases of the study. The final inferences have been made based on the results of both Phases of the study.

The mixed methods research paradigm as defined here mixed or combined quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). By employing this methodology the researcher was able to provide a detailed, rich, and thick (empathic) description, written directly and somewhat informally (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004,
p.14). It was an expansive and creative form of research, not a limiting form of research (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.17).

Limitations

This research was bounded by the specific contexts of the research sites and results may or may not be generalizable to other contexts. However, the study does have the potential to be transferable to other contexts. “A major advantage of mixed methods research is that it enables researchers simultaneously to ask confirmatory and explanatory questions, and therefore verify and generate theory in the same study (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2006, p. 20).

The goal of mixed-methods research is not to replace either of these approaches but rather to draw from the strengths of both in single research studies and across studies (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.13-14). Mixed methods research is also an attempt to legitimate the use of multiple approaches in answering research questions, rather than restricting or constraining researchers’ choices (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.17). Since such vast amounts of data were generated from this two-phase study the discussion of those data is separated into two chapters. In chapter four the researcher examined the phase I survey, followed by chapter five and the phase II data. Now that the research methodology has been discussed the researcher will next begin a discussion of the data from phase I survey.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS OF PHASE I

This chapter will highlight the results of the first phase (Phase I) of this sequential transformative study. It will be followed by chapter five which that illustrates the second phase (Phase II) of the study. The results of the first phase will be presented in part, conceptually rather than consecutively as the survey was designed to solicit responses over the course of the instrument that may connect to earlier questions on the survey. Examples of this will become apparent in section three of this chapter.

The first phase of this study consisted of a mixed-method survey sent to teaching faculties at three school sites (elementary, middle, and high school). The second phase was an in-depth interview with selected participants. The presentation of the results are divided into two separate chapters (chapter four and chapter five) due to both the uniqueness of the data presented as well as differentiating the two distinct phases of this sequential transformative study.

This study examined the characteristics of effective teachers for Native American students using a sequential transformative research design. The study was conceived to answer the following two research questions: 1) what characteristics do faculties perceive in successful teachers of Native American students; and 2) which characteristics of exemplary teachers of Native American students are most clearly related to understanding principles of effective teaching of Native American students and effective teaching practices in general?

The survey from Phase I contained both descriptive statistics that helped to paint a broad picture of the teachers at the research sites as well as qualitative data to develop a
richer understanding of these individuals. For the purposes of presenting the data in this chapter, the results are be presented in four sections. The first is a broad overview of salient research site demographics from the survey. This is followed by section two, which provides an overview of the quantitative aspect of the survey. Section two further focuses on the characteristics of teachers at the research sites. Section three illustrates cross-case view of the three sites. Section four focuses on a broad overview of the qualitative aspect of the survey for the entire sample population. That said, the results are shared first through a broad description of the research site followed by a narrowing focus on the individual.

Section One Overview of Research Site Demographics

The data, again, will not necessarily be presented sequentially as the survey was presented to the respondents, rather the data will be presented conceptually in order to illustrate the salient, but complementary differences between the quantitative nature and qualitative nature of the survey instrument.

Question One-Three: Demographics

Question one asked basic identification questions for tracking purposes. Questions such as name and contact information were included. While, of course, the survey is strictly confidential, the identification information was purposeful for two reasons: one, to aid the researcher in the tabulation and compilation of data; and two; to serve as a potential marker to see if the teachers actually live in the neighborhoods in which they teach.

Research on teachers in the United States indicates that the average teacher age of all Sage Creek Elementary, Pasque Middle School, and Western High School teachers
would be 42 years with 29% of teachers age 50 years or older (U.S. Department of Education). The survey data collected at the research site seems to indicate a significantly older teaching population with fully 45% of the sample teaching faculty surveyed age 50 and older (see Appendix 4).

Mirroring data from the national center of educational statistics almost exactly, the sample teaching population at the research site is almost 76 % female and 24 % male. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reports that females comprise 75 % of the teacher workforce with males comprising the remaining 25 % (U.S. Department of Education). When these data were broken out by school level the data indicates that 84 % of the Sage Creek Elementary teachers surveyed are female, 71 % of the Pasque Middle School teachers surveyed are female, and 73 % of the Western High School teachers surveyed are female.

*Question Four and Five*

The national data (NCES) indicates that more than one-third of teachers (36 %) had 19 or more years of teaching experience. The data from this research indicated an even more experienced teaching force with findings of slightly more than 46 % of teachers with 19 or more years of classroom teaching. In addition the research site has almost 11 % of its teachers with 1-3 years of classroom teaching experience, which is below the 17 % figure provided by the NCES.
The research sites have teachers who have been onsite, at their current school, for either a comparatively short time, 1-3 years 33 %, or a comparatively long time with 29 % of the teaching faculty with 13 or more years at their current school site. The mid range teachers, those with either 4-6 years teaching at their current site (almost 15 %) or those teachers with 7- 10 years (14 %) indicate that nearly one-third of the teachers have been on-site for 4-10 years. This is consistent with the U.S. Department of Education which indicates 24 % of all teachers have been teaching for 4–9 years (U.S. Department of Education). What is statistically interesting is the considerable change from 7-9 years teaching at current site to 10-12 years teaching at current site (see Appendix 4). While no correlation is implied it is interesting to note that the (U.S. Department of Education) data show a similar decline at about the same level of years teaching noting a spike in teachers leaving the profession at the nine year mark.

*Question Six: Other Schools Taught?*

Question six was designed to garner an understanding of the depth of various teaching experiences that the respondents bring with them into their current teaching
assignments at the three schools in the research study. The 123 teachers surveyed here have taught in a combined total of 140 schools. Of that total, 85 of the schools were within the state where the research was conducted. Nineteen additional states, two Canadian provinces, and one foreign country were also represented.

**Question Seven and Eight: From which High School and College did you Graduate?**

Teachers in this sample represent graduates from 60 high schools from across the United States, two from Germany, and one from Japan. Of the 60 U.S. Schools 46% of the teachers graduated from a high school in the research state and another 21% from an adjacent state. In essence 68% of the teachers in this survey graduated from regional high schools.

The teachers in this sample have degrees from 64 colleges or universities representing 26 states, the District of Columbia, as well as one Canadian Province. A significant majority of all respondents (67.5%) earned their first degree in the research state. Of that figure, 34% earned their first degree from the nearest teaching college. Forty-two percent of the total sample completed at least two degrees, and 11% indicated they have three degrees.

**Question Nine: What Courses/Grade Level do you Currently Teach?**

The respondents answered this open-ended question in a number of ways. Some indicated their grade level, for example “I teach 6th grade.” Others might have indicated “I teach 6th grade English.” These data were important in that it served as an additional marker to identify classroom teachers and their subject area as opposed to the school counselor and administrators who completed the phase I survey. This information was used in the selection process for the phase II interview.
Now that a broad overview of the research sites and salient demographics has been presented the next section will focus on an overview of the quantitative data that have emerged from the phase I survey.

Section Two Overview of Quantitative Data

This section represents an overview of this sequential transformative study’s quantitative data. The reader will recall that the Phase I survey was an amalgamation of both qualitative (open-ended) questions and quantifiable answers. Again, this section will not necessarily be presented in chronological order but conceptual order based on the survey design.

Question Ten: College Courses Related to Native American Culture?

Bergstrom, Cleary, & Peacock (2003) argue that a way to educate culturally responsive teachers may be to incorporate more Native American studies courses into the teacher education programs where colleges and universities are training teachers to serve in schools with Indian students. Swisher and Tippeconnic (1999) offer that the starting point for reform is within the scope of teacher preparation: “The misconceptions and stereotypes about Native peoples that persist in academic content and attitudes and behaviors of school personnel must be addressed through preservice and in-service teacher preparation” (p. 303). With their recommendation in mind the researcher asked the survey respondents several questions relating to the preparation of preservice teachers.

One question related to preservice teacher preparation was “How many college courses did you take related to the culture of Native American students?” Of the total sample 17.3% of the respondents indicated that they had taken four or more classes
related to the culture of Native American students. 7.3% of the respondents indicated that they had taken three classes; 29.1% two classes; and 46.4% had taken only one class related to the culture of Native American students. The follow-up question, question eleven, asked the respondents to list those courses. These data will be presented in section four of this chapter.

**Question Twelve: Did You Like School?**

Teachers were also asked to reflect on their own k-12 experience and rank how much they enjoyed school. School for Native American students, and often their parents, can be a hostile place. If a student’s parent did not have a successful experience with school they may be less likely to view school favorably. A similar claim may be made for teachers. Students who enjoyed their own school experience may be more likely to become teachers. The overwhelming majority of respondents, 62% indicated that they “liked school a lot.” Only one respondent indicated that that they “hated school.”

**Question Sixteen: When You Reflect on Teacher Knowledge How Important is?**

The theoretical underpinning of this study is an investigation of the characteristics of exemplary teachers for Native American students. Both question sixteen, and the following question seventeen are rooted in the research literature for best practices. Demmert (2001) states: “Solid content knowledge, sound pedagogy, an understanding of cognitive development and the different stages of children, cultural knowledge and an understanding of the students served, and outstanding interpersonal skills are well established characteristics of effective teachers” (p. 21). Question sixteen was developed to gauge how the respondents rate each characteristic espoused by Demmert in their own teaching practice.
Table 1

Survey of Teacher Characteristics

When you reflect on teacher knowledge how important is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the different stages of children</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound pedagogy</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of cognitive development</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid content knowledge</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of students served</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

kepted question 105

Keeping in mind that the Phase I survey is all “self-report,” the percentages of respondents who appear to support Demmert’s characteristics are overwhelmingly positive. Also remember that the lower the average rating the more higher the number of respondents rated that characteristic as extremely or very important, and the higher the average rating the closer to not important. The lowest, i.e. most important characteristic, average rating was Interpersonal Skills at 1.24; the highest rating average was Cultural Knowledge at 1.88.

 QUESTION Seventeen: How Important are the Following?

Question seventeen, like sixteen is design to elicit responses to gauge how the respondents rate critical characteristics and aspects of their teaching practice. Presented in descending order the teachers responded unanimously that building trust with students
has an average rating of 1.16. The category with the highest average was Teachers and Students being Racially Identical at 4.25.

Interestingly three categories for questions sixteen and seventeen were likert scales. The critical difference between those questions is that in sixteen the researchers asks “When you reflect about teacher knowledge how important are the following” and in seventeen the researcher asks “How important are the following.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Teacher Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important are the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and students being racially identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at extra-curricular events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infusion of culture in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the different stages of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of students served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High standards in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first of those categories was the category understanding of the different stages of children. In sixteen understanding of the different stages of children was rated extremely 1.78 while in seventeen that same category was rated 1.92. That said it appears that
understanding of the different stages of children is slightly more important when reflecting about teacher characteristics than teacher knowledge.

*Question Eighteen: Do you do Anything Differently to Teach Native American Students?*

Question eighteen was designed to ask teachers a simple question: Do you do anything differently to teach Native American students? On the surface it is a simple question; however, when viewed with the follow-up question (19 and 20) the answers appear to be much more nuanced. Both of the follow-up questions and their results are described at length in section four of this chapter.

Do You Do Anything Differently To Teach NA

[Graph showing responses to the question]

*Figure 3*

*Question Twenty Three: Thinking about your Teaching, how Important is it to Infuse your Curriculum with Connections to the Culture of your Students?*

The body of research literature is replete with examples of the importance of the infusion of the student’s home culture. Yazzie (1999) pointed to the growing body of research suggesting that better learning occurs when teachers transform their educational practices and the curriculum to reflect the children’s home culture. Chapter two of this paper examines the body of literature related to the import of infusing the curriculum
with connections to the culture of the students. The teachers who responded to this survey suggest agreement. Figure 4 illustrates how the respondents here value the importance of infusing their curriculum with connections to the culture of their students. Today, many Native American youth experience cultural conflicts and difficulties in identity development due to differences between the values and expectations of their tribal traditions and those of mainstream American social and educational systems (Garrett M.T., 1996). With this in mind it seems that teachers, when infusing culture into academics, can influence achievement. Yagi (1985) wrote, “Teachers’ attitudes about students, knowledge of subject matter, and understanding and knowledge about the culture of students are all shown to promote improved academic performance and student behavior” (p.58). Richardson (1996) agreed: “Teacher attitudes and beliefs, therefore, are important considerations in understanding classroom practices and conducting teacher education designed to help prospective and in-service teachers develop their thinking and practice” (p. 102).

The teachers in this study seem to overwhelmingly support this research and the importance of infusing curriculum with culture. A full 86% of the respondents indicated that it is either somewhat important, important, or extremely important to infuse the curriculum with cultural connections of students. Interestingly 65% of the respondents indicated that it is either somewhat important, or extremely important to infuse the curriculum with cultural connections of students (see Figure 4).
Question Twenty Four: In your Teaching do you use Cooperative Learning?

Cleary and Peacock (1998) suggest that in order to foster academic success a key component is to build trust and to connect with the community. They argue that a factor in building trust is through cooperative learning. Of the survey respondents, 91.4% indicate that they use cooperative learning in their classroom.

The use of cooperative learning varies by teaching level. Interestingly the teachers at Western High School indicated that they use cooperative learning the most. At the high
school, 89% of the teacher respondents indicated that they use cooperative learning at least one or more times per week. When broken out by category the high school respondents indicated that 8.5% do not use cooperative learning at all, a single respondent indicated that they use cooperative learning exclusively; 17% daily; 19% use cooperative learning 4-6 times per week; and 53% use cooperative learning at least 1-3 times weekly. A caveat for both the high school and Pasque Middle School level could be that these teachers generally teach several sections of the same course daily. If a teacher has six English classes, for example, they may teach cooperatively one day and meet the 4-6 times per week criteria of the question.

Middle school teachers use cooperative learning at a response rate of 99%. Of that figure, 6% of the middle level teachers use cooperative learning exclusively; 29% daily; 42% 1-3 times per week; and 22% 4-6 times per week. The figures for the elementary school were somewhat similar with the exception of exclusivity. At the Sage Creek Elementary school 13% indicated that they use cooperative learning exclusively. 31% of the elementary school respondents use cooperative learning daily; 34% 1-3 times daily; and 20% used cooperative learning 4-6 times weekly.

Question Twenty Five: Please Check all that are Applicable:

Question 25 pertains to teacher characteristics. The body of research literature suggests that many factors that assist persistency of students. Having a warm and caring teacher is beneficial. At the research site 98.1% of the respondents indicate that they are, in fact, warm and caring. A second important factor is maintaining high expectations for students; here 93.5% indicated that this is applicable to their practice. 86% participate in community events; and 78.5% indicate that they “know about the culture of their
students” while 36.4% “know a great deal about the culture of their students” and 11.2% “know little about the culture of their students.” This seems to reflect well on the respondents as it indicates that most of the respondents have cultural knowledge of their students.

The research literature further suggests that both participation in community events and cultural knowledge are beneficial for student achievement. However, nearly 25% of the respondents indicated that their teaching does not connect to student’s lives in that only 75.7% responded that their teaching “connects directly to student’s lives,” 67.3% have explored the community of their students, and less than half (47.7%) indicate collaboration with the community. Only 40% of the respondents know where their students live and more significantly only slightly more than one-third (35.5%) know the parents of their students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am warm and caring</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I maintain high expectations for all students</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in community events</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know about the culture of my students</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teaching connects directly to student's lives</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have explored the community of my students</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collaborate with community members both in and out of school</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where most of my students live</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a great deal of knowledge of the culture of my students</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know most of the parents of my students</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know little about the culture of my students</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Survey of Teacher Characteristics
Please check all that are applicable:

answered question 107
**Question Twenty Six: When you Reflect on your Role in Teaching how Important is:**

Question twenty is a likert scale question asking the respondents to gauge their opinion of the import of persistency, student learning, relevancy, modeling an interest in learning, covering the material, subject matter knowledge, knowledge of student, and organizational skills. These categories emerge from the literature as both confirmative and disconfirmative of what good teachers do to engender student success. For example, Haberman (1995) suggests that “Star Teachers” are more concerned with persistency, than with covering the material. In this study data emerged illustrating that the overwhelming percentage of respondents viewed these categories as either extremely or very important (Appendix 2).

The highest rating average (lowest rating number) suggests that modeling an interest (1.28) was most important to the respondents in the phase I survey. This was followed closely by student learning (1.32), relevancy (1.52); knowledge of student (1.57); organizational skills, and persistency were tied at (1.59); subject matter knowledge (1.64); and finally, covering the material (2.36).

**Question Twenty Seven: When you Reflect on your Role in Teaching how Important is:**

Similar to question twenty six, twenty seven uses a likert scale to gauge teacher attitude toward several characteristics of education and practice. The seven categories represented here were culled directly from Haberman’s (1995) chapter “What Star Teachers Do Not Do.” Haberman (1995) writes that star teachers “are not very concerned with discipline (p. 3).” In the Phase I survey the respondent’s data suggests otherwise. Here the data, as evidence in the rating average of 1.83, indicates that discipline and student time on task are most important to the respondents (Appendix 2). Haberman
(1995) writes that good teachers, since they do not “use direct instruction” as their primary means of teaching do not concern themselves with student’s time on task. Rather than concerning themselves with time on isolated teacher driven tasks, good teachers concern themselves with mastery of material. Again, with recent attempts at educational reform the idea of time on task has become more prevalent.

Haberman (1995) suggests that good teachers understand that for students in poverty, in this study as evidenced by the percentages of free and reduced lunch cited earlier, parents may be unable to help their students with school work. Oftentimes teachers blame these parents for their students’ lack of success rather than understanding the difficulties that these families are facing. This pattern of blaming the victim is rooted in deficit thinking and whether or not intentional, clearly evident in this study. For this question respondents collectively rated parental involvement as the second most important category at 1.84. Not one respondent indicated that parental involvement was not important.

The next highest rated category is that of rewards and reinforcements. Haberman (1995) discusses how good teachers do not try to motivate students through a meaningless system of extrinsic rewards for behavior, compliance, or achievement. Alternatively he values the intrinsic rewards that a student can generate when a teacher takes an individual interest in each student and understands their individual needs. The majority of respondents here, however, did not seem to align themselves in this vein. The rating average for rewards and reinforcements was 2.39. That said, on the surface the researcher cannot make claims to what type of rewards and reinforcements the individual teachers were referring to, and it is possible that the respondents were in fact, aligned
with Haberman and thinking of intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards. Again, the survey
cannot examine the individual meaning behind the respondent’s answers, the phase II
survey was employed to elicit more detail from the selected respondents.

The next category was intended to gauge the perceived important of tests and grading. Haberman (1995) writes about good teachers who “have little faith in—and place little credence on—standardized tests of any kind (p.12).” Unfortunately, Haberman was writing before the pressures of the No Child Left Behind era and the testing mania spawned thereafter. The rating average for test and grading was 3.14.

Homework too is a part of the traditional educational format that Haberman (1995) does not support. Rather than assigning additional work, Haberman does support the completion of work started in class. Homework had a rating average of 3.27, making this category the second least important to the sample.

Rather than using “punishment” star teachers considered themselves to be coaches. This category was interesting in that using the rating average of 3.78 as an indicator the respondents support Haberman in that punishment is not important. Haberman (1995) writes that the reason good teachers do not use punishment is that it simply does not work.

*Question Thirty Two: Would you be Willing to Answer Additional Questions Later?*

Question 32 was important in that it not only gave the researcher an indication of the willingness of the respondents to be interviewed for Phase II, it may also function as an informal gauge of teacher’s satisfaction with the Phase I survey. It was apparent that the majority of respondents, 61.6%, were willing to further interact with the researcher.
Section Three Cross-case View of Sage Creek Elementary, Pasque Middle, and Western High Schools

Section three illustrates a cross-case view of the three sites in this research project: Sage Creek Elementary School, Pasque Middle School, and Western High School. It further narrows the results by individual school sites. Section Three is illustrative of the cross-site similarities and differences which emerged from the research of the individual sites as well as from the careful analysis of phase I survey data. As in previous sections, data are presented conceptually.

*Sage Creek Elementary School Demographics*

The Sage Creek Elementary School is located in a neighborhood that is considered to be a high-poverty area as evidenced by 88% of its population is eligible for free or reduced lunch (U.S. Department of Education). Percentage of free and reduced lunch is a common indicator of poverty (U.S. Department of Education). At the school site 61% of the student body is Native American. The school is brand new having replaced its namesake structure approximately two years ago. The new school combines both the Sage Creek Elementary school as well as a community center. In an effort to integrate the school and the community this dual purpose facility has become the trend in the school district of late.

Discrepancies exist in the statistics between those available from the Institute of Education Sciences/NCES (U.S. Department of Education), the school district itself (RCAS.org), the state of South Dakota (South Dakota Department of Education) and that supplied by the individual school sites. For example at Sage Creek, the district data states that 375 students are enrolled at the site (RCAS.org), the South Dakota State Department
of Education claims that 334 students are enrolled (SD DoE), the Institute of Education Sciences/NCES states that 312 students are enrolled (U.S. Department of Education) and the school secretary reports a current population of 409 students (J. Silbernagel, personal communication, April, 2009). The school sites have the most current data and that is generally what the researcher has used unless otherwise cited.

According to Institute of Education Sciences the school sites have a significant percentage of Native American students enrolled. According to data furnished by the school there are currently 409 students enrolled at Sage Creek. Of the 409, 240 (58%) are identified as Native American. The school employs 42 certified teachers in grades pre-K through fifth grade. The certified teaching staff is comprised of two pre-k teachers, three kindergarten teachers, three grade one teachers, and two teachers each for grades two through five. The remainder of the certified teaching faculty is comprised of teachers working as literacy and math specialists, special education teachers, librarians, physical education teachers, and music teachers.

The teachers indicated that they were between the ages of 51-55 with well over half of the sample indicating that they were at least over 41 years. The mean age range for the sample at the elementary and middle schools were 46-50. As might be expected 90% of the teachers at Sage Creek are female. The teachers at Sage Creek Sage Creek Elementary have collectively taught at 39 schools. Of the 39, 20 are in the same school district as their current school, four more are within 50 miles of their current position, six are within the state, and nine are outside of the state. Three of the Sage Creek Elementary teachers bring middle school teaching experience to their current position and one brings high school experience. 67% of Sage Creek earned their first degree in-state and 47%
have had earned two degrees. At the Sage Creek Elementary site 65.4% indicated that they do not teach differently for Native American students compared to 34.6% who said the do teach differently and 93% indicated that the infusion of culture into their curriculum is extremely important. As a part of the instruction, 13% of the Sage Creek teachers indicated that they use cooperative learning exclusively, 31% daily, 34% 1-3 times per week, and 20% 4-6 times each week.

Pasque Middle School Demographics

Pasque Middle School is also situated in what is considered to be a high-poverty area with 80% of its population qualifying for free or reduced lunch (U.S. Department of Education). Again discrepancies exist with the enrollment data at Pasque Middle School. The district data states that 488 students are enrolled at the site (RCAS.org), the South Dakota State Department of Education claims that 493 students are enrolled (SD DOE), the Institute of Education Sciences/NCES states that 485 students are enrolled (U.S. Department of Education) and the school reports a population of 522 students (A. Walker, personal communication, April, 2009). The school currently has 522 students enrolled in grades six through eight. Of the 522 students 298 (57%) are identified as Native American.

Pasque Middle School has 51 certified teachers including those who teach in “cores” of math, English, social studies, and science, as well as those who teach in “encores” such as music, physical education, computers etc, and other teachers such as special educators, math and literacy coaches, and speech teachers (A. Walker, personal communication, April, 2009).

The mean age range for the sample at the middle school was 46-50. At Pasque Middle 31% of the teachers who responded to this survey were male. At Pasque Middle
School the teaching faculty brings a combined total of 50 schools worth of experience to their current school site. Eighteen of the teachers have elementary experience, and six have high school experience. Of the total of 50 schools represented in the data, 12 of the Sage Creek Elementary teachers taught in the district, four teachers taught at district middle schools and three in the district’s high schools. Six schools were represented within 50 miles of the research site, 10 additional within the state, and 10 schools outside of the state.

At Pasque Middle School teachers 76% of the teachers earned their first degree in-state. The Pasque Middle School teachers also indicated a higher percentage of having earned two degrees. Fully one-half of the Pasque Middle School respondents have two degrees. At the Pasque Middle School site more respondents indicated that they do teach differently for Native American students 51.8% do teach differently, this figure slightly outweighs those who do not (48%). One factor in teaching differently includes a high percentage of middle school (86%) respondents who found the infusion of culture to be extremely important. Middle school teachers use cooperative learning at a response rate of 99%. Of that figure, 6% of the middle level teachers use cooperative learning exclusively; 29% daily; 42% 1-3 times per week; and 22% 4-6 times per week.

Western High School Demographics

Western Plains High School is the largest high school in the state with 2286 students enrolled (C. Furchner, personal communication, April, 2009). Western High School has 130 certified teachers (M. Hennies, personal communication, April, 2009). Again discrepancies exist between the data from the school, district, state, and U.S. government. The school as cited above states that 2286 students are currently enrolled.
The district claims 1985 students enrolled (RCAS.org); the state claims 1862 students (SD DOE), and the U.S. Government 2239 students (U.S. Department of Education). While the school principal cites 20% of the student body is Native American (M. Talley, personal communication, April, 2009), the U.S. Department of Education claims that at Western 16% of the student body is Native American and the school qualifies 24% of its population for free or reduced lunch (U.S. Department of Education). The school is a traditional high school with grades 9-12. There have been both attempts at “coring” ninth grade students in a middle school model as well as alternative programs geared toward underachieving students.

The mean age range for the teachers at Western Plains High School was 41-45. Of those teachers at the high school 27% were male. The Western Plains High School has faculty representing a total of 64 different schools. From that figure nine elementary sites are represented along with 12 middle school sites and two colleges. Of the 64 schools represented two are district elementary schools, four are district middle schools, and three are area high schools. Of the three area high schools, one is the school district’s alternative high school, the second is the school district’s other high school, and the third is a local private high school. Eight of the 64 are schools within 50 miles of the research site, 17 are within the state, and 26 are located outside of the state. At Western High School 61.5% teachers earned their first college degree in-state and 40% have two degrees.

At Western High school 62.5% of the teachers indicated they do not do anything differently to teach Native American students, and 37.5% indicated that they do teach differently for Native American students. That said, 82% of the high school respondents
indicated that the infusion of culture was at least important, somewhat, or extremely important.

The teachers at Western High School indicated that they use cooperative learning the most. Of the high school teacher respondents, 89% indicated that they use cooperative learning at least one or more times per week. When broken out by category the high school respondents indicated that 8.5% do not use cooperative learning at all, a single respondent indicated that they use cooperative learning exclusively; 17% daily; 19% use cooperative learning 4-6 times per week; and 53% use cooperative learning at least 1-3 times weekly. A caveat for both the high school and Pasque Middle School level could be that these teachers generally teach several sections of the same course daily. If a teacher has six English classes, for example, they may teach cooperatively one day and meet the 4-6 times per week criteria of the question.

Section Four Overview of Qualitative Data

The phase I survey was a combination of both closed and open-ended questions. The open-ended questions gave the respondents an opportunity to elaborate on their responses as well as offering the researcher significantly more insight into those qualitative responses. Section four will focus on a broad overview of the qualitative aspect of the survey for the entire sample population.

*Question Eleven: Please List those Courses*

Earlier the researcher presented data investigating the number of college courses each respondent had to prepare them which related to both teaching and culture of Native American students. Question ten asked the respondents for the total number of courses that they have taken which related to Native American culture. Of the 126 teachers who
responded to the question a total of 213 responses are evident, since many teachers indicated that they have taken no courses, one, two, three, or four or more courses.

Question eleven asked the respondents to list those courses. A complete break down of these courses may be found in Appendix 4, which classifies the courses into 34 categories. Many of those categories are similar enough that the researcher has combined them into a single category. For example some respondents indicated that they had completed an “Indian Education” course while others indicated that they had completed a “Native American Education” course; similarly, “Cultural Awareness” and “Cultural Diversity” have been combined.

For the purposes of the discussion here the 34 courses referenced above may be consolidated into seven categories which occurred most frequently.

Respondents indicated in 23 instances that they had completed Native American/American Indian History and Culture course, 18 instances that they had complete a Lakota Language course, 16 instances that they had completed a Native American/American Indian Studies course, 13 instances that they completed Education of the Culturally Different, 12 instances that they had completed a Human Relations course,
nine instances that they had completed a Native American/American Indian Education course, and five instances that they had completed a South Dakota Indian Studies course.

Three individual respondents indicated that they, in fact, had not taken a single course related to the teaching of Native American students. Twenty-one respondents could not remember the names of the courses and often indicated that “I can’t remember.” One respondent interpreted the question to include coursework related to teaching students with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and yet another included a Love and Logic course as one that relates to the teaching of Native American students.

*Question fifteen: How do you Define Educational Success? Question Twenty Eight: What is “Success” for Native American Students?*

Question fifteen, how do you define educational success, and question twenty eight, what is “success” for Native American students, were designed to ascertain if the teachers in the sample differentiated between educational success and success for Native American students. This pair of questions was deliberately separated on the survey instrument and the answers often proved to be very interesting. The answers to these questions ranged from complementary such as educational success is the same across both questions, to the contradictory, or deficit model. One respondent indicated that the definition of educational success (question fifteen) is “the joy of learning—being engaged in the learning process.” The same respondent indicated that success for Native American students (question twenty eight) was “graduating from high school. Good attendance. No skipping classes.”

In order to unpack the tremendous amount of qualitative data presented in these two questions the researcher built a two columned spreadsheet with each respondent’s
data side by side. Next an open coding system was employed to develop similarities in the pattern of responses first within and then across the research sites. The coding system consisted of four primary codes and an additional six code amalgamations which are combinations of the four primary codes. The four primary codes consist of 1) divergent and/or deficit; 2) identical or similar; 3) reactionary and; 4) different but not deficit. The six code amalgamations are a blend of two primary code categories. Due to the potential for lengthy answers to open-ended qualitative questions a respondent could have provided substantial data necessitating the need blend categories. For example, one respondent indicated that educational success was “providing students the tools to be productive adults.” The researcher initially coded that as teacher centered. The same respondent indicated that educational success for Native American students is “gaining the tools to be productive,” a student centered action. The two answers, coded together, became teacher centered and identical. Over the course of 210 coded answers from questions fifteen and twenty eight, the researcher used amalgamations in seven instances.

*Questions Fifteen and Twenty Eight Coding*

The four primary codes were unique and as such required definition. The first code, *divergent or deficit* indicated that the responses to the two questions were different from one another and/or represent a deficit mindset in thinking about educational success for Native American students. Code two, *identical or similar*, indicated that the answers to the two questions were either similar, or in fact, identical. Code three, *reactionary*, indicated a tone of defensiveness within or across the two questions. The final code, four, *different not deficit*, indicated that although the answers to the questions may be different,
they were not viewed as exhibiting qualities of deficit thinking. See Figure 7 for chart of codes across school sites.
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The coding of the data at the individual sites became interesting very quickly. Notice how close the divergent/deficit and identical/similar code numbers are at the high school level. Seventeen of 49 respondents were coded as divergent/deficit and 17 were coded as identical/similar (see Figure 7). At the elementary level this pattern was similar as well with 13 respondents coded as divergent/deficit and 10 were coded as identical/similar (see Figure 7). Only at the middle level did a gap emerge with 14 respondents coded as divergent/deficit and a mere six coded as identical/similar (see Figure 7). Only the high school level was coded with an equal number of identical/similar and divergent/deficit and only the middle level had more different but not deficit, than identical/similar.

However, the quantifiable numbers of coding occurrences do not tell the whole story. In order to gain a deeper appreciation of the rich data from these two questions one must probe the qualitative data. To delve more deeply into the rich qualitative data the researcher had to break out the data from the original coding scheme detailed above into smaller, more manageable data. To this end the researcher sorted the respondents not only by school site but also by the respondent’s code as exhibited in Figure 8. The data
are presented by school site with the high school data presented first, followed by the middle school data, and finally the elementary school data.

At the high school level seventeen respondents were initially coded as divergent/deficit. Those seventeen data sets were then re-coded within the divergent/deficit category into five subcategories by carefully examining the respondent’s answers to question twenty eight: “What is “success” for Native American students. By coding those data from question twenty eight the researcher could contrast those data from question fifteen: “How do you define educational success.”

**Questions Fifteen and Twenty Eight Coding Subcategories**

The researcher coded the data exhibited in the divergent/deficit category into the following subcategories: *Graduation, Societal Value, Passing, Mainstream, and Image* (see Figure 10). Those data coded in the subcategory graduation indicated that respondents viewed graduating from high school as success for Native American students. The subcategory societal value was coded in instances where the data illustrated a future goal benefiting society as a whole, or at least in the world view of the respondent, as success for Native American students. The code passing was indicative of
progress and/or completion of coursework as a benchmark for success for Native American students. Mainstream was a code term given in those instances where the data indicated that success for Native American students was somehow equated with being similar to all other students. The final code, image, was used in cases where the data was concerned with the idea that feeling good and having a positive sense of self was success for Native American students. In certain cases the amount of open-ended data were such that responses may have been coded in multiple subcategories.

Figure 9
High School Divergent_Deficit_Graduation

The data from the high school level suggest that of the original seventeen data sets coded as divergent/deficit, four respondents were subcategorized as graduation. This means that to these four respondents graduation from high school is “success” for Native American students. Recall that divergent or deficit indicates that the responses to the two questions are significantly different from one another and/or represent a deficit mindset in thinking about educational success for Native American students. Appendix 4 exhibits a complete table to illustrate the divergent/deficit in this subcategory. It is particularly telling when a respondent indicated that “The joy of learning - being engaged in the learning process,” is their definition of educational success. The same respondent indicated that for Native American students success is: “Graduating from high school. Good attendance. No skipping classes.”

High School Divergent_Deficit_Societal Value

The subcategory societal values is rooted in teacher perceptions of educational success and a perception of what success is in the education of Native American students. Again, this subcategory is a deeper level of analysis from the code divergent/deficit. Two of the original divergent/deficit data sets were subcategorized in this way (see Appendix 4). One may see how divergent/deficit the idea of educational success as “Reaching at least on child and making them realize their potential” as contrasted with “It seems to be at this point staying out of JSC [the Juvenile Service Center] for skipping.” Imagine how dire the concept that educational success for Native American students is “being employed” while educational success is being able “to have a happy successful life.”
High School Divergent_Deficit_Passing

In this subcategory the respondents were concerned in a large part that educational success for Native American students equates with completing or passing coursework. Of the original seventeen data sets six were subcategorized here. From this subcategory emerged a very good example of the researcher’s concept of divergent thought in the data. One respondent indicated that educational success is “the successful building of relationships with students in order to facilitate their learning.” This is clearly a teacher centered response. The same respondent indicated that educational success for Native American students is “having a sense of belonging at school, and from that position learning enough to progress through the curriculum.” These paired responses (see Appendix 4) are interesting for several reasons; one is that for educational success the respondent was teacher centered. Another interesting idea with this pair is that the respondent is equating “sense of belonging” with educational success for Native American students. A third is the minimalist expectation for Native American students in “learning enough to progress.”

High School Divergent_Deficit_Mainstream

Three data pairs of the original seventeen divergent/deficit codes were subcategorized as mainstream. Mainstream suggests the respondents equated educational success for Native American students as becoming more like their expectations for the dominant culture. For example, one respondent indicated that success for Native American students is “getting to class on time, dressing out for the class [physical education] and participating.”
Remember that due to the large amount of respondent data some data may be subcategorized in more than one group. This is evident in educational success for Native American students: “I would hope that it would be to feel like they have mastered the material presented and make a connection to the info presented in the course. That they feel good about what they know and want to know more. They have made a connection to young people in German speaking cultures.” This statement met the criteria for three subcategories. The first part “I would hope that it would be to feel like they have mastered the material presented and make a connection to the info presented in the course” was first subcategorized in the previous part of the discussion, passing. The next part “That they feel good about what they know and want to know more,” is subcategorized in the later section image. Finally, “They have made a connection to young people in German speaking cultures,” is categorized in this section (see Appendix 4).

*High School Divergent_Deficit_Image*

This final subcategory is that of student self image. It must be noted that the idea of image of the student is from the perspective of the respondents and not the students themselves. Basically the subcategory indicates that success for Native American students is connected with the respondent’s perception of student well-being. Of the seven original codes for divergent/ deficit, six have been subcategorized into image (see Appendix 4). An example of this is that one respondent suggested that success for Native American students is “being able to provide for their family and being a part of community…a noble member of society.” The same respondent suggest that educational
success means “having the problem solving skills and the means to go out and find information necessary to solve problems that are encountered in the real world.”

*High School Similar_Identical*

This section represents the second data sets form the original for data codes. At the high school level seventeen of the respondent’s answers to questions fifteen and twenty eight were coded as being either identical or very similar to one another (see Appendix 4). An example of an identical code is where a respondent indicated that the definition of educational success is “when students learn the curriculum that is taught” and educational success for Native American students is the “same as anyone else.” Data that was coded as similar includes educational success is “the ability to learn what is required. It is often demonstrated through success in completion of class work and tests and through participation in class” while educational success for Native American students is “the same as for other students. Learning the material, learning how to learn, demonstrating that they have met the standards.” Since the seventeen data pairs here are identical or similar, the researcher did not need to build a taxonomic system to subcategorize the data as in the divergent/ deficit code above.

Four interesting data pairs necessitate further discussion. While the researcher did not need to build a taxonomy that does not imply that additional analysis and coding was not undertaken. Keeping in mind that this entire set of data is primarily coded as identical or similar the researcher dual coded four data pairs. Interestingly, of the four dual coded data pairs two pairs were coded similar/reactionary and two pairs were coded similar/teacher centered.
The first dual coded data pair suggests that educational success is “when they develop a desire to learn on their own.” This data pair was dual coded “reactionary” in that the respondent suggests that success for Native American students “is success. Singling out a group for this definition is implying a lower level of ability.” The second similar/reactionary data pair suggests that educational success is “when the students understand the curriculum and are interested in learning more” while educational success for Native American students was the “same for all students: good attendance, understanding of curriculum, becoming productive adults.

The second set of dual coded data pairs were coded similar/ teacher centered. In the first set the respondent suggests that educational success is “providing students the tools to be productive,” clearly a teacher centered action. That respondent indicated that success for Native American students was “gaining the tools to be productive.” In the final dual coded data pair the respondent indicated that educational success was “mine or my students??????.” This was certainly an unintended response to the survey. The researcher had not anticipated that a respondent would view educational success as a teacher centered query. The same respondent indicated that educational success for Native American students is “the same as it is for anybody else. To get through high school with a diploma and a focus on the future.”

High School Reactionary

This data set was coded as reactionary in that the tone of the data seemed to indicate that the respondent was reacting to the question what is success for Native American students. One example of this is the respondent (see Appendix 4) who indicated that educational success is “allowing a student the ability to reach his/her
optimal potential in the related subject matter, as well as with one’s personal character and self-respect.” The same respondent reacted to the question of educational success for Native American students by responding “I can’t speak for someone else. Success is different for everyone.”

*High School Different but not Deficit*

The final high school code is that of the responses being different across the data pair, but not exhibiting deficit characteristics (see Appendix 4). This code could be as simple as educational success is “good” as one respondent suggests, while educational success for Native American students is “showing up to class and engaging in the day’s lesson” as the same respondent concluded. Another respondent suggests that educational success is “giving it your all and taking charge of your education!” and educational success for Native American students “depends on the individual.”

It is interesting to note that in three of the responses to what is educational success for Native American students a focus was placed on the individual, but no such emphasis was present in the question what educational success is. Furthermore, one respondent’s response suggest that Native American students are “other” in the response “I don’t like grouping them according to the question as each is an individual.” The response suggests simultaneous inclusivity and exclusivity.

*Middle School Coding*

At the middle level (see Figure 10) the data is very similar to those data at the high school level. Most of the respondents were initially coded as divergent and then subcategorized into divergent/deficit. Interestingly more of the middle school
respondents were coded as different but not deficit than similar/identical. Furthermore, like the high school data very few respondents were coded as reactionary.

**Middle School Divergent_Deficit_Graduation**

At the middle school level fourteen of the data pairs were coded as divergent/deficit. Of those fourteen, four data pairs were dual coded. The data in this middle school section will be presented in the same order as that of the high school section. That said, the first subcategory *Graduation*, will be presented first. That will be followed by the subcategories *Societal Value, Passing, Mainstream*, and *Image* (see Figure 10).

Not surprisingly the middle school teachers were not as concerned about graduation because for their students graduation is several years distant. In fact only one middle school respondent was subcategorized as divergent/deficit graduation and that one was dual-coded in societal values as well. The respondent represented here indicated that educational success is defined as “being able to have a conversation about what you know, and to use knowledge to increase the learning of others.” For Native American student’s success is “being able to get a job and have a place to live other than a motel.” The respondent further indicates that success for Native American students is “being a
contributing member of society and success (sic) with their choices,” and that it is “imperative that these students graduate” (see Appendix 4).

**Middle School Divergent_Deficit_Societal Value**

As mentioned above the subcategory divergent/deficit societal value was developed as the data suggested that the respondents held a perception of the value that educational success plays for Native American students. The data here speaks about how the respondents view their students. In one case the respondent indicates the educational success is the “creation or fostering of the continued desire to seek greater skills and knowledge of the subject being studied.” As a means to illustrate how this respondent was subcategorized as deficit the same respondent proffers that educational success for Native American students is “found through the intrapersonal discovery of their individual and community worth before they are ensnared in the ever-growing and all-to attractive grasp of gang life” (see Appendix 4).

**Middle School Divergent_Deficit_Passing**

The data from the middle school respondents were subcategorized as divergent/deficit passing more often than that of the high school level. An example of how these data emerged and was coded is that one respondent indicated that educational success is “a mixture of hard work and enjoyment for what you are doing.” Educational success for Native American students is that “they want to come to school and work with me”

**Middle School Divergent_Deficit_Mainstream**

In the subcategory divergent/deficit mainstream, the data of two respondents suggest that success for Native American students is parallel to that of their mainstream, non-Native peers. The data here indicate that the respondents are perceiving success for
Native American students as parallel to their peers while at the same time advocating for the Native students. This is evident in “we have to also help our Native students feel they can stand up for their rights” (see Appendix 4).

**Middle School Divergent_Deficit_Image**

The subcategory divergent/deficit image pertains to the perception that the respondents have for their student’s self-image. In these data that means that the respondents are offering their perception of the import of educational success as it relates to students well-being. To illustrate this one respondent indicated that educational success is “learning what you need to make you successful in your life.” While success for Native American students is that “they feel important and successful” (see Appendix 4).

**Middle School Similar_Identical**

As noted above in the high school data set, the similar/identical category from the initial data coding indicates that the respondents answers to questions fifteen and twenty-eight are either identical or strikingly similar. Many of these answers were “the same as for any other student” (see Appendix 4).

**Middle School Reactionary**

Only one respondent at the middle school level was coded as reactionary. While answering the question what is educational success the respondent indicated that it is “the ability to think flexibly about the ideas explored in a given content area.” The reactionary code was given in that the respondent argues that success for Native American students is “achieving what every other child achieves regardless of skin color” (see Appendix 4).
Middle School Different but not Deficit

The middle school data for different but not deficit is interesting for several salient reasons. The first is that there were more data pairs coded as different but not deficit than similar/identical. Also interesting is that there were as many respondents coded as different but not deficit at the middle school level as at the high school level despite the greater number of respondents at the high school site. An example from the data of different but not deficit is evident in educational success is being able to “apply content standards to other situations,” and success for Native American students was recorded as “building a desire for success and persistence in learning.” It is clear that while these two responses are in fact, different, the data does not suggest deficit thinking by the respondent (see Appendix 4).

Elementary School Coding

At the elementary level (see Figure 11) the data are also similar to those data at the high school and middle school levels. Like the respondents throughout the data most of the elementary school respondents were initially coded as divergent and then subcategorized into the divergent/deficit subcategories as evidenced previously. The second most used code was similar/identical, followed by different but not deficit. Whereas the high school and middle school data had very few respondents coded as reactionary the elementary had none.
The elementary data were coded in the same manner as the middle and high school data. The initial coding separated the data into four codes: divergent/deficit, similar/identical, reactionary, and different but not deficit. As would be anticipated very few of the respondents were principally concerned with graduation from high school as an indicator of either educational success or success for Native American students. In fact only two respondents had data pairs that were coded divergent/deficit graduation (see Appendix 4).

**Elementary School Divergent_Deficit_Societal Value**

The elementary respondents were more likely to be subcategorized as divergent/deficit societal value and the other remaining subcategories. In fact, there exists almost equal distribution of coded pairs across the remaining subcategories. Educational success for one respondent was “children are learning content in a safe environment.” Both the deficit thinking as well as the societal value becomes evident as that same respondent indicates that for Native American students’ success is “becoming contributing members of a community.” On the one hand educational success connotes learning content in a
safe environment, and on the other the deficit thinking that success for Native American
students equates to a contributing role within the community (see Appendix 4).

*Elementary School Divergent_Deficit_Passing*

This subcategory also proved to be interesting. The data here represents the
concept of completion. Completion or passing was in some cases across the data the
successful completion of an assignment, grade level, or course. In the elementary data it
became more tasks orientated. Educational success was defined as “students learn to
learn new things,” while success for Native American students was “finishing the task
and not having to redo it” (see Appendix 4).

*Elementary School Divergent_Deficit_Mainstream*

The mainstream subcategory is also divergent/deficit. Simply stated it means that
the data pairs are divergent in content and possibly exemplifying deficit thinking as well.
Additionally this subcategory seemingly normalizes the non-Native and “others” the
experience of the Native American student. For example, in this subcategory educational
success was defined as “increased skill performance, increased social poise, and
maintaining friendships.” The other side of this data pair indicated that success for Native
American students is “staying engaged in school day, consistent attendance, parents
being part of school community, and staying in school until high school graduation.” It is
evident that this respondent if not conscientiously, is normalizing the non-Native
experience, while at the same time disenfranchising the Native student (see Appendix 4).

*Elementary School Divergent_Deficit_Image*

Remember that the subcategory divergent/deficit image is one in which the
teacher’s perception of the students self-image is considered. When asked to define
educational success one respondent indicated that for the teacher it was “helping children to feel successful and to enjoy learning.” The divergence and deficit becomes apparent quickly as does the notion of image when the same teacher indicated that for Native American students’ success is “honoring their parents by excelling in whatever skills they have” (see Appendix 4).

*Elementary School Similar/Identical*

As in both of the previous school levels, the data for the elementary similar/identical were relatively easy to code. See Appendix 4 to view the paired data. In many cases the respondents indicate that success for Native American students “is the same for everybody.”

*Elementary School Different but not Deficit*

The final code for the elementary data discussed here is that of different but not deficit. Again, this implies that while the data may be different across the data pairs, it does not suggest deficit thinking. Four data pairs met the criteria. For example, one respondent suggests that educational success is “taking the kids from where they are at and moving them forward,” while success for Native American students is “to be able to go forth and do whatever they choose to do in the world” (see Appendix 4).

*Question Nineteen: If you do Teach Differently for Native American Students what do you Change?*

Question 19 is an open-ended question which asked: “If you do teach differently for Native American students what do you change?” 53 respondents answered this question although only 44 respondents indicated, on the previous question (question 18), that they did, in fact, change their teaching. This was also the case in question 20 which
asks: If you do not do anything differently in teaching Native American students, why not? The researcher speculates that the respondents answered these questions without considering their previous answer or their seemingly contradictory nature.

The qualitative nature of the responses necessitates qualitative analysis for the presentation and understanding of the data. As discussed in chapter three the data were analyzed using an open coding and constant comparative analysis while remaining consistent with sequential transformative strategy. To analyze and present the data the researcher built two taxonomies (see Figures 12 and 13) in the vein of Glesne (2006) “to assist in displaying social phenomena (p. 158).” This map will help visualize the data. Using the open-ended responses to the question the researcher developed classificatory theme categories and continued to probe for additional categories and subcategories until the respondents’ responses were fully mapped. While the thematic categories are not mutually exclusive key patterns emerged from the taxonomy that will be illustrated both within the individual questions nineteen and twenty as well as across the analysis for both questions.

For question nineteen the researcher found four overarching categories emerging from the data. The question asked “If you do teach differently for Native American students what do you change?” Using the response data the researcher developed four emergent categories. The emergent categories are: “We are the Same,” “Culture,” “Deficit Model,” and “Teaching.” While looking at the taxonomy the reader will
understand that these four categories are not subservient to one another but instead are equally valued across the data.

We are the Same

The first category is “We are the Same.” This category emerged with data that suggests that the respondents are not differentiating between students based on race, culture, or background. This category was further developed into subcategories of “Relationships,” and “Colorblind.”

The subcategory “Relationships” includes data such as a shared bond in that making sure that the students “know I was a student at Pasque, or sharing a bond of race “I believe, because I am a Native, I am able to associate real-life situations to the material being taught” and finally creating a classroom atmosphere that is “warm and welcoming.”

The subcategory “Colorblind,” suggests that the respondents do not differentiate between students and that they consider all of their students to be similar. This notion of “colorblindness” has seemingly contradictory facets. This subcategory includes responses
that seem to be rooted in equality such as “I teach in various ways to serve all the ways kids learn,” “My lessons are geared so that all children meet success,” and “I don’t see differences in color of skin.” Furthermore the subcategory has statements that seem to be rooted in a manner of subjective equity such as: “Good teaching is good teaching for all students so changes are made for individuals, but not for race” as well as the belief in “high expectations for all my students of all cultures.”

Culture

The next category “Culture” was developed to explore the emergent themes of from three related perspectives based on the survey responses. These researcher generated subcategories are rooted in culture both as a shared representative experience as well as culture in terms of artifacts expressed creatively by a people. The emergent subcategories have been designated as “Artifacts,” “Myth/Stories,” and “History/Culture.”

The first subcategory “Artifacts,” speaks to both a physical setting of the classroom environment as well as integration of culture in the curriculum. In terms of classroom design teachers indicated that they have Native art on their classroom walls, “cultural pictures,” and books in the classroom relating to “their culture.” While considering the cultural integration into the curriculum some respondents indicated that they were incorporating Native American music in their music curriculum as well as adding traditional drumming and songs.

The subcategory “Myth/Stories” is illustrative of curricular choices that responding teachers use to differentiate instruction for Native American students.
Respondents indicated that they integrate units on the oral traditions of their students, traditional stories of the Lakota, as well as myths and legends from other cultures.

The final subcategory is that of “History/Culture.” This subcategory is essentially a catch basin of cultural concepts and connections. It included responses such as the value and import of all cultures included in the classroom. Respondents indicated that they recognize a need to teach Lakota culture because “I believe students from this area need to understand Lakota culture” while also celebrating all cultures, “to understand ourselves.” They further commented on a need to understand not only the individual student but also the family.

**Deficit Model**

The next category is that of the “Deficit Model.” This category has its genesis in the concept of deficit thinking according to Valencia (1997), is a theory which suggests that school success for minority students is in fact the direct result of the student’s own “internal deficits or deficiencies (p.2).” In other words, deficit thinking blames the culture, the student, or the parents for lack of school success. Delpit (2006) places the
blame for deficit thinking squarely on the shoulders of colleges of education who she states focus on “negative indoctrination” (p. 172), by linking socioeconomic status and academic success. When analyzing the data from question nineteen it became apparent that some of the respondents were, in fact, operating in a deficit model. Remember that question nineteen (what do you change) is a follow-up question to question eighteen (do you do anything differently to teach Native Americans). Thus when a respondent answers “I am more tolerant of their inability or conscious choice to not meet deadlines” the researcher categorized the response as an indication of the “Deficit Model.” This category is further developed into two related subcategories: “Student,” and “School.”

Subcategory “Student” is principally inclusive of statements that illustrate deficit thinking about Native American students. This is apparent in one teacher’s response “the vocabulary is so underdeveloped.”

Subcategory “School,” too is rooted in deficit thinking. In this subcategory the respondents not only blame individual students but also seem to blame the system in which the teachers function. One respondent was concerned about administrative repercussions of failing students “As a teacher we cannot fail too many students or it is redirected at us.” Several additional teachers would lower the attendance or completion expectations based on teacher perception of their students’ culture.

Teaching

The final category in the taxonomy for question nineteen is that of “Teaching.” This is the largest and most developed category because it goes directly to the root of the question and answers the question of what do you do change in your teaching for Native American students. While the preceding category had negative connotations, this
category is, for the most part, positive in nature. It is fundamentally what teachers are reporting that they do to influence the achievement for Native American students. The subcategories include a change in “Expectations,” for Native American students; a modification in teaching through the use of “Peers;” the incorporation of “Cultural Cues” in developing relationships with students; individual teacher-centered “Teacher Actions” in which teacher’s methods and actions are apparent; and finally “Other Resources” that the classroom teacher utilizes to impact student learning.

The first subcategory is that of “Expectations.” While I have indicated that much of the category “Teaching” is positive, this subcategory is less so. Teachers here have apparently changed or lowered their expectations for Native American students. Two responses for changes in expectations are: “I am not as strict with tardies and unexcused absences if I know they have difficulty getting to school” and “I have more patience for absences and tardies.” It is interesting to note that one respondent editorialized their response with “I accept late work without penalty, if I know it was their own work.”

The subcategory “Peers” is certainly positive in nature and speaks to the methodological considerations of the respondent. Peer learning is supported in the literature of Haberman (1995), a work which in part, undergirds this study, as well as Delpit (2006) who writes Native American students “need appropriate contexts—such as small groups—in which to talk” (p. 171). Respondents indicated that they believe “Kids learn from other kids and experiences” and that teachers should “engage in more peer learning and peer tutoring.”

The next subcategory is “Cultural Cues” and exhibits elements of how teachers perceive certain student characteristics that may, or may not, be rooted in the home
culture of the student. Many respondents indicated that their Native American students are “shy” and do not wish to be “singled out” in the classroom. Additionally respondents indicated that as teachers they are cognizant of the concept that many Native students do not make or maintain eye contact with teachers and that the teachers did not view this as a lack of respect. While the preceding two examples from the respondents may seem stereotypical, the data does illustrate some deeper cultural understanding. One respondent spoke of “understanding how important relatives are” in the lives of Native students and yet another respondent focused on learning styles and indicated that “Native Americans are visual, perceptual learners.”

The fourth subcategory is “Teacher Actions.” This subcategory is exciting in that it encompasses the actions of teachers in the classroom that the teachers believe are directly tied to student learning. The subcategory “Teacher Actions” is a compilation of teacher characteristics, cultural competencies, teaching methods, and an understanding of how students learn.

While unpacking the subcategory “Teacher Actions” and investigating teacher characteristics as discussed by the respondents the researcher found that teachers in this study had characteristics that they believed helped them to be more efficacious with Native American students. These characteristics included a belief that teachers should speak softly, offer more encouragement and provide more positive feedback. One respondent indicated “I teach every student differently as much as possible, depending on their needs.”

The respondents also indicated that they had an understanding of cultural competencies and how cultural cues are important when working with Native kids.
To illustrate this, respondents suggested that “I am more aware of their [Native American students] cultural tendencies,” and that the teachers are sensitive and try to incorporate cultural history into the curriculum. Some respondents argued the importance of teaching from a Native perspective. This teaching from a Native perspective was illustrated in both the integration of culture into the curriculum as well as the recognition of the importance of that culture. One respondent indicated that knowing the culture may lead to better understanding of the student. In part, this may be due to teaching strategies and information that have been taught at the undergraduate level to help teachers to be more effective with Native American students.

Along with this sensitivity comes a certain level of the deficit thinking discussed earlier. Masquerading as helpfulness is the lowering of standards apparent in “I may give them more time for completion” and “I usually try at least 2 times to make that extra effort to extend assignments or make up work,” “I also accept late work far more than I should which I do not necessarily agree with,” because some responding teachers “recognize that they may not learn exactly the same as white children.” A further example of deficit thinking was apparent in “math language is also a challenge for many of my students so I frequently use ELL strategies.”

Not all of the respondents were acting from a deficit model. Many were operating form a perspective of encouragement and relationship building. “I try to encourage them more. I try to build a relationship with them more.” Specific strategies mentioned include the increase use of wait time for Native American students, as well as more hands on learning.
Of the teaching methods evident in the discussion wait time was mentioned frequently. Additionally a respondent indicated that the physical structure of the classroom is important and that this particular respondent has students sitting side by side at tables to facilitate discussion. Respondents further indicated that they “present materials in as many ways as possible to reach as many students as possible” and try and teach in various ways to serve all the ways kids learn.

Respondents also illustrated an understanding of how students learn, and a certain belief, specifically, about how Native American students learn. Respondents try to relate lessons to life experiences, use manipulatives for skill development, and “try to paint a visual image because they are more visual than auditory.” The use of visual models and representation was mentioned with some frequency.

The final subcategory is that of “Other Resources.” In this section the responding classroom teachers indicate that that there exists a need for resources outside of the classroom. These resources include a need for both support personnel at the school as well as within the community. Native American mentoring was specifically mentioned as an outside resource.

*Question Twenty: If you do not do Anything Differently in Teaching Native American Students, why not?*

This question, like question nineteen lead itself naturally to a taxonomy (see Figures 14 and 15) view in the vein of Glense (2006), and both taxonomies had categories that emerged similarly. For example both taxonomies share categories titled “Deficit Model” and “Teaching” although the subsequent subcategories are significantly different as will become evident. Question twenty asks: If you do not do anything
differently in teaching Native American students, why not? The researcher was able to develop four categories in the analysis of this question. Two of the categories are named above and the remaining two are “The Same” and “Uncertain.” The researcher will address each category in the order in which they appear on the taxonomy.

The first category “The Same” had a great deal of information leading to an appreciation of the perceptions that the responding teachers bring into their teaching practice. At first blush this category suggests that the respondents are viewing all students identically. This is very nearly accurate although further unpacking of the nature of the respondent’s comments necessitates additional sub-groupings. This category has been further developed into five subcategories: “Strategies,” “Equity,” “Colorblind,” “Content Area,” and “Inclusion.”

When considering “Strategies” teachers responded that they use “multi-modality” in their practice, but “kids are kids and will grasp things when they are ready.” When considering Native American students in particular a respondent stated: “I feel they are the same as anybody else and can learn the same as anybody else.”
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The next subcategory, “Equity” speaks largely to the sentiment that all students are identical and thus are equal and should be treated the same. Many respondents gave examples of this such as: “I look at my students as children and I treat them all the same.” Teachers also wrote of issues of respect indicating that they “treat all students fairly and with complete and total respect.” Further examination of the equity subcategory lead to a statement that read “Standards and expectations should be the same for every student.” More alarming seems to be a perverse social justice reversal “Why should we single some [students] out?” Respondents indicated that they want the same set of rules and expectations for all and that their classroom goals are the same for all students. One respondent was so vehement that they responded with three exclamation points to underscore their belief that all students are equal: “We are all the same!!!”

The next subcategory “Colorblind,” is very closely linked with “Equity,” and again with the larger category of sameness. The researcher wrestled with the decision to make it a unique subcategory but ultimately determined that the differences were, in fact, significant enough to merit its own place. On the surface the concept of colorblindness seems to indicate that the teachers do not see individual differences of students. This is in part true for this subcategory with a respondent indicating “I don’t view students by nationality,” an interesting comment in the nearly monoculture aspect of the research site.

Again, the very nature of the category “The Same” lends itself to subtle nuance and that is apparent in the subcategory “Content Area.” The justification for this category lies primarily in the fact that the respondents here were speaking directly to the curricular concerns of their particular content areas. In my area there is no reason to treat kids differently. While much research may offer a competing viewpoint respondents here
suggested “In my subject area, skills are learned in a similar way among all students” and that “Cultural differences do not significantly impact the way you learn to play a musical instrument.” Many respondents, again echoing the category sameness argued that their content is the same for all students regardless of background, for example “science is the same for everyone,” or that what they teach is relevant to all races, “what I teach is as relative to them as it is to non natives.”

The final subcategory is “Inclusion.” This category was developed with the idea that the respondents seemed to indicate that they are teaching all of their students according to their needs in a “safe, loving environment.” It became apparent from the data in this category that the teachers here have a great deal of love for their students as well as a commitment to teaching them similarly. “I love all my students the same, treating them all with the respect they deserve- I hold all of my students to the same standards.” It also became apparent that some teachers were expressing sentiment that may be perceived as defensive “I don't know what else "they" would need. I teach individual students and what is good for one group is good for all.” Some respondents indicated that they are very inclusive “I teach to all levels and cultures,” and “I teach children of all cultures and backgrounds. I teach children.”

Uncertain

The next category under question twenty If you do not change, why not, is “Uncertain.” This category explores the rationale that the respondents offer for not changing their instruction for Native American students. Three subcategories were developed from the data which evidence specific attributes of the data. The three subcategories are “Not Necessary,” “Not Applicable,” and “Confused.”
The first subcategory “Not Necessary” illustrates respondent’s belief that it is not necessary for them to alter their current instructional methods. They believe that it is not necessary to change. The respondents offered several reasons for this lack of change including “I do not see a need to” and “I don't feel it's necessary.” This does not, alone, necessarily connote that the teachers represented are resistant to change. It is plausible that the teachers are already meeting the needs of their students. Another teacher responded “Other than sometimes prodding them to attend class more, the area I teach (art) doesn't require it, in my opinion. I feel that the way I teach reaches most learning styles, including those of Native American Students.” Perhaps one of the most disturbing comments was the answer “Why?” Does this mean why change to meet the needs of Native American students or does it mean that the instruction is sufficient so why change? The researcher does not possess the answer.

The second subcategory is “Not Applicable.” The respondents here seem to be suggesting through their responses that they do not do anything differently to teach Native American Students because in their individual situations change does not apply. One respondent, a physical education teacher offered: “I can't change the rules of how our activities are played. They need to know the rules of how the game is played.” Some of the responses were slightly cryptic such as change is not applicable because change “really has nothing to do with racial differences.” Yet another respondent indicated that change based on race is not important: “Race, ethnicity, gender, even sexual preference...all of these seem irrelevant to learning and are used as excuses by far too many. Respecting humanity and having a desire to help others develop their talents is.” Another respondent wrote pragmatically: “I believe we do what each child needs, not
necessarily what each race needs. Saying all Native American children need the same thing is like saying all white children need the same thing.

The final subcategory of Do Not Change is that of “Confused.” Respondents here were simply confused about changing instruction for Native American students. “Sometimes I’m just not sure how to incorporate cultural awareness into a lesson” or if not sure how to incorporate culture they did not “know what to do differently” for Native American students. Seeming to fit well with the subcategory the final response in this category confused the researcher. One teacher indicated that he/she has “examined this and continues to.”

**Deficit Model**

The third category for question twenty is “Deficit Model.” The deficit perspective in this taxonomy is not unlike that examined in question nineteen. The researcher developed two subcategories that illustrate the respondent’s deficit perspective. The first, “opportunity” speaks to a respondent’s perspective of the home life of their Native American students. This subcategory places a value on the perceived value of education at home: “Not all students have equal opportunities at home to see the importance of quality education.” This statement is telling on three levels. One, it questions the
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opportunities at the home of the student; two it questions how the family values education; and three, it makes an implicit judgment about the quality of education expected.

The next subcategory under the deficit model is that of “Teacher Perceptions.” This subcategory is especially interesting as it lends insight as to how the classroom teachers perceive the educability of their Native American students. Some of their statements are damning. One respondent indicated that they did not want to “single them out and make them feel inferior.” This may be true, but doesn’t the fact that the respondent is singling them out by race in their response indicate that they are in fact singling them out? If this is the case then are they making them feel inferior as well? A second interesting response modeling the deficit perspective is “I try to be more lenient so they can eventually achieve success as well.” This speaker seems to be indicating that by lowering expectations Native Students can “eventually” achieve the same success as non-Native students. Further responses are even more dire, indicating that Native American students need to understand how to succeed in a white world, should not be given false expectations, and that the world outside of the classroom “doesn’t make exceptions.” Apparently, this teacher does not either.

Teaching

The final category for question twenty is “Teaching.” This category was especially noteworthy. The responses here were filtered into two subcategories: differentiated and strategies. As could be expected the former embodies responses relating to an idea of differentiating instruction to meet individual student needs. This was heartening in that many respondents share an idea that all students have individual
needs and that one size truly, does not fit all. The second subcategory, strategies, is the “what” teachers are doing to meet those needs.

The sub-category “differentiated” not only speaks to the need to modify instruction based on need rather than race; it also provides commentary illustrating how teachers relate with their students. One prominent theme emerged of the individual. Respondents indicated that they “treat each student as an individual,” look at students as individuals, consider individual needs, offer individual help, individualize instruction, to utilize individual student’s strengths, and that all students are individuals. A second related theme was a desire to meet learning needs through modification of instruction based on the student.

The final sub-category is “Strategies.” This sub-category principally considered the strategies teachers employ to meet the needs of their students. Typically this group contained stereotypical tips such as not to expect eye contact with traditional Sioux students.

Interestingly it also had responses such as allow students an opportunity to “save face,” and not to back students into corners. Respondents in the English classroom wrote how the implementation of reader’s/writer’s workshop helps to meet individual learning needs. One respondent indicated that she “asks everyone to share when comparing cultures. I believe that everyone is different and I am interested in everyone regardless of race. I am a minority myself and do not need “special attention.”” A final notable response that was included in strategies, although it clearly overlaps with the deficit model is the response “If you get it right for Native students and the LD students, then you get it right for all kids.” Native students and LD kids?
Question Twenty One: Please Identify Several Characteristics of Good Teachers at your School; Question Thirty: What are the Characteristics of a “Successful” Teacher for Native American Students and, Question Thirty One: What do “Successful” Teachers for Native American Students do that may be Different from Other Teachers?

Questions 21 and 30 were designed to develop a sense of which characteristics were important to the sample teachers. Question 31 sought to see if there exist salient differences. Like questions 15 and 28 earlier in this section, these first two questions were framed to ascertain teacher self report data about characteristics of good teachers at the individual sites. Question 21 asked the respondents to identify several characteristics of good teachers at their school site; and, question 30 asks about the characteristics of a “successful” teacher for Native American students. The data will be presented side-by-side as in earlier parts of this section. It must be noted that these data pairs are not mutually exclusive and it would be a disservice to attempt wholesale inferences across the data pairs. While the juxtaposition of this data across the pairs is interesting it should not be considered definitive. It is possible that respondents answered question 21 with the characteristics of good teachers at their school site and used question 30 to emphasize, or add to what they had said previously.

The researcher coded a total of 104 data pairs from the phase I survey (see Appendix 4). Of the 104 data pairs, 50 were respondents at the high school site, 28 of the respondents were at the middle school, and 26 respondents were from the elementary school site. While coding questions 15 and 28 earlier the data illustrated divergent characteristics across the data pairs. While coding questions 15 and 28 the researcher
found a common core of characteristics of good teaching. While questions 15 and 28 were illustrative of differences, questions 21 and 30 illustrate similarities. Question 31 helps to triangulate and support the previous data.

The 104 data pairs equate to 208 individual blocks of qualitative data that needed to be coded. To this end the researcher employed a coding scheme to develop a componential analysis. The initial componential analysis generated two primary categories, humanistic and academic. The concept of humanistic is based in the idea of these codes are human characteristics such as relationships. The humanistic category was divided into two subcategories relational and interpersonal skills. Relational means characteristics that exist within the individual such love or respect. Interpersonal is how those characteristics manifest themselves between individuals or within classrooms such as enthusiasm and humor. The two subcategories under academic are content and skills. Content means these codes are principally concerned with the transference of knowledge. These codes include ideas such as solid content knowledge and relevance of subject matter. Academic skills are more aligned with management issues such as the delivery of content or integration of culture (see Figure 16).
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The tremendous quantity of data dictated the need for an enormous number of individual codes. A total of 124 codes were generated for questions 21 and 30. There were 74 individual codes generated for the humanistic and another 50 for the academic (see Appendix 4). With the rich data provided by the participants each individual data pair may have been coded within several categories. For example, one teacher at the elementary school site indicated that characteristics of good teaching at her school site (question 21) meant: “A good teacher is organized, knows the content area, and has good relations with his/her students (see Figure 17).” That single sentence was coded as academic/ skills/ organized, due to the key words “a good teacher is organized;” academic/ content/ solid content knowledge, due to the key words “knows the content area;” and, humanistic/ relational/ relationships due to “good relations with his/her students.”

| A good teacher is organized, knows the content area and has good relations with his/her students. | Caring, doing what it takes to make them successful. |

That is only one example from one half of 104 data pairs. To put this into better perspective the humanistic / relational category alone had twenty codes. These 20 were apparent in the data in 182 instances across the three school sites. While all of the data is interesting two codes are especially so. The code “love” only appeared in the data at the middle level (twice) and elementary level (six). It is interesting that at both levels the respondents are indicating that an important characteristic for teaching is love. Furthermore, at both the middle and elementary level the code “calm” emerged as an important characteristic for teachers.
Patterns began to emerge from the data and the researcher became cognizant that many categories with few recorded instances of occurrence could be collapsed into more dominant categories. For example, under humanistic/relational the codes “non-judgmental” and “open-minded” were similar enough to combine. This was also apparent in the codes “rapport” and “connect with students.” This collapsing of the data codes resulted in a more manageable data set.

Once the data were coded the researcher investigated the patterns that developed based on the research literature. Overall the three sites varied subtly on what teacher characteristics their respondents were principally concerned with. In the category academics, the high school respondents were most concerned with “high standards” followed by “solid content knowledge.” The middle school respondents were most concerned with “high standards” followed by equal representation of “cultural knowledge” and “solid content knowledge.” The elementary respondents were most concerned with “organization” followed by “knowledge/ pedagogical content knowledge.”

Under the category humanistic all three levels indicated that the characteristics of “relationships/ caring” were the most coded from the data. At the high school site that was followed by “knowledge/ understanding of students;” the middle followed with “hardworking/ dedication;” and the elementary with the characteristic ability to be “flexible.”

Two primary aspects of teacher characteristic from this data were investigated, confirmative and disconfirmative. The confirmative bolsters the research literature while the disconfirmative contradicts the literature. Recall early phase I data from section two
of this chapter. In questions 16, 17, 25, and 26 the researcher sought to gain perspective on how the answers the respondents gave correlate with the research literature. Clearly those data have been reported. This section seeks to compare and triangulate those responses.

Question 16 evolved from Demmert (2001) and asked the respondents to gauge the import of solid content knowledge, sound pedagogy, cultural knowledge, understanding of the different stages of children/ cognitive development, understanding of students served, and interpersonal skills. When asked in questions 21 about teaching characteristics and 30 teaching characteristic and teaching characteristics for Native American students the most often coded responses for the category academic at two school levels was in fact, solid content knowledge. Interestingly, not a single respondent mentions solid content knowledge as important in question thirty one, what do “successful” teachers for Native American students do that may be different from other teachers.

Keep in my that Demmert (2001) was not ranking his characteristics but simply indicating that in his work those characteristics are important in the education of Native American students. Respondents in this study further confirm that sound pedagogy and cultural knowledge are important. Demmert (2001) also speaks of understanding of the different stages of children/ cognitive development, understanding of students served, and interpersonal skills. Of those characteristics the respondents here seem to support understanding of students served, and interpersonal skills, but the data is not as strong in the support of understanding of the different stages of children/ cognitive development.
Question 17 offers additional characteristics for effective teaching as supported by the research literature. In questions 21 and 30 the respondents seem to support the idea of building trust with students, and infusion of culture in the classroom. There were absolutely no responses in questions, 21, 30, or 31 that support the idea of teacher and student being racially identical as an important characteristic for effective teaching. One respondent in question 31, coincidentally a Native American teacher wrote: “They practice good teaching habits, they love their students. These questions are kind of offensive. They are almost implying a form of discrimination in who teaches our kids, all of our kids, and how it's taught. I am proud to work with the teachers at our school, who are mostly non-native American and who teach mostly Native American kids. I've learned a lot from them and stand by their dedication and love for all students.”

Only one solitary instance of attendance at extra-curricular events as a characteristic for effective teaching was reported, and no respondents specifically addressed community involvement as an important characteristic for effective teaching. Finally the idea of interpersonal skills was clearly evident in the data. The various manifestations if interpersonal skills were coded with such frequency they became a category to themselves with 64 code categories in the initial coding and 223 instances of “interpersonal” codes recorded. High standards in the classroom were also important to the respondents. High standards were coded more often than any other code in the category of Academic/ skills.

Question 25 was a self-report likert scale of teacher’s self-perception of their own teaching characteristics (see Table 3). While 98.1% of the respondents indicated that they are “warm and caring” the code “warm” was coded exactly twice in the data from
questions 21 and 30. This code warm stands in stark contrast with two of the respondents from question thirty one. Here, when asked what do “successful” teachers for Native American students do that may be different from other teachers, one respondent stated “Not all teachers can be effective for Native American students, some teachers have the personality to work with Native students, and others are too critical and judgmental toward the students.”

The characteristic of both high expectations for all students and participation in community events appears in question 25, but the data relevant to questions 21 and 30 has been presented above. Two remaining characteristics from question 25: I know about the culture of my students, and my teaching connects directly to student's lives were important in the question 21 and question 30 data. The last questions 25 categories: I have explored the community of my students, I collaborate with community members both in and out of school, and I know where most of my students live, were not suggested as important characteristic based on the qualitative data of questions 21 and 30.

The question 26 categories emerge from the literature as both confirmative and disconfirmative of what good teachers do to engender student success. Of these categories the data from question 21 and 30 suggest support for persistency, student learning, relevancy, modeling an interest in learning, subject matter knowledge, knowledge of student, and organizational skills. It is only the disconfirmative category of covering the material that is not supported by the data. Interestingly covering the material was placed in the survey design deliberately as disconfirmative. It is based in the work of Haberman (1995) in the section “What star teachers don’t do.”
Question Twenty Two: If you Could Change Anything about Teaching and Learning at your School what would you Change?

Question 22 was designed to elicit what, if any, changes the respondents might make at their school sites. This question was designed for two primary reasons. The first was to attempt to gauge their satisfaction at their sites and the second to attempt to ascertain if they have changes they would make to improve the education of their students. The results were interesting.

Many of the respondents illustrated some typical responses, such as many respondents were concerned about class sizes being too large, or the schools being too large, or not having enough teacher preparation time. Some were more interesting such as bemoaning the lack of teacher attendance at extra-curricular event, certainly a concern that the literature would support. One respondent wanted to increase teaching days from 180 to 220 to improve achievement. Many respondents were concerned about a lack of parental involvement which seems to be a common theme in the field. Some respondents felt an increase in technology was the answer. Two respondents were clear in stating that everything is great at their school: “I wouldn't change anything!!!,” while several more sought to raise expectations for all students.

While the preceding is a snap-shot of the data, in order to understand the rich data that qualitative research offers the researcher would be remiss without going into some of the specific concerns of the respondents. This investigation of the rich qualitative data paints a descriptive picture of the research sites that other methodologies may miss. Some of these data are represented of caring, compassionate, culturally responsive educators. Some do not. One respondent, in order to change the climate of their site states that the
school should place “less emphasis on cultural differences / understanding.” When asked if you could change anything at your school site one respondent exhibits frustration by stating “Where do I begin!?”

This level of frustration is evident in the deficit thinking exhibited by two respondents. The first, while seemingly concerned about persistency is upset about “having students in the building who have shown repeatedly that they have no desire to receive an education,” while another feels that the answer to persistency issues is to implement “forced after school programs for those students who do not complete their required assignments.”

One respondent clearly “owned” their statement by using “I” centered language. This respondent indicated that she/he “would be better at building relationships. I would be better at maintaining discipline. If I could change learning, I would give more incentives for students being in class. I would have a class for parents on how to support their students.” The theme of parental involvement is evident throughout the research literature as well as the data presented in this study. A respondent at the middle level stated “We live in a very high poverty area. I believe, sometimes life is so difficult for our student’s parents that the parents don’t have the time to help their children with their schoolwork which sometimes makes the children think school is not really that important.”

Haberman (1995) suggests that “star” teachers do not blame parents for their ability or inability to be involved in their students efforts at school, or for the poverty those students my be experiencing. A respondent wrote “there are some students that I hate to send home at night. Culturally speaking, both Native American and White. Their
families are economically challenged and their families are pretty dysfunctional.” Those sentiments are echoed precisely in the words of one of her colleagues in that what is necessary is “more understanding of the poverty issue by some teachers, which may be a bigger difference than race.”

The race issue is paramount in this district “I still feel that the teachers have some prejudice towards the Native American students. When I hear a teacher say those students I get the feeling they are talking about Native American students. They have categorized them and usually when they say those students or kids it is when they are misbehaving.”

Fortunately not all of the respondents were so dire. Many illustrated a more enlightened view which suggested changes to help Native American students in culturally responsive ways. Knowing the importance of family one respondent offers: “I would like to see a change in attendance policies that are more sensitive to Native American cultural issues. Possibly a way to make up missed days for funerals, ceremonies etc.” Another wished for “flexibility in the class and grade structure.” This respondent wanted that flexibility to help stem the tide of non-persistency across the school district and stated: “there are students in the 3rd through 5th grades that are making the decision that they want to dropout of school as soon as they are able.” In an attempt to reverse that concern one respondent’s answer to the question if you could change anything was “I would create an all Indian High School for the [research site] area.”

Now that the quantitative and qualitative data of the entire sample has been represented the next chapter, chapter five, will delve deeply into the qualitative of the selected respondents to the phase II interviews.
CHAPTER 5
FINDINGS OF PHASE II

The previous chapter related the results of the phase I data. This chapter introduces and discusses the phase II data. To answer the research questions the researcher has designed this study using Creswell (2008a) sequential transformative strategy. This research consists of two complimentary phases. The results of the phase I data are presented in chapter four. From those data the researcher selected several candidates for in-depth qualitative interviews. Chapter five will discuss the results of those phase II interviews.

Stemming from the phase I data the researcher designed an interview protocol (see Appendix 3) to help answer the two research questions: 1) what characteristics do faculties perceive in successful teachers of Native American students; and 2) which characteristics of exemplary teachers of Native American students are most clearly related to understanding principles of effective teaching of Native American students and effective teaching practices in general? In order to answer those questions the researcher relies on six questions from the in-depth interviews. These six questions were initially present in the phase I survey and through the data analysis and sequential transformative strategy they were re-invented to be used in a unique manner for the interviews.

The results of the phase II interviews will be presented in five sections based on the answers to those six questions. Data across this chapter has been coded as academic, humanistic, and instructional. It is important to note that these three categories are not exclusive, but rather interdependent. The first section will discuss what the researcher
has termed Section One: Question Sixteen due to this question’s placement on the phase I survey. This will be followed by Section Two: Question Seventeen. These two sections will assist the researcher in addressing research question one. Section Three: Question Twenty-six; and Section Four: Question Twenty-seven were selected to help answer research question two. The final section, Section Five: Questions Thirty and Thirty-one will provide a bridge connecting the two research questions. The researcher is using the data from the qualitative interviews for the evidentiary support. With this said, while the individuals represented by the data are important, their answers to the questions are more important.

Section One: Question Sixteen

The underpinning of this study is an investigation of the characteristics of exemplary teachers for Native American students. Question sixteen in the phase I survey asked the respondents to reflect on teacher knowledge. Both question sixteen, and the following question seventeen are rooted in the research literature for best practices. Demmert (2001) states: “Solid content knowledge, sound pedagogy, an understanding of cognitive development and the different stages of children, cultural knowledge and an understanding of the students served, and outstanding interpersonal skills are well established characteristics of effective teachers” (p. 21). Question sixteen was developed to gauge how the respondents rank each characteristic espoused by Demmert in their own teaching practice.

Question sixteen in phase II was developed to bolster the data from the first phase and extend the data set through the qualitative nature of the interview. The researcher asked the respondents to think of him as a new teacher coming to the respondent for
advice on teaching. To facilitate this process, the researcher had prepared a set of flash cards from question sixteen for the respondent to rank order and discuss. The sample for the phase I responses are found in (see Figure 18).

The group responses to questions suggest an array of characteristics related to teacher practice. As in chapter four, the data dovetails into three overarching categories: Academic, Humanistic, and Instructional. Research question one: what characteristics do faculties perceive in successful teachers of Native American students is represented by both questions sixteen and seventeen. The data are presented individually as well as reflective of the whole sample.

When you reflect on teacher knowledge how important is:

- Interpersonal Skills: 103
- Understanding of Students Served: 101
- Solid Content Knowledge: 98
- Understanding of Cognitive Development: 95
- Understanding of the Different Stages of Children: 91
- Cultural Knowledge: 90
- Sound Pedagogy: 90

Figure 18

The researcher examined the phase I data for question sixteen and arranged it on figure 18 based by number of responses indicating that the characteristic was either very
or extremely important. Once those data were tallied the researcher arranged the data by highest number of respondents indicating very or extremely important to lowest.

While analyzing the data for chapter five it became apparent that subtleties existed in the qualitative data that gave credence the category “Instructional” to become independent in relation to how it emerged under the academic in chapter four. It was only after analyzing the phase I data, conceptualizing the phase II part of the study, and beginning the analysis of the phase II data that these three overarching categories of Academic, Humanistic, and Instructional emerged. This became an obvious strength of the sequential transformative strategy. The continual looping pattern of revisiting the distinct phases of the study allowed the categories to be unearthed. It was remarkable to note that even the seemingly random grouping of the phase I data of question 16, above, had important ramifications later.

For aesthetic purposes of presenting the data on the page the researcher grouped the aforementioned data from most often cited as very or extremely important at the top to less often cited toward the bottom. This became important in light of the categories that have emerged as pillars in this study. When looking at the figure and analyzing other data it was interesting to understand that the first two most cited characteristics both fit into the “Humanistic” category. The next three fit into the “Academic” category, and the final two into the “Instructional” category.

The researcher next isolated the data into responses by category. For example, the first data unit that was isolated was the six responses the teachers gave for question 16 “Interpersonal Skills.” These were then coded as relating to the academic, humanistic, or
instructional categories. This deeper analysis of the data revealed that the respondent’s answers to the questions could be coded in one or more categories.

The following sections are a discussion of the qualitative responses to question 16. The data will not be presented by cases, as this is not a case study, but rather by the individual categories of the question. As mentioned above, the first category is Interpersonal skills. This will be followed by Understanding of students served/Understanding of the different stages of children; Solid content knowledge; Understanding of cognitive development; Cultural knowledge; and, Sound pedagogy. For each category the researcher presents an illustrative quotation from the data which presents the essence of the category.

*Interpersonal Skills*

*You could know everything in the world and if you can’t connect with your students, you’re not going to be able to reveal that information to your students. I think you have to first establish relationship with those individuals, gain their trust, gain their respect, and then you can teach whatever you want to cover.*

--Iris Brown

Most of the data from the category interpersonal skills were coded as humanistic. Many respondents seem to support Iris and stated: “It’s like the old adage, ‘they have to know how much you care, before they care how much you know.’” Two respondents were coded as both humanistic and instructional. Sandy asks herself “alright, what skill can I bring in, how can I relate it, how can I make sure the child is successful.” In summation, interpersonal skills as coded from the data the respondents value the development and maintenance of relationships.
Understanding of Students Served/ Understanding of the Different Stages of Children

I grew up just like these guys. I didn’t grow up in [Research City], but I grew up in a poor household, I grew up with low expectations, I grew up with a lot of the same problems they have, you know, taking care of brothers and sisters, things like that. Taking care of yourself when parents weren’t around, you know, it is understanding where they are coming from.
--Mark Iron Cloud

These two categories were combined not only because of their similarity, but also because the data from the respondents was similar. Since these two categories were combined the researcher was left with twelve responses to code. It is possible, as in the data from Mark, to have data from understanding of students served to be coded in one category and the data from understanding of the different stages of children in another. In Mark’s case his understanding of students was coded as humanistic and understanding of the different stages of children as academic. The data here was coded into each of the three groups, academic, humanistic, and instructional, and also in five instances dual-coded as instructional/humanistic.

Only Mark had data which was coded into the academic category. He indicated that Understanding of students served/ understanding of the different stages of children equates to cognitive development.

In the humanistic category the respondents spoke of the need to “understand poverty, understand what it means to come from a single parent home” (Jackie), and understand where the students are coming from by understanding their “different backgrounds, different family life, all different kinds of problems and personal things going on in their lives (Iris).”

Sandy was the lone respondent whose data suggests that she approaches the understanding of students served from solely an instructional standpoint. Sandy spoke of
“questioning, by observation, by the way they are performing, you can tell by their performance, whether they are getting it or not, or how they respond, the questions they ask or no response.”

Five respondents were coded as humanistic/instructional meaning that one part of their response was humanistic and another part was instructional. This is important in that it helps to support the model that the researcher will develop later in this chapter. While much of the data in this section, nine of twelve responses, have been coded as humanistic or humanistic/instructional it is clear that meeting students’ needs at a human level is important. But is that enough? Simply understanding students is only one part of a very complex equation. Mike is able to make the leap from understanding the student and describes why the next step is critical. “Get to know their hobbies, likes, dislikes, so you can use those regardless of the curriculum to hook them on the materials that you’re trying to get across.” He makes the connection from the humanistic to why that understanding is important, the instructional.

Renee spoke of having to change her teaching. She had taught at a small high school in a rural agricultural community before coming to Western Plains. Expressing frustration at first, she in essence changes her practice to better serve her students: “So you have to totally change how you are teaching. If the students aren’t willing to do it, then it’s doing no good. So right now I’ve realized my kids are not going to do homework, they are not going to study, that means all I have them for is class time, which means I better not be talking very much. So instead of presenting the material then sending them home to practice it, in my class I present the material, show them an example problem and then they practice it in class.” In this response Renee is able, albeit
apparently somewhat reticently, to exhibit a move from the humanistic to the instructional.

The last category coded is academic/instructional. Only the Sandy data was coded here. Sandy makes the connection between the academic, aspect of stages of children “you take them from where they are,” to the instructional “pre-assessment at the beginning at the beginning of the year,” to guide her practice. In its essence this category illustrates how the respondents value getting to know their students on a personal level and how that knowledge influences the teaching practice of the respondents.

Solid Content Knowledge

Content knowledge, of course its very important and I am good at what I do, but to a kid that means nothing, so for me to sit there and open up their brain and hope it doesn’t go right through them is silly, so I prefer not to be the sage on the stage and I prefer for them to be more the learners.

--Jackie Lawson

The respondent data for solid content knowledge was coded as humanistic in one case, academic/humanistic in three, and academic/instructional in one instance. The humanistic code was Mike. Through his data it is apparent that that Mike places more emphasis on his students than on solid content knowledge. “My degree is in zoology. So, a long time ago I had a good background in science, some things I have forgotten or are a little fuzzy. The thing is, I know where to look it up and I know where to find out what I need to know in order to get the kids. So I don’t put that as high as knowing the kids, there are days when, in my classroom, we spend the entire day processing somebody’s bad weekend.”

Three respondents were coded as academic/humanistic. This, again, supports the academic model that is emerging between the humanistic, academic, and instructional.
Iris recognizes the need for teachers to know the subject matter, to be organized, to be educated, and understand the material. She further states that this is important only “once they have established their relationships with their students.

The final respondent, Sandy, was coded academic/instructional. On the academic side she speaks of needing to know where she is going and where she “is leading these kids.” She extends this into the realm of instruction by asking “how am I going to present this material in different ways?” Sandy sums up her argument by stating “you have to have a solid content knowledge of what you’re teaching and what direction you’re going and how to present it and how you reach the different levels of children.” Here the respondents determine that having solid content knowledge is important, but using that knowledge to meet the needs of children is more important.

*Understanding of Cognitive Development*

> You have to know the different stages of children and how they develop. Like a three year old, a four year old, a five year old, and six year old. What is expected from them? I mean, how did they grow? What does a six year old look like?

--Sandy Mason

The data coded here consist of three respondents coded as humanistic and two as instructional/humanistic. Mark speaks for the humanistic by making a connection between his 5th graders and his own 7th grade son. He speaks about how students, regardless of their chronological age or grade level are unique developmentally. Mark talks about the need to push students as far as they can go academically but not “to push them so hard they become frustrated.”

Two respondents were dual-coded as instructional/humanistic. Jackie speaks of a “safety net” because everybody is at a different level developmentally. She “encourages deep thinking” and understands that students may be at different levels because of
“experiential reasons” and with this in mind she tries to connect with her students on another level of relationship building to address the cognitive. “So I like to connect with, kind of like I’ve been a single mom, I’ve been on food stamps, I’ve been in rehab or whatever, I can relate to them, the more I can be open and honest in my thinking than I can listen to their and start understanding their thinking.” Understanding of cognitive development speaks to not only how children develop but also how the respondents conceptualize their understanding of that development.

**Cultural Knowledge**

*When I look at cultural knowledge it’s not only their cultural heritage but socioeconomic status, the cultural norms are norms that come out of poverty, more so than they are Native American, Anglo or Oriental. Although they are all flavored by the cultural heritage of the student, so knowing if you’re going to reach kids that come from poverty, it’s that personal relationship that is number one. Without that you really can’t go anywhere. Then when you start dealing with the other cultural identities, having that relationship first allows you see how traditional this student is, how embedded is their cultural heritage into their family.*

--Mike Mathers

Mike expresses a humanistic view of cultural knowledge. He along with the rest of the respondents was coded as such. Two of the six had the additional coding of humanistic/instructional. In those cases the respondents moved beyond just the humanistic into implications for instruction.

Iris recognized that different “cultures learn differently,” and individual cultures may have different values. Renee was especially interesting in her response to this part of question 16. She is coded in the humanistic but she also expresses clear thoughts on attendance in her response “So far my biggest hurdle is getting Native American kids to come. They won’t come to school. So I really can’t do anything with them if they don’t come.” Mark suggests that students, while part of their home culture, also share a popular
culture across the “mainstream” and that his students are “all talking about Twilight [vampire book], they all listen to rap music.”

Both of the respondents who were coded as humanistic/instructional made a connection from the affective humanistic to the tangible classroom benefits for students. Jackie seeks to connect with her students culturally by getting to know them as a person basis, then “they will eat out of my hand if I give them the time to know about them and to be able to work with them.” Sandy understands that children come from different backgrounds and that in order to be successful “you have to have knowledge of where they are coming from.” The respondents indicate that culture is an important factor in building connections with their students.

**Sound Pedagogy**

*You have to have sound pedagogy; you have to know where you are going in the classroom. It’s like a map; you have to know where you start and where you’re going to end up in all subject areas. You have to know, it’s like driving, you have to know where you’re going to end up, you have to stick with it, you can’t just one time in your classroom do something, and the next time whip it out and say ‘that didn’t work,’ you can’t get on the wrong road.*

--Sandy Mason

Sound pedagogy was comparatively the least important to the entire sample. It also was selected near the bottom in many of the phase II interviews. While coding these data for academic, humanistic, and instructional, four variations of the coding emerged for the researcher. The code academic was used twice, humanistic once, humanistic/instructional once and academic instructional once.

The academic was illustrated in Sandy’s comment above. Renee adds that “if you don’t know what you’re teaching, you probably shouldn’t be teaching.” The humanistic was coded in one instance by Iris where she indicated that the word pedagogy was new to
her but she believes that the term seems to be speaking more about building relationships:

“I think it is very important that you have relationships with your students before you
even try to teach them the subject matter.” Academic/ instructional was coded in Mark’s
data; he determined that he probably should have ranked sound pedagogy higher than he
did cultural knowledge. With the humanistic/ instructional Mike again illustrates that
teachers need an understanding of their students before they have effective instruction,
because “in order to do inquiry you have to have a tie in with the kids, you have to have
an understanding of who they are, in order to allow for several entry points into any given
unit.” Jackie echoes the importance of building relationships with her students and
suggests that she strives to “put relationships first.” The respondents do value sound
pedagogy, but do not view it as important as understanding their student’s needs.

Section Two: Question Seventeen

Like question sixteen above, question seventeen was designed to elicit responses
to gauge how the respondents rank critical characteristics and aspects of their teaching
practice. Question seventeen will assist the researcher in addressing research question
one: what characteristics do faculties perceive in successful teachers of Native American
students. As in question sixteen above, these data were coded as humanistic, academic, or
instructional. Also as in sixteen some categories fit multiple data codes. The data will be
presented in order of most often selected as extremely or very important as evident in the
phase I survey. To that end the data in section two will be presented in the following
order: 1) Building trust with students; 2) High standards in the classroom; 3) Infusion of
culture in the classroom; 4) Community involvement; 5) Attendance at extra-curricular
events; and, 6) Teachers and students being racially identical.
Building Trust with Students

I guess one of the things that I’ve really noticed about our kids, especially, when I say our kids, I mean the kids that come from low socioeconomic background, they don’t have much at home, you know, yeah they have loving parents, they have aunties and uncles and everyone from Native American to non-Native to white to whatever, I guess one of the biggest things that they value and one of the biggest…it’s things like trust. It is one of the things they really look for. This is true of everybody but I think more so with these kids. When you break that, it tends to do a lot of damage, even a little bit. They hold on to that, they hold on to that. You have to hold on to that too, you can’t take it for granted with them.

--Mark Iron Cloud

The first characteristic to be discussed is building trust with students. Building trust with students was a theme that emerged repeatedly in question sixteen above. That was interesting because the question sixteen categories of characteristics did not explicitly mention trust; implicitly however the respondents connected trust to many other characteristics. Within this characteristic one respondent’s data was coded as academic, one as humanistic, and two each as humanistic/academic, and humanistic/instructional.

Again, academic may be considered as classroom management in some circumstances. That is how Renee was coded through her response. She indicated that to build trust teachers need to be consistent with the classroom policies and procedures. Mike in the humanistic category was more concerned with building trust by being supportive of students even when they offer the wrong answers to questions. Mark is illustrative of building trust in that he makes the connection with his students based on maintaining high expectations, the shared experience of growing up in poverty, and valuing his own culture as a Native American educator. Mark is cognizant that shared race does not mean “I am going to automatically going to relate with these students.”

Three respondents made a connection between humanistic/academic or humanistic/instructional. These respondents considered building trust to be paramount to their
practice and in fact, the first step. They make the connection that without building trust effective learning academically will not be possible. Jackie believes that her role as a teacher is changing, and that she is “a support wall, or I can be an encourager, a cheerleader, or a success coach, whatever you want to call me.” The respondents here agree that building trust with students is an integral component of effective instruction.

**High Standards in the Classroom**

*Every time I expect more and more with my kids, I expect them to the next level, and the next level, and the next level, when we reach a level I reach out and try another level. I don’t think there is an ending to the levels you can go, I just expect it. I don’t just put them into the high standards. I start where they are at and I build. --Sandy Mason*

Iris viewed high standards in the classroom as a classroom management issue: “being on time, being ready to go, listening when the announcements are being read and I have certain expectations that I ask to be fulfilled.” Mark speaks for several respondents when indicating that high standards means not allowing children to fail, “I’m not going to be like, ‘if you can’t get it, don’t worry about it, let’s just move on.’ You can’t allow them to give up, that’s the biggest thing for me, and I can’t let them give up.” Setting high standards and expectations was important and as evident in the data a way that these respondents illustrate caring for their students.

**Infusion of Culture in the Classroom**

*I was hired through the Title VII program to work with teachers to try to develop curriculum that had this Native American spin on it. I had no idea what that looked like, I honestly I don’t know if anybody ever does. --Mark Iron Cloud*

Mark’s comment above is very interesting. The research literature speaks of infusing the curriculum with the home culture of the students and delivering instruction in culturally
responsive ways. Here Mark, who was hired specifically to do just that is uncertain that he, or anyone else knows what that looks like. The data for this characteristic was coded as humanistic in two responses, instructional in one, academic/instructional in two, and humanistic instructional in one. The important link for effective teaching seems to be using the humanistic to impact the instructional to reach the academic. Mike suggests through his response of humanistic/instructional, that regardless of the results it is important to attempt to infuse the curriculum with culture because no matter the outcome if “I tried to bring some cultural relevance into their group into the classroom, again I’m building the trust up with them.” Sandy and Jackie speak of cultural evidence at their school sites such as artwork and posters, to the use of historical events like Wounded Knee and the Battle of Greasy Grass. Renee is more pointed: “I just don’t see any way to integrate culture into chemistry because all I’m teaching them is math really.” In this section the respondents are not universally committed to an infusion of culture as a vehicle to impact achievement although it may help build relationships.

Community Involvement

*We’ve [Pasque Middle School] done food drives, fund drive carnivals that I’ve been involved, we’ve deliver food baskets to the community. Its kind of like any one of those you could be a part of those, the adults are seeing you as non-threatening. It allows them to come back to the school, a lot of our parents have very bitter memories toward school and so to have them feel that they are accepted here, it is a totally foreign idea to them, but once they have that, and we have the parents, then the kids will do just about anything for you too. You’re back to the trust.*  
--Mike Mathers

Four of the six respondents were coded as humanistic like Mike above, one was coded instructional and one as academic instructional. Mark too, sees the import of building community: “when you’re living in a community like this, they can tell if you just check
out and you just go home and they never see you again until Monday morning.” He feels that community involvement takes away the “us and them thing,” that can bring the community together, “if they see that you’re taking that extra step and they understand that.” Sandy indicated that for her community involvement is communicating with parents. Renee feels that “idealistcally [community involvement] it would be great, but it doesn’t really happen much either.” The extent of her community involvement as evidenced by her interview is bringing her students to the local college to use their resources. In the section community involvement is viewed as another method of building relationships.

_Attendance at Extra-Curricular Events_

_I have several of my Native American boys who are playing for Western Plains, because I continue to push and cheer and the basketball coach has me come down and talk to those guys. That stuff is really huge, especially in a building such as Pasque, because so many parents don’t show, a surrogate if you will._

--Jackie Lawson

The characteristic “Attendance at extra-curricular events” was coded across the respondents as humanistic. It was the sole characteristic that was coded unanimously. Respondents spoke of PTA events, family literacy nights, sports, music, pow wows, and sweat lodges. Regardless of the event, the respondents made a connection that attendance at extra-curricular events was important in the building of relationships with students by showing them that the respondents care about their lives outside of the classroom. Even while respondents indicated that they had to juggle their personal or family life with the value of attendance at extra-curricular events, they were willing to do so because, as Mark stated, “I make that time to go to those games and it makes a big difference, they are excited when they see you, and not only that it makes a big difference with the
parents and it just goes a long way, and when they see that you go that extra step.” While
Renee recognizes the value of attendance at extra-curricular events she tries to attend the
“occasional choir concert or play,” but she “hates sports.” She is able to illustrate caring
none the less by showing an interest when the students wear their uniforms to class on
game days. The respondents use attendance at extra-curricular events as another vehicle
to build relationships with students even while negotiating their own busy personal lives.

*Teachers and Students being Racially Identical*

>To me, again, that’s the one blood that I’m talking about. It doesn’t matter how
much money we make, what color our skin is, what our dad does for a living, we
are all one and we are all entitled to be treated the same.”
--Iris Brown

Most of the respondents here were coded as humanistic. The remaining two were coded
as academic, or humanistic/ academic. The respondents were overwhelming against a
belief that teachers and students should be racially identical. Mark, one of two Native
Americans in phase II states: “a good teacher is a good teacher.” He continues with: “I
think I’m the only Indian person that’s here, that’s a teacher. I think it doesn’t make a big
difference; it does with the community, you hear that a lot from the people, “how come
you’re not hiring more Indian teachers?” That’s a big question, even I was asking those
questions a long time ago, and here I became a teacher, but once I got to know a lot of
people, like I said, good teachers are good teachers, it doesn’t matter what color you are.”
The second Native American in phase II is Jackie. “I am registered Yankton-Sioux and I
don’t look like it. I have an Indian family and a German family.” She commented, like
Mark earlier that the community is asking for more Native Americans to be hired and that
“I kind of think that that’s a racist statement.” Mike steps away from the idea of race and
focuses instead on poverty, “Our culture is one of poverty here.” The respondents here
do not see being racially identical to their students as necessary and, in fact the two Native American teachers in the data were offended by the suggestion.

Section Three: Question Twenty-Six

Question twenty six, from the phase I survey was a likert scale question asking the respondents to gauge their opinion of the import of persistency, student learning, relevancy, modeling an interest in learning, covering the material, subject matter knowledge, knowledge of student, and organizational skills. These categories emerge from the literature as both confirmative and disconfirmative of what good teachers do to engender student success. For example, Haberman (1995) suggests that “Star Teachers” are more concerned with persistency, than with covering the material. As with earlier sections of this chapter the respondents were asked to rank order and then discuss why a specific characteristic may be more important to them than another. The data here will be presented as 1) Organizational skills; 2) Student learning; 3) Relevancy; 4) Modeling an interest in learning; 5) Persistency; 6) Covering the material; and, 7) Knowledge of student.

Organizational Skills

When I had my student teacher come in, she was very organized, she came in with these little folder things, I was like ‘what is that’, she was like ‘it’s a folder, you put stuff in.’
--Mark Iron Cloud

On the phase I survey, the characteristic organizational skills were selected as extremely important by a larger percentage of elementary school teachers than their middle of high school peers. Mark, above, clearly is an anomaly. Of the codes represented here, instructional was used one time, and humanistic/ instructional, and academic/ instructional one time each. Two respondents, Mark as evident above and Mike who
stated that “if something happened to me, it would take a month to figure out what I had in the room to start with,” did not fit into the coding scheme at all. The instructional was coded in Sandy’s data. Here she was speaking about how important organization is in her kindergarten teaching. The final respondent, Jackie uses organizational skills to add more content to her curriculum; I really like it because I can jam a lot more into it, than what I used to be able to do.” The respondents make a connection to their organizational skills leading to being able to have more time to interact with their students and thus fostering better relationships.

Student Learning

Well, student learning is important because why are we here as teachers? To have our students to learn, we’re here to have them go from where they are at to achieve to the best of their ability. We want them to be good citizens of the world, we want them to be able to take care of themselves, be productive.

--Sandy Mason

The characteristic student learning was coded as humanistic; instructional; humanistic/instructional; and, academic/instructional. Sandy as quoted above represents humanistic/instructional. Jackie as coded humanistic spoke “before long it’s not about you it’s about them, and that’s what you want.” Iris related what her lesson that morning was covering, and Mike connected the academic to the instructional by speaking about how students understand primary concepts through his instructional methods. The respondents find student learning to be important.

Relevancy

Well, relevancy, it goes right back to knowledge of students and building relationships, its how do I make today’s lesson relevant to the majority of the students. And I say the majority because if I said all I would be crazy. If I’m not already, you just couldn’t, how can I make this relevant to the majority today. Maybe tomorrow it is a different majority it’ll be relevant to, how do I hook it to
their lives; even if I can just brush across their lives with some topic, they will spend more time on it.
--Mike Mathers

Mike represents the code instructional in that he is thinking about his practice and how he can reaches his students. The academic is represented by Iris who suggests the “material should be relevant to your curriculum, you need to follow your objectives, your standards, your guidelines, and you get fired if you don’t.” Jackie uses “big ideas” to enhance relevancy. Sandy, the kindergarten teacher tells the story of her students discovering that letters are not just found in the classroom: “They get real excited when they go home and open a book and they start to understand books, and they says ‘I found a letter ‘M’ in my book.” Mark represents academic/ instructional in that he explains to his students “what we’re going to do and this is why we are doing it.” He helps to develop the relevancy by explaining why his students will use this material in their future. Renee in the code academic/ humanistic is pragmatic: “They always want to know ‘why do I have to learn this,’ and in chemistry it’s a very good question, I have no idea why the state suddenly requires every student to take it, it makes no sense.” The respondents value building relationships with their students by showing students the relevancy of what they are learning.

Modeling an Interest in Learning

I model everything I do, so in a mini-lesson for the workshop, workshop isn’t just writing it’s workshop in any class, but I model everything. So I model what I want them to do, I model how I would like, I model how I would go about something, I just need to model and show them how I learn and it might be different for them but to actually do a play by play for them so that they understand what I want from them.
--Jackie Lawson
Modeling an interest in learning was another interesting category to code. Jackie, as evident above, represents the instructional. Other respondents were coded as humanistic/instructional; humanistic/academic; academic/instructional; and one respondent, Mark as humanistic/instructional/academic. Iris was coded as humanistic/instructional. She made the connection from the humanistic, modeling an interest in learning, to the instructional in that she works out with her students in her cardio fitness class. Mike moves from the humanistic in that he shares his own stories of working on a master’s degree with his middle school students to the academic speaking about a school/business coalition with which he is involved. Renee is coded academic/instructional due to the fact that she spoke of student learning and modeling an interest in learning at the same time. She states that the “whole goal of teaching is getting someone to learn it, so if nobody is learning anything there is really is no point in being there.” To make the connection to the instructional she indicates that “if I show that I’m interested in learning then maybe they will be more likely be interested in learning something.” The most interesting response code came from Mark who represents the developing model in that he begins with the humanistic “you have to keep that interest high and basically, what is looks like is ‘let’s get this done, let’s do it, let’s keep doing it,” moves into the instructional “That’s what modeling interest in learning, and not only that, but talking to them about their future,” and ends with the academic “When you go on to college, this is what you can expect, be ready for this, this is what you’re going to need it for.” The respondents illustrate an interest in learning to both motivate and build relationships with their students.
Persistency

Persistency, it means setting up an atmosphere, it kind of goes with expectations, keeping it fire lit under them. Not just for them but for yourself as well. Not letting them necessarily rest, but you know, just keep them going, not much down time, we’ve got so much content to cover, you have to keep those expectations high, keep that persistent, keep positive atmosphere as well, we have to keep every at a level, at the beginning of the year, you start gung ho, you try to keep that throughout the year, sometimes it’s hard, some weeks, some days you want to, you just don’t want to do it, you have to keep it up, it’s for them, so persistency is big.

--Mark Iron Cloud

Mark’s response was coded as humanistic/instructional. He begins his comment with the humanistic and moves into the instructional. He data tells the reader about he pressure to cover the content, keep expectations for the students high, and the importance of pushing the students as far as possible academically. Iris too was coded as humanistic/instructional, but she takes a slightly different tack in that her humanistic coding speaks to student’s attributes, attention deficit, social students, and students who don’t care, “You have to stay persistent with those individuals, keep them on track, get them back to doing the activity; you can’t just leave them there and expect them to achieve it because they are usually distracted quite easily.”

Two respondents were coded humanistic, and two respondents were coded instructional. Jackie spoke of persistence in her own practice. She related that she faced a period of teacher burn-out and needed much reflection to bring her teaching back. She credits the development of trust with her students and relationship build as factors important in her persistency. Mike’s data were also humanistic. One salient difference between these two respondents is that Jackie’s response was related to her own self and Mike speaks to his practice and his students: “teaching the kids not to give up really looks hard.” Both respondents whose data were coded instructional illustrated a divergence
similar to Mike and Jackie. One respondent, Renee had data that suggests a centering on self, while Sandy’s data focused on her practice. Renee stated “if I wasn’t so persistent I would have quit after the first semester because there are so many kids who don’t care, and don’t try, and fail.” Sandy was much more optimistic: “don’t judge a kid by saying that he’s never going to learn it. Be persistent…yes, he will succeed.” Persistency was illustrated as not giving up on students or on themselves.

**Covering the Material**

*I look at my standards, I teach as many as I possibly can, but I also realize that if I actually want my kids to learn it and understand it, not just memorize it which is down here in the knowledge category, then I actually have to take time and I have to slow down if they are not getting it.*

--Renee Swenson

Renee’s data illustrates how covering the material in her practice moves from academic in her examination and teaching of the standards to the humanistic wanting her students to grasp the content. She later remarked that she would “rather they actually learn what I cover than that I cover everything and they don’t learn it.” Both Sandy and Mark had data which addressed covering the material in academic coding, while Jackie and Mike’s data were academic/instructional. While covering the material is important the respondents want their students to have a solid grasp of the content rather than a superficial knowledge of the material.

**Knowledge of Student**

*That means you have to know your students and their personalities. If you know how they come in everyday, if you know the ones that are always grumpy, they sit grumpy, that’s good to know. You have to know where these kids are coming from, their background. That will help you a lot too, to know if they had breakfast, or didn’t have breakfast this morning, or if they have siblings, if they don’t have siblings, if they live with grandma, or they don’t live with grandma. It affects their teaching and they like you to know a little about them and if you know if they have a brother or sister, they really think that’s cool that you know*
something about them, like their mom’s name or their grandma’s name and that’s important. That they [the student] are the most important people in the world. You have to let them know that they are really, really important. --Sandy Mason

Knowledge of student was very interesting data to code. Here the respondents represented two codes, humanistic and humanistic/academic. Sandy’s data represents the humanistic. Mark, Mike and Jackie suggest that knowledge of student is affected by building relationships. This supports the emerging model. The Iris data is slightly different; she starts with the academic in speaking about reaching the students and “how the material is coming across to them but then she extends her thought toward the humanistic in the relationship building and trust that she views as important. The respondents understand that they can have a deeper knowledge of student if they have developed personal relationships with their students.

Section Four: Question Twenty-Seven

Question Twenty Seven: When you reflect on your role in teaching how important is:

The phase I survey used a likert scale to gauge teacher attitude toward several characteristics of education and practice. The seven categories represented were culled directly from Haberman’s (1995) chapter “What Star Teachers Do Not Do.” It was especially interesting in the data to see the respondents make sense of these categories. An example of this is the category “discipline.” In the Haberman work discipline is not a priority for “star teachers.” In this study many of the respondents reframed discipline in terms of classroom management. In the phase II interview the respondents first ranked the categories in order of most important to least important and then discussed the rational for the rank order. The data will be presented in this section in the following
order: 1) Rewards and reinforcements; 2) Student time on task; 3) Tests and grading; 4) Parental involvement; 5) Homework; 6) Punishment; and 7) Discipline.

*Rewards and Reinforcements*

*We should constantly encourage individuals ‘good job, I see you improving, I like what you’re doing, I like what I see,’ kids like to be appreciated; we all like to be appreciated for our efforts. So rewards are extremely important. It doesn’t mean that is costs you money, it means a pat on the back, it’s a compliment, some type of praise, it doesn’t have to be a gift, or anything like that.*

--Iris Brown

Every respondent interviewed for the phase II data collection was coded as humanistic. Iris above speaks of the ease of giving rewards and reinforcements in the classroom. Sandy, at the elementary level makes a connection with rewarding behavior such as “I like how John is sitting.” Jackie extends rewards and reinforcements to having her students recognize their own good work and that she is “their guide and helping them see how marvelous they are, because me saying good job, good job, isn’t going to do it, it has to be them saying good job, good job.” Mark is not a keen on providing rewards and reinforcements for his students: “I’m not big on handing out a lot of rewards and reinforcements,” but he continues to illustrate the value of building relationships with his students. He suggest that “reinforcements are again that rapport, you talk to them, if they are doing something right, you let them know they are doing something right, if they are not, be real with them and say, ‘hey, you can do this,’ you show them a little of what they can succeed at, you can find success in every one of them, that’s what reinforcement is, it’s showing them that they can be amazing, it reinforces that ‘hey, I’m doing it.’” Mike questions the idea of extrinsic rewards and using various enticements such as candy or a token economy to motivate students, but he concludes “I know there are folks, you don’t pay them for what they are supposed to do, but hey, that’s what gets us to work on time.”
The respondents share a belief that rewards and reinforcements should be intrinsic, but the reality in the classroom is often extrinsic.

**Student Time on Task**

> When I teach, we listen and then we do hands on, then we do other movements and opportunities, so student time on task I like to keep them moving, especially in kindergarten, but I still like to keep them focused. So I still have them focused, but teach in many different ways. So, I might be teaching about, lets just say snakes, I will read a book on snakes, but then we will do an activity on snakes, so the content comes all together. It keeps them on task, it keeps them moving. I think it’s important to have them on task because if they are not on task they will not be learning. It’s lost.
>
> --Sandy Mason

The coding of the respondents in the question 27 data continued to be interesting. Here in the characteristic student time on task the data were coded as academic in four respondents and as academic instructional in two. This suggests how the respondents value student time on task as an academic focus rather than humanistic or instructional. The academic/instructional was evident in Sandy above as well as Renee who spoke of not only engaging her students but the importance of their own independent practice: “the only way you learn anything is to actually do it yourself.” Renee moves from the instructional into the academic with her belief “that talking at them is never going to get them to learn anything, so them actually doing something is the most important thing that can happen for them to actually learn something.” The remaining four respondents were coded academic. Iris illustrated a classroom management concern that to be on task her students “are not writing notes.” Mark was more philosophical “I think of when they grasp a concept or strategy and they are locked in on it, they are happy to do it, they want to do it, that’s important” and Jackie emphasized that the more the students are engaged
the faster the time goes by in a “time flies when you’re having fun kind of attitude.” To
the respondents in this study time on task means time engaged and learning.

Tests and Grading

Again, that kind of goes along with meeting their needs. I’m not saying that I give a billion tests out there, but you want to know where they are at. You want to know, it’s going to tell you a lot about your students. When it comes to like reading, you take your running records, you look at trends in your classroom, some use, not necessarily looking at the individual anymore, but what am I going to touch on to make the most impact to most of my students. Right now we’re taking these achievement tests, these computer online programs, and they specifically target certain standards. We look at the layout of exactly what answers they got wrong, which ones they got right. You can even see them as a whole class, you know everyone got question three wrong, so you look at question three and say, ‘ok, now they got that wrong’ so you cover that. It helps knowing where you have to go next, that’s the biggest thing. I guess that when you’re covering the material sometimes, again, it kind of makes you and forces you to come back and recover something; you know that they are not getting something.

Tests and grading is a big deal.”
--Mark Iron Cloud

Under tests and grading each respondent had at least a partial coding of academic. Here
three respondents shared academic. Mark, was coded academic/ instructional due to his
data moving from management concerns, record keeping, to the instructional of how to
use the testing data. The Jackie data from this section was coded as academic/
humanistic. She begins with the academic by speaking about how “loose” grading is in
her writing workshop. Later Jackie asks the question: “What do I want, do I want
somebody who does everything in a row or do I want a thinker. So for me I want a
thinker and I don’t think that [standardized testing] gives us thinkers.”

The Iris data was coded academic. She reported that we have to evaluate students
“because it is public education,” but that evaluation is not the most important aspect of
teaching. Sandy too, had data coded as academic. She indicated that the intent of her tests
and grading is to “see what is the next level I can take them to, did they accomplish it?
Did it stick? Do they understand what that letter is? Do they really know that sound? So that’s what testing/grading looks like in kindergarten.” Mike quipped that “tests and grading is right there next to punishment.” He remarked that he has difficulty with the system of grading at his Pasque Middle school “we are assigning points that are irrelevant to student understanding.” The respondents view tests and grading as an important tool for student development, but not the primary mission of their teaching.

**Parental Involvement**

> Well if parents aren’t involved the kids aren’t involved, that’s how it works
> --Mike Iron Cloud

Again it is interesting how the respondents were coded. In the category of parental involvement the codes were three humanistic and three humanistic/ academic. The idea of caring emerged in this data in several ways, “if parents do not care the student will not care,” or “students want their parents to care.” Renee shows concern that if the student’s parents do not care and if the parents did not graduate from high school, the students will not care. Iris wants parental involvement because the students “are young, they are immature, and they need to be taught discipline, and taught to finish things and stay focused and the importance of education so it takes parental involvement to accomplish that.” Mark states that for parents of students in poverty “have more pressing issues that require attention and those issues can range anywhere from money issues to relationship issues, anything.” Mark also understands that parental involvement does not necessarily mean that the parent is actively involved at the school, but their impact on student learning can be evident in “talking with the students [and] they will tell you, ‘yeah, my mom was making sure I did this [homework] last night.’ I’ve never met your mom before, but that’s awesome, that’s parent involvement right there.” The respondents value
the role and involvement of parents, but that involvement may be illustrated in a variety of ways.

**Homework**

*You have to have a home to do homework.*  
--Mike Mathers

The data from homework, like the preceding categories was coded without much variation. In fact, homework was coded almost exclusively as academic. One respondent, Renee, added instructional to her academic code. In her case, she bemoans the fact that her students do not bring homework to school. “I would love it if everyone would do their homework because then they are going to understand it a lot better.” Recognizing that her students do not return homework she is altering her instruction from having her students “knowing a bunch of facts” to being able “to use the facts.” She wonders “who needs to memorize the names of the elements on the periodic table, you can look them up.” Iris wants her students to have homework to “teach some discipline and responsibility.” Mark gives homework in an effort to afford his students with “the opportunity to do it.” Jackie simply does not, “I don’t give it. I don’t give homework. I don’t like homework; I don’t believe in homework, a lot of the kids here don’t have the space to really do homework.” The respondents see homework in various ways; philosophically they see the importance of homework, but they carefully consider its implication and application.

**Punishment**

*I hate punishment. I used to be the Nazi from hell. But that wasn’t about the kids, you know, have you ever read Parker Palmer, says ‘you teach who you are.’ If you get up there and you’re crabby old bag and you’re kicking them out left and right, it isn’t about the kids, it’s about you.*  
--Jackie Lawson
Punishment was at or near the bottom of all of the respondent’s answers and each was coded academic in a classroom management model. Only Jackie moved into the humanistic through personal reflection. Sandy, ever the kindergarten pragmatist spoke of her system: “they get a verbal warning, then the next one is recess, then the next one is maybe spending a little time after school. But a lot of times punishment in kindergarten is just sending them to their seat.” Mark spoke of personal responsibility and that his students need to take responsibility, while Mike spoke of natural consequences for student actions. The respondents did not discuss punishment as punitive but rather as an aspect of personal responsibility for the students.

** Discipline**

_I don’t really do discipline and punishment. In my class if kids are talking, I say I’m going to move on when everybody is quiet._

--Renee Swenson

The final characteristic was coded primarily as academic, and like punishment before, the respondents were principally concerned with management issues. Mike sees discipline as “classroom management but it’s more teaching the kids how to be disciplined in their own learning, being responsible for their own learning.” Iris does not see a need for discipline if “you are organized, if you’ve established your relationships, if you are doing everything in your classroom, keeping your students busy, you’ve got lots of variety, you’re making it fun, you’ve got them engaged, you know they all understand the material.” Mike sees discipline as persistence “you can do it, self discipline,” and Mark as high expectations in the classroom. Jackie works at respect in her classroom and feels that her students “don’t want to disappoint Lawson.” She went further in that “Lawson does not want to disappoint anybody either,” and that if “she says she’s going to be there,
she says she’s going to do something, she does it.” Her students “need to follow through, that’s the discipline, not the negative.” Discipline was viewed by the respondents as a classroom management concern or as a personal character to develop within the students.

**Section Five: Questions Thirty and Thirty-One**

*Characteristics? I have to answer this for all students, because I can’t just throw in and say it’s just for Native American students. I just want to make sure that you understand that. You know it is patience, caring about them, being persistent, being respectful, and sticking to your guns too. Having those high expectations, hire a monkey just to keep them going all the time. It’s all the characteristics of what you would think of what would be a great teacher; I think they would touch everybody, not just one group of people.*

--Mark Iron Cloud

Question 30, asks the respondents the question “as a new teacher, what should I consider characteristics of successful teachers for Native American students.” Question 31 asks “as a new teacher, how do I differentiate between a successful teacher for Native American students and others who may be less so.” These two questions, considered together will provide a bridge connecting the two research questions asking about the characteristics the respondents perceive in successful teachers of Native American students; and which characteristics of exemplary teachers of Native American students are most clearly related to understanding principles of effective teaching of Native American students and effective teaching practices in general?

Again these data are presented as coded in the emerging model of humanistic, instructional, and academic. These two questions, in essence are asking the respondents to discuss characteristics of successful teachers for Native American students and how do I differentiate between successful teachers and those that may be less successful teachers for Native American students. The respondents personalized the former and externalized the latter.
In question 30 the respondents were all coded as humanistic. Their responses included the teacher centered characteristics such as understanding, patience, kindness, sense of humor, trust, and a love of children. Life-long learning, the desire to grow and the willingness “to go the extra mile” were exhibited as important. Renee spoke of building trust by connecting with students on a personal level “I notice this about you, I notice that about you, not tied to academics, not tied to worth, not tied to anything, just to start building a relationship, so maybe you can get them to start doing something for you.” Mike warns that teachers need to be “real” with their Native American students because they “have BS detectors big time, they will call you on it the first chance they get.”

The respondents also offered suggestions based on their perception of culture nuances such as “they don’t make direct eye contact.” Iris developed a list of stereotypes that a “good teacher” would not take personally such as “sometimes don’t have good family lives” and that it is often “hard for them to get to school,” this was because “mom or dad might be passed out or somewhere else.” Iris does not suggest that these external challenges are specific only to Native American students and that a characteristic of a successful teacher is understanding of students “we have to be more understanding of family life, but then that goes with all cultures, but we see more of it with Native Americans.”

Jackie seems to have a deep commitment to understanding her students. Her first priority is to stop making excuses. She believes that we as educators need to “rid the excuses that they are poor, they are Native American, mom’s an alcoholic, you have to really take all of that out you have to see who they are, they are a kid.”
The question becomes how do the teachers develop these characteristics? Jackie believes that self-reflection is the key and that self-reflection takes time. “I think that self-reflection is huge for a teacher, to think that you’ve got it all figured out is a myth. I have 31 years and don’t have it figured out, I have to change all the time, and I have to change with the kids.” Mark encourages his student teachers to investigate the practices of other teachers to see “what they are doing right” and not to focus on “what they are doing wrong, we are all doing something wrong.” Mark concludes his discussion with a comment about are good teachers born, or developed “Part of me wants to say you’re born with and part is just notice and be open, notice what they are doing right and be open to change.”

Jackie had this to say about question 31 “Oh god, I hate this, this is like the worst question ever.” Teaching is hard according to Jackie and she wants to share her profession only with those teachers who are “passionate about what we do.” Jackie wants preservice teachers “to have the heart. I’ve seen a lot of new teachers and preservice teachers come through here and they don’t have the heart” for teaching. Mike was more pragmatic when determining which teachers are effective: “Gees, you go down to the office and ask who writes the most office referrals. If you are not successful, they are off task and causing problems for you. It is that simple.” Mark was offended by the nature of the question “I don’t know how to answer that question, only because I feel like those types of questions have this almost, you know, segregated feeling to them. I honestly don’t look at my students as you guys are Native American and you guys are white.” Sandy too, agrees that “it doesn’t really matter what culture” the individual student is a member of, but rather she wants “to emphasize that children are children. I hope people
are not looking at them and saying you’re Native American, you’re white, you’re Hispanic, and you look at children as children.”

The rich data that are evident from the teachers responses to the phase II interviews paints portraits of deeply caring educators who are working diligently to ensure the success of their students. It is apparent from the data that the teachers in the phase II data represent a composite model for successful education of Native American students. The model that emerged from the data coding as represented in this chapter had its genesis in phase I. As a testament to the strength of the sequential transformative strategy, data that were analyzed in phase I have been strengthened through the phase II interviews and a model of successful instruction emerged. This model is premised on the idea that in order to be successful teachers for Native American students, teachers must first embody the humanistic. Without the humanistic aspect of caring, and building relationships the teacher cannot develop effective, culturally responsive instruction. In turn, without the humanistic and the instructional components in place the teacher cannot reach the academic. This three part consecutive model will be presented in further depth in the following chapter, chapter 6 conclusions and implications.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter will discuss the conclusions and implications derived from the data in relation to the research questions: 1) what characteristics do faculties perceive in successful teachers of Native American students; and, 2) which characteristics of exemplary teachers of Native American students are most clearly related to understanding principles of effective teaching of Native American students and effective teaching practices in general? In addition the researcher will address the salient current literature and how this study helps to fill a niche in the research base relative to that literature. As a result of this study the researcher will report an emergent conceptual model and implications for the field of teacher education. The researcher will further highlight the third component of the sequential transformative strategy, the “call to action.” Finally the researcher will discuss possibilities for future research. The discussion in this chapter will take place in five sections. The first section will be a discussion of the salient literature; this will be followed by the emergent conceptual model; implications for the field of teacher education; the call to action requisite in sequential transformative strategy; and finally a discussion of some possibilities for future research.

A Discussion of the Salient Literature

This section will reconcile salient literature from the field and the results of this study. Reyhner’s (1992) research indicates that particularly negative critical factors for
Native American students include large schools, uncaring and untrained teachers, passive teaching methods inappropriate curriculum, inappropriate testing/student retention, tracked classes, and lack of parental involvement.

While phase I was illustrative and perhaps even confirmative of some of those negative characteristics of schools, especially the large size and overcrowding evident at Western High School, most of Reyhner’s assessment was refuted by the phase II interviews. Phase II illustrated deeply caring teachers, using active, engaging teaching methods and teachers who are working diligently to make connections with students, parents and the community. Tippeconnic (1999) supported this statement of community building and partnership. Parental and tribal involvements connect communities to schools at both the college and the K-12 levels. “When community involvement is high, the school becomes a focal point and is involved in the reconstitution of community life” (p. 45).

Mike Mathers in his phase II data illustrates the import of building community: “when you’re living in a community like this, they can tell if you just check out and you just go home and they never see you again until Monday morning.” He feels that community involvement takes away the “us and them thing,” that can bring the community together, “if they see that you’re taking that extra step and they understand that.” One way the teachers in this study illustrate building relationships is through reaching out to and immerseing themselves in the community. Ogbu and Simmons (1998) wrote: “Because much of the mistrust comes from the community and the students’ parents, teachers will need to work hard to try to enlist parent and community support of their children’s education” (p.182). This was apparent and confirmative in the
study. Greater parent involvement can reduce the cultural distance between home and school. Reyhner (1992) states: “although teachers may advocate that they want parent involvement, what they really want is for the parents to ‘get after their students to attend school and study’” (n.p.).

This sentiment did not seem to hold in the phase II interview data. While it is evident that some of the respondents wish that the parents were more involved with the school and their students, the respondents clearly understood the realities of their teaching situation. Mike Mathers speaks about this explicitly “a lot of our parents have very bitter memories toward school and so to have them feel that they are accepted here, it is a totally foreign idea to them, but once they have that, and we have the parents, then the kids will do just about anything for you too.”

Cajete (1999) states: “Successful learning is tied to the degree of personal relevance the student perceives in the educational task” (p. 137). This idea of relevance was met head on in the phase II interview. The respondents illustrated that they value building relationships with their students by showing students the relevancy of what they are learning. The phase II respondents were honest about relevancy even to the point of admitting to students if they did not know who a particular concept might be relevant to the students. When the respondents did illustrate relevancy in their practice it was often a mechanism to help the students connect with the curriculum and find motivation.

Intrinsically speaking, Bruner (2003) supported this concept with this statement, the “Objective of any act of learning, over and beyond the pleasure it may give, is that it should serve us in the future. Learning should not only take us somewhere; it should allow us later to go further more easily” (p.17). This idea of going further more easily is
perhaps difficult for some Native students due to many cultural realities outside of school.

Through the understanding of these cultural realities the reform-minded practitioner can create a better teaching practice. Culturally responsive teaching builds on the strengths that the students bring to school (Banks, et al., 2005). By melding the curriculum with a student’s culture teachers can positively affect student learning. The idea of infusing culture into the curriculum was met with mixed reactions across the two phases.

In the phase I survey the infusion of culture in the classroom was seen as extremely important to 22 respondents (21%), very important to 40 (38%), neutral to 29 (28%), important to 10 (10%), and not important to 4 (4%), respondents. Mark Iron Cloud, who when hired by the school district expressly to work with teachers to help them infuse their curriculum with Native culture admitted that he is uncertain that he, or anyone else knows what that looks like. When the phase II respondents make an effort to bring culture into their curriculum it is often to build relationships.

Swisher and Tippeconnic (1999), believe a primary focus on research and practice must be the teaching-learning relationships between students and teachers. This relationship is the most basic interaction that takes place in schools each day and one that may determine whether students persist or not. The teachers across the phase II data place tremendous value on building relationships with students, parents, and the community. This is evident in the humanistic coding that is foundational to the not only the coding of the phase II data, but to the conceptual model as well.
What are the teaching characteristics that best benefit Native American students? Demmert (2001) states: “Solid content knowledge, sound pedagogy, an understanding of cognitive development and the different stages of children, cultural knowledge and an understanding of the students served, and outstanding interpersonal skills are well established characteristics of effective teachers” (p. 21). In the phase I survey each of these characteristics were rated on a likert scale and in phase II they were ranked and discussed.

Keep in mind that Demmert (2001) was not ranking his characteristics but simply indicating that in his work those characteristics are important in the education of Native American students. Respondents in this study further confirm that sound pedagogy and cultural knowledge are important. Demmert (2001) also speaks of understanding of the different stages of children/ cognitive development, understanding of students served, and interpersonal skills. Of those characteristics the respondents here seem to support understanding of students served, and interpersonal skills, but the data is not as strong in the support of understanding of the different stages of children/ cognitive development.

Richardson (1996) stated: “Significant teacher change can only occur if teachers are engaged in “personal exploration, experimentation, and reflection” (p. 104). In the data Jackie Lawson represents Richardson’s ideals perfectly. Recall how she spoke of her own “teacher burn-out” and through much self reflection she emerged as an outstanding teacher.

High expectations for students, as a characteristic of good practice, were illustrated to be very important to the respondents across this study. In phase I, nearly every respondent indicated that this is applicable to their practice. In the phase II data
high expectations was a part of discipline. Ladson-Billings (1997) writes of teacher expectations for learners. “Students treated as competent are likely to demonstrate competence. Much of the literature on teacher expectations of student achievement helps us understand that when teachers believe in students’ abilities, the students are likely to be successful” (p. 703). The teachers in phase II appear to support this.

Often educators set their expectations for minority students too low and therefore students suffer. When teachers have these low expectations for student performance, students will meet them. Ladson-Billings (1997) wrote “when teachers believe that because of their race, social class, or personal economic situations, students may not be intellectually able, student performance (and how it is assessed) confirms those beliefs (p.703). Ogbu and Simmons (1998) argue that teachers should have clearly stated high standards and expect students to meet those standards. By setting high expectations and building the trust necessary to reach those standards teachers can offer students the possibility of success. The respondents in this study want to “get rid” of the excuses of poverty, lack of parental involvement, or a bad home life and race. Mark Iron Cloud states that this affects “all students, because I can’t just throw in and say it’s just for Native American students. I just want to make sure that you understand that. You know it is patience, caring about them, being persistent, being respectful, and sticking to your guns too and having those high expectations.”

Hermes (2005) argued that poverty plays a more significant role in school success than culture. She wrote that “Often ‘culture’ in education is expected to remedy complex and deep-seated social problems” (p.96-97). The respondents in this study understand that on a fundamental level. They spoke of the need to “understand poverty, understand
what it means to come from a single parent home” (Jackie), and understand where the students are coming from by understand their “different backgrounds, different family life, all different kinds of problems and personal things going on in their lives (Iris).”

Mike Mathers “When I look at cultural knowledge it’s not only their cultural heritage but socioeconomic status, the cultural norms are norms that come out of poverty, more so than they are Native American, Anglo or oriental. Mike steps away from the idea of race and focuses instead on poverty, “Our culture is one of poverty here.”

A logical way to address the needs of cultural literacy in U.S. schools is to develop a larger cohort of Native teachers (Manuelito, 2003). Reyhner (1992) supports the concept for more Indian teachers who will stand as role models for their children. These instructors would offer students a unique cultural knowledge and would maintain the ability to identify with the problems their students face. Native teachers enhance the teacher-student relationship for Native youth and increase the desire of students to remain in school (Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999).

The respondents in this study do not see being racially identical to their students as necessary and, in fact the two Native American teachers in the data were offended by the suggestion. The respondents were overwhelmingly against a belief that teachers and students should be racially identical. Mark, one of two Native Americans in phase II states: “a good teacher is a good teacher.” He continues with: “I think I’m the only Indian person that’s here, that’s a teacher. I think it doesn’t make a big difference; it does with the community, you hear that a lot from the people, “how come you’re not hiring more Indian teachers?” That’s a big question, even I was asking those question a long time ago, and here I became a teacher, but once I got to know a lot of people, like I said,
good teachers are good teachers, it doesn’t matter what color you are.” The second Native American in phase II is Jackie. “I am registered Yankton-Sioux and I don’t look like it. I have an Indian family and a German family.” She commented, like Mark earlier that the community is asking for more Native Americans to be hired and that “I kind of think that that’s a racist statement.”

Question 27 in this study is rooted in the work of Haberman (1995). Haberman, in his seminal work *Star Teachers of Children in Poverty* discussed what “Star Teachers” do not do: 1) rewards and reinforcements; 2) student time on task; 3) tests and grading; 4) parental involvement; 5) homework; 6) punishment; and 7) discipline. These categories emerge from the data as both confirmative and disconfirmative of what good teachers do to engender student success.

Haberman (1995) states the star teachers do not “use clever rewards such as stickers, smiling faces, or tickets for pizza” (p.14) to motivate students. A full two-thirds, or 62% of the teachers surveyed in phase I found rewards and reinforcements to be extremely or very important. Every respondent interviewed for the phase II data collection were coded as humanistic in their discussion of rewards and reinforcements. So rewards are extremely important. They were not necessarily implying that teachers must offer their students a carrot for motivation and in fact, according to Iris Brown “It doesn’t mean that it costs you money, it means a pat on the back, it’s a compliment, some type of praise, it doesn’t have to be a gift, or anything like that.”

Time on task was not important in the Haberman (1995) work because he suggests that good teachers do not need to measure time on task because they do not employ direct instruction as a teaching method. I suggest that with the constraints of the
No Child Left Behind Act, the classroom climate has shifted. In the phase I survey 84% indicated that student time on task was either extremely or very important. In the phase II interviews where the respondents had an opportunity to consider what time on task looks-like in their practice the respondents were more philosophical in viewing time on task as engaged and learning.

Star teachers, according to Haberman (1995) spend “as little time as possible on tests and grading” (p. 12). The phase I survey supports this. The phase II respondents view tests and grading as an important diagnostic tool for student development, but not the primary mission of their teaching. Iris Brown relates the story of “very few kids said at that evening of excellence [recognition banquet for top 5% of graduates] ‘thanks for teaching me all the math or thanks for teaching me all the English,’ it was thanks for treating me the way you did and making me feel good in your class.”

Haberman speaks of “parent bashing” as something that star teachers do not involve themselves with, but rather that star teachers “describe parental support in terms of parents showing an interest (p. 10).” In the phase I survey 80% of the survey respondents found parental involvement to be either extremely or very important. In the phase II the respondents value the role and involvement of parents, but understand that involvement may be illustrated in a variety of ways.

Homework too is a part of the traditional educational format that Haberman (1995) does not support. Haberman states that homework “places the teacher in the superior position of making assignments to both the child and the parent” (p. 10). Rather than assigning additional work, Haberman does support the completion of work started in class. Only 28% of the respondents in this study determined that homework is either
extremely important or very important, but in the phase II Mark Iron Cloud does give homework as an “opportunity” for students.

Punishment according to Haberman doesn’t work, so star teachers do not use it to modify behavior. Only 11% of the phase I respondents found punishment to be either extremely important or very important. Punishment was at or near the bottom of all of the phase II respondents’ answers and each was coded academic in a classroom management model, respondents did not discuss punishment as punitive but rather as an aspect of personal responsibility for the students.

For example, Haberman suggests that star teachers “are not very concerned with discipline,” in the Phase I survey 87% of the respondents found discipline to be either extremely or very important. This is an apparent contradiction to Haberman's assertion. It was only through the phase II interviews where this apparent contradiction was reconciled. Discipline as reported in this study was reported as classroom management more than punitive. Iris Brown does not see a need for discipline if “you are organized, if you’ve established your relationships, if you are doing everything in your classroom, keeping your students busy, you’ve got lots of variety, you’re making it fun, you’ve got them engaged, you know they all understand the material.”

The Emergent Conceptual Model

The emergent conceptual model developed due to the sequential transformative strategy of this study. On the phase I study Questions 21 and 30 were designed to develop a sense of which characteristics were important to the sample teachers. Question 31 sought to see if there exist salient differences. Question 21 asked the respondents to identify several characteristics of good teachers at their school site; and, question 30 asks
about the characteristics of a “successful” teacher for Native American students. The 104 data pairs equate to 208 individual blocks of qualitative data that needed to be coded. To this end the researcher employed a coding scheme to develop a componential analysis.

The initial componential analysis generated two primary categories, humanistic and academic. The concept of humanistic is based in the idea of these codes as characteristics such as the development of relationships. The humanistic category was divided into two subcategories: relational and interpersonal skills. Academic skills are more aligned with management issues such as the delivery of content or integration of culture (see Appendix 4).

In the phase II interview the researcher again asked these questions about the characteristics of a “successful” teachers. While coding this qualitative data it became apparent that humanistic, and academic were not inclusive enough and as such a new code, instructional, emerged. At this point in the data analysis the researcher was excited, the conceptual model was emerging. It became clear that the model, shown as (Figure 19), would illustrate visually what exemplary teachers, as evidence in this study do that is different from their peers.
Using the model as a guide one can see that humanistic, in the top position is paramount. It seems that unless the teachers have this characteristic, they cannot reach the instructional. In the humanistic category the respondents spoke of the need to “understand poverty, understand what it means to come from a single parent home” (Jackie), and understand where the students are coming from by understanding their “different backgrounds, different family life, all different kinds of problems and personal things going on in their lives (Iris).”

Mike is able to make the leap from understanding the student and describes why the next step is critical. “Get to know their hobbies, likes, dislikes, so you can use those regardless of the curriculum to hook them on the materials that you’re trying to get across.” Iris stated “it is very important that you have relationships with your students before you even try to teach them the subject matter.” Mark had data that accurately illustrates the entire conceptual model. While speaking about the importance of modeling an interest in learning he begins with the humanistic “you have to keep that
interest high and basically, what is looks like is ‘let’s get this done, let’s do it, let’s keep doing it,” moves into the instructional “That’s what modeling interest in learning, and not only that, but talking to them about their future,” and ends with the academic “When you go on to college, this is what you can expect, be ready for this, this is what you’re going to need it for.”

This conceptual model recognizes the important of the representative characteristics but is also concerned with the process of how those characteristics are utilized to impact academic success. It is a process orientated model to use the characteristics of effective teaching, the humanistic, instructional, and the academic, in concert to ultimately gain the product of persistency and academic success for Native American students.

**Implications for Teacher Education**

Osborne (1996) wrote that although teachers may accept a broad understanding of culturally relevant pedagogy, teachers may find some classroom processes at odds with their current classroom processes. Classroom change for teachers will necessitate their coming to terms with new strategies. The starting point for reform lies squarely in the preparation of teacher candidates at the preservice level if reform is to be achieved. The implications for teacher education presented here contributed to the development of teacher candidates that could gain the characteristics necessary to use the conceptual model.

Swisher and Tippeconnic (1999) offered that the starting point for reform is within the scope of teacher preparation. They wrote: “The misconceptions and stereotype about Native peoples that persist in academic content and attitudes and behaviors of
school personnel must be addressed through preservice and in-service teacher preparation” (p. 303).

The researcher, using this study, and the emergent the conceptual model, as the blueprint, believes that there are four significant implications for teacher education. The four implications are: relationship building; reframing race and poverty; exposing teacher candidates’ views of the “other;” and, examination of self through reflection.

*Relationship Building*

The data in this study continuously illustrates that the respondents who seem to be more effective teachers greatly value the building of relationships. Some of the evidence cited was their discussions of community involvement, family literacy nights, attendance at extra-curricular events, and even a cabinet with toiletries for student who might need a toothbrush. The data was clear that the respondents indicated that without building the relationship with their students, parents, and community, they could not reach the next level of the conceptual model.

As an implication for teacher education, teacher educators should not only express how important the building of relationships is, but they should model it as well. Granted, building relationships with the parents of the university student is presumably less important than it is for the pre K-12 teacher, but other examples of relationship building could be modeled. Other models could include the obvious relationship established with students in the university classroom. It is important to show caring. In the researcher’s own practice this emergent model is used to guide his practice with his own students.
Reframing Race and Poverty

This dissertation is primarily concerned with what is success in the teaching of Native American students. Much of the introductory chapters are illustrative of a need to radically change how Native American students are taught, the rates of their academic persistency, and implications of culture in the classroom. That said, the researcher through the course of this dissertation process, has altered his own perception. The researcher is beginning to consider poverty to be a more significant factor in this equation than race. This shift in perception comes directly from the analysis of the data. Many respondents indicated “Our culture is one of poverty here.”

The researcher is not willing to abandon wholesale the unique implications of race and culture but as mentioned previously has undergone a shift in perception. The researcher now is starting to think that the implications of race and culture are of utmost importance in building relationships, but may play less of a role than he previously thought in instruction. The implication for teacher education would be an emphasis on understanding poverty while at the same time using culture knowledge and understanding to build relationships.

Exposing Teacher Candidates Views of the “Other”

Throughout both data sets, the phase I and phase II, the researcher would analyze data which spoke of “those” students. Generally speaking if a respondent was speaking about “those” students they were referring to Native American students. This use of the word “those” serves to make the Native American student the “other” which in turn then “normalizes” the non-Native. The implication for teacher education is more than simple
semantics. The implication is that teachers need to be cognizant about their own beliefs about themselves and their practice.

**Examination of Self Through Reflection**

In teacher education our students are encouraged to become “reflective practitioners.” In this study the respondent Jackie agrees. Facing teacher burn-out she had to reexamine her practice and believes that self-reflection is the key, and that self-reflection takes time “to think that you’ve got it all figured out is a myth. I have 31 years and don’t have it figured out, I have to change all the time, and I have to change with the kids, for the kids.” The idea of thorough self-reflection Jackie came to understand that she needs to “change with the kids, for the kids,” is powerful indeed. The implication here is that in teacher education we should be not only telling our students to be reflective, but to illustrate the importance for reflection throughout the course of their teaching careers.

**The Call to Action**

While the methodology presented in this study could be simplified as being mixed-methods, it is much more than that. The deliberate use of sequential transformative strategy (Creswell 2008a) as a mixed-methods approach offers a potential to give voice to marginalized or underrepresented groups or populations. Aside from the two phase approach represented in this study there is one critical factor not yet addressed. Sequential transformative strategy “ends with a call to action (Creswell, 2008a, p. 212).” Creswell did not address the particulars of what the call to action should look-like, nor does the literature suggest models. That being said, it falls to the researcher to
determine how that call should be determined. The researcher proposes that the call will take three primary forms: Advocacy, Partnership, and Inclusion.

Advocacy

Advocacy here means a continued commitment to working with marginalized or underrepresented people. While again, this dissertation is principally focused on teachers’ characteristics for Native American students. It has evolved, for the researcher, into a call for deeper investigations into poverty as well as a renewed commitment to social justice. Sheets (2003) levels a damning charge about the state of the field, “much of the current diversity scholarship, in spite of its quantity and quality, appears to advance a mindset satisfied with magic, hope, and advocacy—rather than pedagogy” (n.p.). It is the intent of this work to illustrate, as the respondents and the conceptual model have done, that magic and hope are not enough. The strong pedagogy that Sheets is looking for can only be implemented if the classroom teacher has already made the first step of the humanistic.

Partnership

Swisher (1996) argued that non-Native Americans “question their motives beyond wanting to do something to improve education for Indian people” (p.85), while Lomawaima & McCarty (2002) believe that “productive research will result from respectful collaboration that does not dichotomize researchers as Native or non-Native but does make the contributions of Native colleagues integral to the design and conduct of the studies” (n.p.). The writing of a dissertation is primarily a solitary undertaking without the benefit that collaboration may offer. It is in the direction of Lomawaima and McCarty that the researcher intends to travel. During the course of this dissertation the researcher has developed many relationships within the Native community and is
planning on rich collaborations in the future. In particular, the researcher and Mark Iron Cloud have had long conversations about potentials for future work. Some of these possibilities will be discussed later in this paper.

**Inclusion**

The idea of inclusion as presented here is particularly important in the call to action. Many times researchers will gain access to a research site, take time and resources from that site, extract their data, and offer no tangible benefit to the site. In this work the researcher has been in conversations with both teachers and administrators about possibilities to share parts of this work with the faculties at the school sites. These conversations are continuing and the researcher anticipates returning to the schools to present salient aspects of the work.

**Possibilities for Future Research**

The completion of the dissertation is indeed a big step in the academic life of the researcher. It is however, not the last step, but the first. This is exciting. There is much work to be done and the researcher is enthusiastically ready to engage. It seems to the researcher that the more deeply he became immersed in this project the more he wanted to learn, and to study, and add to the project. Fortunately, he had guidance from his advisor who counseled him to “narrow your focus, narrow your focus, you can set the world on fire later, for now, narrow your focus” (J. McCarthy, personal communication).

Now is the time to investigate the possibilities for “setting the world on fire.” First the researcher would like to replicate this study in a variety of settings. How would the data look in other contexts such as other schools, districts, or regions? In a related pilot study the researcher investigated how this study would work in the context of the
Dominican Republic where primarily white teachers teach primarily non-white Dominican elementary students.

The researcher, as a part of the World Federation of Association of Teacher Educator’s call for collaboration has established contacts in New Zealand and would love to compare this study with a similar one investigating the education of the Maori people. Additionally a cross-case study of the Indigenous peoples of North America with the Maoris of New Zealand and the Aboriginals of Australia would be fascinating. While these possibilities would be, perhaps difficult, the researcher envisions more manageable possibilities as well.

It would be interesting to run a comparable study across a school district to see if the teachers in more affluent school sites have similar characteristics. Perhaps even more interesting would be to locate an affluent school which serves a high percentage of affluent Native American students to see if the conceptual model is important in that setting.

Speaking of wealth and poverty, further study of poverty and race is needed. The researcher remains somewhat conflicted in terms of precisely how important the role of culture is in the classroom for this particular sample. Clearly the graduation rates for Native American students are disturbingly low and yet the phase II respondent, Mark Iron Cloud in particular indicates that the role of culture in the classroom is not a priority.

The researcher would like to have a deeper level of knowledge as to the relationship between poverty and race. Does the research literature equate poverty and culture? This study is potentially more about low socioeconomic status and school achievement than race. Further research needs to be done.
Another study that the researcher would like to see is one that compares the graduation rates, attendance, and test scores of the teachers who seem to embody the characteristics discussed here. In affect one could conceivably look at the testing data of the six teachers in the phase II and verify if their characteristics and the conceptual model make a difference in student learning.

Conclusion

Many issues have been raised in this paper and much work remains to be done. Researchers should continue to investigate the manifold challenges inherent in educating Native American students. Deeper, more focused investigations of best teaching practices, building on previous work may yield tangible results in the classroom. But the investigation is not enough. Teachers must use this research to impact student learning and achievement. While many factors are outside of the classroom teacher’s scope of influence, teacher candidates should be trained in culturally responsive methods to address factors that are within their control and which can be addressed in the classroom. Educators need to have the skills to identity the learning needs of all students. In reform-minded teaching, teachers will work to understand the diverse needs of the students in their classrooms. This knowledge of the individual learner is important in teaching all students, but research suggests that it is paramount in the education of Native American students. Understanding the individual Native American student means understanding the unique perspectives that Native American students bring to the classroom.

In conclusion, though the obstacles for narrowing the achievement gap for Native American students are clearly daunting, the answer lies in the preparation of teacher candidates. Reflective, reform-minded, well-trained, culturally responsive, community
building educators can make significant differences in the lives of Native American youth. The impact of this educator model has the capacity to not only narrow the achievement gap and raise the rate of persistency among Native American students but also teacher candidates have within their grasp the ability to positively change an entire culture.
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**Voluntary Participation**
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relations with the university. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the research study.

**Confidentiality**
All information gathered in this study will be kept completely confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility at UNLV for at least 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be destroyed.
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UNLV/ Teacher Characteristics

Dear Teacher:

I am William M. Young, a former teacher at [Research Site] who is now working on a graduate degree in Teacher Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I am studying Teacher Characteristics. We want to do this study to better understand how students and their teachers work together and to see what works best for teaching the students at your school site. I will be working closely with [Research Site] teachers and one of my Professors at UNLV, Dr. LeAnn Putney.

All responses are strictly confidential. We will guard your privacy by changing your name in any paper or conference presentation that may come about as a result of this study.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and the results may show what good teaching practice exists in [Research Site]. I understand that you are very busy in the work that you are doing and I really appreciate your time.

You can ask me any questions regarding any this study and its purposes. Feel free to contact me, William Young (605) 391-1002, Dr. LeAnn G. Putney (702) 895-4879 or the UNLV Office for the Protection of Human Research Subjects at 895-2794

Please click the following link to begin:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=8i8O9cvXVa9cGNjj86J8Lg_3d_3d

If link does not automatically connect you to the survey, please paste link into your browser to begin.
**APPENDIX 2**

**PHASE I SURVEY**

Question One: Remember your answers to this survey are STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL and your anonymity will be protected. However the demographic information provided will help the researcher in the compilation of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address 2:</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town:</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code:</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 120

Question Two: Age? Please check one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 123

Question Three: Gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 121
**Question Four:** How many years have you been teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 123*

**Question Five:** How many years have you taught at your current school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 123*

**Question Six:** Please list any other schools where you have taught:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 95*

**Question Seven:** From which high school did you graduate? (School, city, state)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Eight:** From which college(s) or universities did you graduate? (School(s), degree(s))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question Nine: What courses/grade level do you currently teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Ten: How many college courses did you take related to the culture of Native American students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question Eleven: Please list those courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question Twelve: Think back to when you were in school (K-12), would you say that you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liked school a lot</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked school a little</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not like school</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hated school</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question Thirteen: How many students do you teach each day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-70</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-90</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-110</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110+</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question Fourteen: Approximately how many of your students are Native American?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Fifteen: How do you define educational success?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Sixteen: When you reflect on teacher knowledge how important is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid content knowledge</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound pedagogy</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of cognitive development</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the different stages of children</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of students served</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question Seventeen: How important are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building trust with students</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at extracurricular events</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the different stages of children</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infusion of culture in the classroom</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and students being racially identical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High standards in the classroom</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of students served</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question Eighteen: Do you do anything differently to teach Native American students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question Nineteen: If you do teach differently for Native American students what do you change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Twenty: If you do not do anything differently in teaching Native American Students, why not?</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Twenty One: Please identify several characteristics of good teachers at your school:</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Twenty Two: If you could change anything about teaching and learning at your school what would you change?</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Twenty Three: Thinking about your teaching, how important is it to infuse your curriculum with connections to the culture of your students?</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Twenty Four: In your teaching do you use cooperative learning:</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Twenty Five: Please check all that are applicable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I participate in community events</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have explored the community of my students</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where most of my students live</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know most of the parents of my students</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collaborate with community members both in and out of school</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I maintain high expectations for all students</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am warm and caring</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teaching connects directly to student's lives</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a great deal of knowledge of the culture of my students</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know about the culture of my students</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know little about the culture of my students</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

question Twenty Six: When you reflect on your role in teaching how important is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistency</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling interest in learning</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering the material</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter knowledge</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of student</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational skills</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Twenty Seven: When you reflect on your role in teaching how important is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent involvement</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests and grading</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student time on task</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards and reinforcements</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Twenty Eight: What is “success” for Native American students?

Answer Options Response Count
---
| answered question | 105 |

Question Twenty Nine Please describe one (or more) “success” stories teaching Native American students:

Answer Options Response Count
---
| answered question | 85 |

Question Thirty: What are the characteristics of a “successful” teacher for Native American students?

Answer Options Response Count
---
| answered question | 95 |

Question Thirty One: What do “successful” teachers for Native American students do that may be different from other teachers?

Answer Options Response Count
---
| answered question | 91 |
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Question Thirty Two: Would you be willing to answer additional questions later?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Thanks</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 3

PHASE II INTERVIEW

Good Morning/Afternoon. It is ___<time>_ on ___<date>_ and I am with ___<name>___.

First I would like to thank you for agreeing to visit with me today. Imagine that I am a brand new teacher to your school and I have come to you for advice on teaching. First I will give you a set of flash cards dealing with Teacher Knowledge. Please take a moment to rank these seven cards.

1. Q 16. When you reflect on teacher knowledge how important is:

   1. Solid Content Knowledge
   2. Sound Pedagogy
   3. Understanding of Cognitive Development
   4. Understanding the Different Stages of Children
   5. Cultural Knowledge
   6. Understanding of Students Served
   7. Interpersonal Skills

   Thank you. I see that you ranked ______ as the most important. What does ______ “look-like” in the classroom, what does it mean to you and your teaching practice?

   You ranked ______ as the second most important. What does ______ “look-like” in the classroom, what does it mean to you and your teaching practice?

   Third ______ what does ______ “look-like” in the classroom, what does it mean to you and your teaching practice?

   Fourth ______ what does ______ “look-like” in the classroom, what does it mean to you and your teaching practice?

   Fifth ______ what does ______ “look-like” in the classroom, what does it mean to you and your teaching practice?
Six _________ what does _________ “look-like” in the classroom, what does it mean to you and your teaching practice?

Seventh _________ what does _________ “look-like” in the classroom, what does it mean to you and your teaching practice?

Thank you. Here is another set of cards. Please rank these

2. Q 17. How important are the following:

1. Building Trust with Students
2. Community Involvement
3. Attendance at Extra-curricular Events
4. Infusion of Culture in the Classroom
5. Teachers and Students being Racially Identical
6. High Standards in the Classroom

Again, imagine that I am a new teacher coming to you for advice. How do you do in your practice, what does it “look-like?”

You indicted that _________ was second. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?

You indicted that _________ was third. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?

You indicted that _________ was fourth. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?

You indicted that _________ was fifth. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?

You indicted that _________ was sixth. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?
Here is another set of cards. When you reflect on your role in teaching how important are the following. Please take a moment to rank the card from most important to least.

3. Q 26. When you reflect on your role in teaching how important is:

1. Persistency
2. Student Learning
3. Relevancy
4. Modeling Interest in Learning
5. Covering the Material
6. Knowledge of Student
7. Organizational Skills

Let’s talk about each. What does _________ mean to you? What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?

You indicted that _________ was second. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?

You indicted that _________ was third. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?

You indicted that _________ was fourth. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?

You indicted that _________ was fifth. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?

You indicted that _________ was sixth. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?

You indicted that _________ was seventh. What does it “look-like” in your practice, how do you do it?
Here is another set of cards. When you reflect on your role in teaching how important are the following. Please take a moment to rank the card from most important to least.

5. Q 27. When you reflect on your role in teaching how important is:

1. Discipline
2. Punishment
3. Homework
4. Parent Involvement
5. Tests and Grading
6. Student Time on Task
7. Rewards and Reinforcements

Let’s talk about each. As a new teacher what should _________ mean to me? Why?

You indicted that _________ was second. Why?

You indicted that _________ was third. Why?

You indicted that _________ was fourth. Why?

You indicted that _________ was fifth. Why?

You indicted that _________ was sixth. Why?

You indicted that _________ was seventh. Why?

6. Q 28. As a new teacher what should I consider “success” for Native American Students?

7. Q 30. As a new teacher what should I consider characteristics of a “successful” teacher for NA students?

8. How do I develop these characteristics?

9. Q 31. As a new teacher how do I differentiate between a “successful” teacher for NA students and other teachers who may be less so?

Again, thank you for both your time and your insight. Your knowledge is beneficial to this study and I look forward to sharing results with you as soon as possible.
Young: Good afternoon. It is approximately 3:05 on 3/26/09. I’m with Mark Iron Cloud at Sage Creek Elementary. First, I would like to thank you for agreeing to visit with me today. Imagine that I am a brand new teacher at your school site and I’ve come to you for advice on how to become a better teacher. First I’ll give you a set of flash cards dealing with teacher knowledge. Please take a moment to rank these in order.

Mark: In order?

Young: What you believe to be most important.

[Mark arranges cards]

Mark: It’s not quite officially yet, so…

Young: No problem, take your time.

Mark: Ok, I think I’ll go with that. I’m not to sure, but I’ll go with it.

Young: I see that you ranked interpersonal skills as the most important. What does interpersonal skills look like in the class and what does it mean to you and your teaching practice?

Mark: Interpersonal skills, I think about dealing with the kids as…I guess, what it looks like to me, at least with this set of kids here, is kind of, for a lack of better phrase…is being real with them. First of all, I don’t claim myself as a great teacher or one that is looked upon as being the be all, end all of teachers. I think it looks like when they are in the wrong, you need to tell them of their expectations, you need to tell them the truth, you know when you have 30 and you only have so much time, you kind of have to get to the point with them. You have to tell them their expectations and you have to keep those expectations high. You have to talk to them like there people, I’m not one for love and
logic or anything like that, not saying I’m against it or don’t like it, I’m saying if I have a kid that’s off task and he’s kind of acting like he’s working, I’m going to go up to him and say ‘ok, I’m noticing your acting like you’re working so let’s get busy here, and he will look at me like and then ok, all right let’s get busy. You know if it comes down to it and there’s a real problem, I pull them off to the side I say ‘what’s going on, tell me what’s going on and I can help you, and we’ll do it together’ and I’ll give him his options. Always options. It’s always trying to stay calm with them no matter what I do, good days, bad days, that’s what I see as interpersonal skills. It can make them feel comfortable around you and establish that, I think it goes a long way. Then you build upon that with everything else. I guess that’s as good as I can answer it.

Young: You ranked understanding of students served as the second piece of this, what does that look like in the classroom and how do you do it?

Mark: Understanding of students served, well, for me personally you have to understand where they are coming from, their background, and their home life might look like, the friends they hang out with, their socioeconomic status, you know, things like that. You have to take into account and it helps when they have a problem, for instance, for me it helps because I guess I grew up just like these guys. I didn’t grow up in [Research City], but I grew up in a poor household, I grew up with low expectations, I grew up with a lot of the same problems they have, you know, taking care of brothers and sisters, things like that. Taking care of yourself when parents weren’t around, you know, it’s understanding where they are coming from, I don’t know what that looks like because I can honestly say teachers who had a different upbringing than I did, who have their own special struggles as well, but for me, it’s just like small things that matter. They come in and you pay
attention, you know if you’re asking for…if they didn’t bring in their pencils or they
don’t have things they need, I’m not going to get after them because they don’t have any
control over that. So it’s small things like that, I think they recognize that, I honestly
believe that they recognize, they see it and they appreciate that you’re not going to go
there, you’re not going to belittle them for things they have no control over. Like I said
it’s always the small things with these guys, as long as you can pay attention to the small
things, it helps things run smoothly, you build that rapport, you build that respect, it
seems like you’re watching out for them if you notice those small things.

Young: Next is understanding of cognitive development, what does that look like in the
classroom and how does it play out?

Mark: You know, right now in 5th grade, they are really talkative and really social, they
are starting to get that way, and I also have a lot…not a lot but a handful that should be in
6th and 7th grade, I have a 7th grade son at home and he is very talkative and very social
and sometimes you have to take into account some of those things, when it’s ok to be
talking, when it’s time to get busy. Some of the things they can’t help or they can’t
understand sometime you have students in here that just seem that they are still stuck in
3rd grade and you have students that are way above. I guess if you don’t have that
understanding, you can easily misinterpret that as misbehavior, misinterpret that as
disrespect for you or anybody around you. If you remember that and keep that in mind
and tucked away in the corner of your head, you know, it helps a lot. It helps you get
through the day and helps them get through the day as well.

Young: Next you have understanding the different stages of children. How does that play
out and what does that look like in the classroom?
Mark: I kind of looked at it as the same way as cognitive development. I guess what I’m looking at is what are we talking about the differences between these two here, like I said it’s kind of the same thing as what I said before.

Young: That works for me. Next you have solid content knowledge. In your classroom what does that look like?

Mark: That looks like coming in prepared, coming in knowing the standards that these kids need to be taught, what their job is, what they should be coming out of 5th grade with, for me, it’s not only knowing the content knowledge but the things they have to know be prepared with to go on to Pasque Middle School. It helps a lot, you know, when you’re solid with that and they have a billion questions, you know, 5th grade, they have so many standards and it’s like the content knowledge from 4th to 5th, it just jumps, you have to be quick on your feet, and some days standing there kind of stumbling, you didn’t even think of that, it helps to have solid content knowledge. That doesn’t go for just 5th grade, but any grade I would say.

Young: Next you have cultural knowledge. What does that look like in your classroom?

Mark: Again, that goes along with where the students are coming from. Today it seems in a place, especially like [Research City], I think these kids…there’s all types of culture, you know, right now they are all part of the main stream culture, you know, right now they are all talking about Twilight, they all listen to rap music, they have this almost gang culture, poking into this [Area of City] culture and you have that mixed in with their own culture, if they are Native American, their Native American culture, you have your non Native students that really kind of don’t know, and everyone doesn’t know. The reason it’s kind of low down there is…I guess, I don’t know, some of the things I think about
with culture, especially when we come across it, I guess it’s all about…it’s just a broad term, you have to really be specific when you talk about it. We all live in this popular culture, we all live in this culture of going home and watching TV and eating Cheetos, or maybe that’s my culture, but we all share certain aspects of this culture, but we have to be specific. If we are talking specifically about Native Americans cultures, if we’re talking about Native American students, I don’t see it as a high priority, at one point in my life I did and that was actually before I became a teacher and I got a lot more to say about that, if you have some more questions further down the road on that. It kind of goes along the lines of knowing your students backgrounds and I kind of already covered that.

Young: Last, you have sound pedagogy. What does that look like?

Mark: You know, I was thinking about that, maybe I should have put it a little higher. You know the practices and the teaching styles and the approaches, you know, the more I think about it this probably should have been higher, well, right now with our district, we have to do what we’re given, you know, with Math Investigations and…you know again I think about individual needs, some are ready to move on and one of the things that I cringe is I have like four or five that get done and sometimes, unfortunately, you have to have them wait. I should have probably put this before cultural knowledge.

Young: Thank you. Here is another set of cards, please rank these, again in order from most important to less important.

Mark: This is from a teacher standpoint, us attending…

Young: Yes, again I am a novice teacher coming to you for advice.

Mark: Some of these higher ones might go hand in hand here. The first one is building trust with students.
Young: Ok.

Mark: Kind of like what I talked before. I don’t think…for me, I think it’s easy because I kind of same background with them, but just because I have the same background doesn’t mean I’m automatically going to relate with these students. I think no matter how you build that trust with the students, it’s going to go a long way. They need to count on you the first thing, when they walk in the doors; the chances are you’re probably going to be the only one that they’re counting on for the whole day or the whole week. You’re their one constant. Even if you have to keep on them, you know, you have those expectations and it goes a long way. One of the things I saw with my student teacher, I have a student, his name is [Student], he is a great student, he reminds me of my son actually, but he can get really frustrated at times. He can get really rambunctious, very disruptive and he tried that with me at the beginning of the year. I was just real with him and said ‘ok are you kidding me, we’re 5th grade now, let’s move on from this.’ I don’t yell at these kids, I told him of my expectations and I told him what I was going to do for him, and I fulfilled that and he fulfilled that with me and now he’s doing great, but when my student teacher came in, he tried to push the buttons of her so she kind of had to do the same thing and it worked out for her as well. So building trust is the biggest thing, I think it’s everything, you build everything on top of the trust, it’s the foundation for me. Young: Next we’re talking about high standards in the classroom, what does that look like in your practice?

Mark: Let me go back to the trust issue, I have one more thing about that.

Young: Sure

Mark: I guess one of the things that I’ve really noticed about our kids, especially, when I say our kids, I mean the kids that come from low socioeconomic background, they don’t
have much at home, you know, yeah they have loving parents, they have aunties and uncles and everyone from Native American to non-Native to White to whatever, I guess one of the biggest things that they value and one of the biggest…it’s things like trust. It is one of the things they really look for. This is true of everybody but I think more so with these kids. When you break that, it tends to do a lot of damage, even a little bit. They hold on to that, they hold on to that. You have to hold on to that too, you can’t take it for granted with them. Ok, high standards, it looks like…knowing what that expectation is and holding it to them. Does it mean that they might fail a million times as long as they are trying their hardest. I tell them all the time, if you fail here, let’s do it again tomorrow, let’s do it again right now, I’m not going to be like, ‘if you can’t get it, don’t worry about it, let’s just move on.’ You can’t allow them to give up, that’s the biggest thing for me, I can’t let them give up. They have to keep going even if they didn’t reach that proficient level in whatever standards you’re covering, at least you’re telling them you’ve tried your best, and this is your best and let’s keep going. One day you’ll get it, might not be today, but you’ll get there. To me, in the classroom, what it looks like is not giving up.

Young: The third item is attendance at extra curricular events, how do you do that?

Mark: That’s a biggie actually, that goes along with the trust thing and kind of goes along with the other things, you know when they have their basketball events, or if they have something going on in the community like a pow wow, or they got anything going on, they are always saying, ‘Mr. Red Bear, I’ve got this going on, you want to come?’ I have my own life and everything, my own kids, but I make that time to go to those games and it makes a big difference, they are excited when they see you, and not only that it makes a
big difference with the parents and it just goes a long way, and when they see that you go
that extra step. You’re not going to be able to make it to all of them, but it means a lot, it
kind of proves that you’re serious about what you’re doing in your classroom. That kind
of goes along with community involvement.
Young: Well, let’s speak about that.
Mark: Ok, community involvement. I guess again when you’re living in a community
like this, they can tell if you just check out and you just go home and they never see you
again until Monday morning, or the next day. When you’re friends with like, basketball,
and referee basketball, I would go to the pow wows, it’s just showing that you’re…I
guess it’s going that extra step then just school, I mean, they see you interact with the
people they know in the community and they see those people with you and it just…they
feel like it’s not, it kind of takes away that us and them thing. It just leaves us as a whole,
it kind of adds to that whole atmosphere with the whole community involvement. If they
see that you’re taking that extra step and they understand that.
Young: The next one you have is infusion of culture in the classroom. What does that
look like in the classroom?
Mark: Well, infusion of culture in the classroom, well, this is interesting because I was a
cultural resource specialist for about three years for the district, before I became a
teacher, and my job was do just that. I was hired through the Title VII program to work
with teachers to try to develop curriculum that had this Native American spin on it. I had
no idea what that looked like, I honestly I don’t know if anybody ever does. First of all,
when we talk about…I’m talking specific about native American culture here, what
people think it looks like is when you take your lessons and you look at the background
of the majority of your students and you kind of put this reflection upon what your student body is. For here, for my classroom, I have a mostly Native American classroom, so if I was to do this I would try to infuse the culture in it, I would try to teach them culture, I would try in my lessons and on top of that there are so many parts to this, there is actually teaching the culture, there is actually teaching values, there is actually knowing cultural differences, which I don’t see here in Rapid City too often. There are a lot of avenues, I hold it low because when I come in here, my number one job isn’t to teach them culture, it’s to make sure they are left reading at a 5th grade level, make sure they know all their multiplication facts before they move on to middle school, I want them to be prepared for what’s coming up and a lot of the times, infusing those cultural lessons isn’t high on that…I mean, we don’t have much time for that and we don’t have resources, if we do it’s all fragmented, they don’t fit for everything I guess. I hold it low because I guess this big one…before I was a teacher, I probably put this at number one, because it was what I heard from the community, it was what they wanted, this is what they still want, but I’m not sure that I agree with that, I don’t agree with a lot of those people. There is so much that is ingrained to culture that we don’t want to lose it, we look at our past here, we look at all Native American people past, it’s pretty grim, we’re pretty run down, we’re not in the best of places, we’re an minority, most of us are poor, a poor minority, you mix that with our grim history and you have a lot of angry people and you mix that into a place like [Research City] where this place has been built off of a lot of racial tension, and there still is. I guess it’s…for me, when I see, when I hear parents and I see people in the community and they say what are you doing about culture in the classroom and they don’t ask me about this, they ask other people. I guess they assume it
comes with me, but is doesn’t. I don’t actively seek it out; I guess it comes out in other ways I guess. For me the culture should come from the families, but unfortunately the families can’t even do that because they don’t know the culture themselves. They know of the culture, they know basic things but they couldn’t tell you specific things, they couldn’t hold certain ceremonies, they don’t know certain people, so it’s a huge issue, and it’s just a huge issue. For me as a teacher, when I became a teacher, it went really low; I saw what my students needed the most. I want them to succeed in life down the road, I want them to be able to get a job, I want them to read, I want them to do the math, I want them to graduate from high school, they need all these things, I want them to go on to college and there knowledge that they are suppose to learn, that’s what I’m going to focus on, I’m not going to waste my time on the culture. That’s horrible, that sounds horrible, but that’s these kids, they are high needs kids and we need to devote as much time as we can to focusing on making sure they are ready. They are capable of it, absolutely, that’s why it’s low.

Young: You’re last card is teachers and students being racially identical.

Mark: Right

Young: What to you think about that?

Mark: I don’t think it’s a necessity. A good teacher is a good teacher. I’ve always believed that. I think back to my teachers, I’ve never had…all my teachers in my lifetime, except for a few college courses, have been white, I have my favorite teachers just like anybody else. Like I said, a good teacher is a good teacher. I didn’t look at them differently, my parents didn’t look at them differently, maybe other people did, but here at Sage Creek, there are a lot of people…I think I’m the only Indian person that’s
here, that’s a teacher. I think it doesn’t make a big difference; it does with the community, you hear that a lot from the people, how come you’re not hiring more Indian teachers? That’s a big question, even I was asking those question a long time ago, and here I became a teacher, but once I got to know a lot of people, like I said, good teachers are good teachers, it doesn’t matter what color you are.

Young: Ok, thank you. Imagine this, another set of cards. When you reflect of your role in teaching, how important are the following. Again with the idea that I’m a brand new teacher coming to you.

Mark: I think I’m going to go with that.

Young: Let’s talk about each. What does persistency mean to you and what does it look like in your classroom?

Mark: Persistency, it means setting up an atmosphere…it kind of goes with expectations, keeping it fire lit under them. Not just for them but for yourself as well. Not letting them necessarily rest, but you know, just keep them going, not much down time, we’ve got so much content to cover, you have to keep those expectations high, keep that persistent, keep positive atmosphere as well, we have to keep every at a level, at the beginning of the year, you start gung ho, you try to keep that throughout the year, sometimes it’s hard, some weeks, some days you want to, you just don’t want to do it, you have to keep it up, it’s for them, so persistency is big. You can’t let yourself let go I guess.

Young: You indicated model an interest in learning is number two, what does that look like?

Mark: Well having enthusiasm for your lessons, I guess that kind of goes with persistency, but model interest, you know, telling them what they are going to need it for,
not just model but be excited about it, going out there and not just saying ‘ok, let’s get out our math books,’ but say, ‘alright, let’s go, math investigations.’ Even if it’s something you don’t want to do, you don’t just judge things, you give it your all, and you have to keep that up. If you give them an inch that you don’t want to do it either than they are going to feed off of that, they are going to…you have to keep that interest high and basically, what is looks like is ‘let’s get this done, let’s do it, let’s keep doing it.’ For instance we have word works and some days we have the lessons where you give them a group of words and they have to sort them according to you know, like, prefixes and things like that, some are short, some are long, how long is the list, it doesn’t matter, we’re going to get them all done. That’s what modeling interest in learning, and not only that, but talking to them about their future, I tell them, ‘when you guys graduate from high school,’ I talk to everyone like that. ‘When you go on to college, this is what you can expect, be ready for this, this is what you’re going to need it for,’ You know each day we do a little bit of algebra, you know, ‘when you guys go on 8th grade or 7th grade, this is what your going to be doing, you’re doing it right now, that’s awesome.’ That’s what it looks like.

Young: Ok, excellent. You indicated student learning was third. What does that look like in your classroom?

Mark: I was kind of wondering what specifically, what do you mean by student learning?

Young: How important is it?

Mark: It’s very important, that’s their job. That first week they come in, I tell them that their job is to learn. I don’t really use the word learn, I use the word think, when you start thinking, you start learning. That’s the main thing everyday, we have to learn
something, even if you learn to do it the wrong way, tomorrow we re-learn to do it the right way, you have to learn something, you can’t just sit there, you can’t just waste your time, waste my time, we have to do something. It’s very important. I think that’s it.

Young: You indicated knowledge of student was fourth. Let’s talk about that.

Mark: Knowledge of student, again that kind of goes back to what we talked about before, knowing where they are coming from. I guess, when I think of this one, I think of individual now, I guess you know which students are going to just plow through something, the ones that are going to be struggling, you start putting them into groups, you start knowing which ones you can definitely count on all the time, the ones that are consistent, you start knowing the ones that need the little extra boost, the ones you have to stand by to make sure they keep going, I think it’s pretty important, I think it’s pretty important. I guess if you don’t know your students then you are kind of shooting in the dark.

Young: How do you get that knowledge of each student?

Mark: Well, within the first month or so I guess, you start looking at their work, you start looking at their work habit’s, you start paying attention to what they are doing, and not just in the classroom, but what they are doing out on the playground, how they are acting the lunchroom, you really take notice I guess. You notice of whose lazy, we sometimes have students who are just lazy. I guess it comes back again to the little things; you have to watch out for. I have a student, his name is [Student Name] and he’s a great student, last week he was just quiet all of a sudden, I pulled him aside, I knew there was something wrong with him, and sure enough, he had a little fight on the playground with somebody and he was scared to tell a teacher because he thought he was going to get into
trouble. So I pulled him and another student out and we talked about it and I said let’s not take this to [Dean of Students], let’s solve it right here and they agreed upon it. It’s the little things you notice, it goes toward…well, I have another student, I know her, she is a frequent flyer at the nurse’s office, she always wants to go down there, and she is never sick. She even goes to the far lengths of making herself sick, so she can leave and it’s kind of crazy. It’s just knowing those types of things, instead of just saying, ok go to the office. You start paying attention, you start noticing those things and you just tell her, why do you fake it, let’s stay in here. Be real with them.

Young: You indicated relevancy was next. Let’s talk about that.

Mark: Relevancy, I guess in the lessons and everything you do, you try to start off lessons and tell them this is what we’re going to do and this is why we are doing it. Some students just, that’s the first thing, ‘why are we doing this, why do we have to learn this.’ And sometimes you don’t even have an answer for that, it’s in the book. But other times you can tell them well this is what you’re going to need, these are the skills you’re going to need when you go on to 6th, 7th and 8th grade, high school and college. These are the things you need to learn, to know, and it…for the most part, it makes a difference, sometimes it doesn’t, but when they know that they are doing something for a reason, they are more apt to try to remember it, try to grasp onto it.

Young: You indicated covering the material was number six, what does that look like in your practice, how do you do that?

Mark: Well, like at the beginning of the year, well, me and the other 5th grade teacher, we get with our literacy team, we get with our math team, and we try to curriculum map for the entire year. The reason why it’s kind of low, it doesn’t mean that I just skip lessons,
it means that sometimes our weeks don’t go as planned, sometimes it feels…actually, not sometimes, always feels like we don’t have any time for anything. So, I guess what that looks like is a lot of planning, making sure you’re covering what you can, sometimes you have to cut corners for time. Some things are more important than others, when it comes to math there are a billion standards for that and then you have to know what exactly you are going to cover, same goes for reading there are a lot of standards and you just have to get them in as best as possible. Our math Investigators, our head person probably wouldn’t be happy to hear that we don’t get to the last two books, it’s just because we didn’t have time. Certain books required more time to cover and so covering the material means that we’re over covering the material, consistently coming back to it. It’s low, but it’s still a big thing, just because it’s second to the last, doesn’t mean that I don’t cover the material.

Young: You indicated organizational skills were seventh. What does that look like in your practice and how do you do it?

Mark: That’s my weakest spot right there. When I had my student teacher come in, she’s very organized, she came in with these little folder things, I was like what is that, she was like it’s a folder you put stuff in [laughs]. As you can tell, my desk is really messy, I guess for me, I guess for any teacher for any job, it should be higher, for me it’s not. The only reason I put it down is because it’s one of the biggest areas I need to improve on. But I think I’ve done well enough where I haven’t been the most organized, I’ve lost papers, lost materials, lost handouts, things like that, but I have improvised and make the best of it when it happens, quite a few times. But it should be a kind of higher, kind of mid way, but like I said it’s only low because I need improvement in that area.
Young: Ok, thank you. Now again, we you reflect on your role in teaching, how important are the following cards. Again with the idea that I’m a novice coming to you.

Mark: Ok, I think I’m going to go with that.

Young: You ranked parent involvement as high, so as a new teacher, what should that mean to me and what does it mean in your practice?

Mark: It means, you can tell the students who do really well in school, they have parents at home that really care about their education, that are really actively involved, what that looks like is that their…when they go home you can tell that they ask how their day went, you can tell if they are asking if they have homework or what they need for school, you can tell that the education is at the forefront. It doesn’t necessarily mean that their parents are coming in the doors everyday, or that they show up at every PTA meeting, or that they are showing up at every school event. It means the biggest driving force for them is their parents, whether it’s their parents or aunties or uncles or grandparents or whoever, if they see that it’s very important in them, then they tend to do a lot better, unfortunately for us, parent involvement is not very big, it’s not very high, that’s kind of a by product of just trying to get by with your day, week or month. When you don’t have much time, I know that sounds like I’m making excuses for them, but it’s…well, like some right now I would say over half my students it would seem as though when it comes to their families, no matter who they are, whether it’s their actual parents, step parents, grandparents, education doesn’t seem like it’s the most, biggest thing on their plate. They have so many other issues that they have to deal with, that the education thing is just kind of a side thing here, well we have to take you, so school. They have more pressing issues that require attention and those issues can range anywhere from
money issues to relationship issues, anything, but like I said, you can tell when you have a parent that is really involved. There are some parents that I haven’t even met all year, but with talking with the students they will tell you, ‘yeah, my mom was making sure I did this last night.’ I’ve never met your mom before, but that’s awesome, that’s parent involvement right there.

Young: You indicted that student time on task was second, why?

Mark: Student time on task, to me that’s important, for me when I think of student time on task, I think of when they grasp a concept or strategy and they are locked in on it, they are happy to do it, they want to do it, that’s important. When you see that you know that they learning something, or thinking about it. When I see students, and that’s a big indicator of knowing your students as well, when you see students twiddling their thumbs, making little house out of paper or cutting stuff, I mean that it’s a big red flag of knowing if they actually get it, if there is a problem. It’s a good gauge of knowing whose doing what, I guess. It’s a good deal, for me it is.

Young: You indicated that tests and grading is number three, why?

Mark: Again, that kind of goes along with meeting their needs. I’m not saying that I give a billion tests out there, but you want to know where they are at. You want to know, it’s going to tell you a lot about your students. When it comes to like reading, you take your running records, you look at trends in your classroom, some use, not necessarily looking at the individual anymore, but what am I going to touch on to make the most impact to most of my students. Right now we’re taking these achievement tests, that are these computer, online program, and they specifically target certain standards. We look at the layout of exactly what answers they got wrong, which ones they got right. You can even
see them as a whole class, you know everyone got question three wrong, so you look at questions three and say, ‘ok, now they got that wrong’ so you cover that. It helps knowing where you have to go next, that’s the biggest thing. I guess that when you’re covering the material sometimes, again, it kind of makes you and forces you to come back and recover something; you know that they are not getting something. Tests and grading is a big deal.

Young: You indicated discipline was number four, why?

Mark: Discipline, I think of discipline in a different light, I guess you think of being stern and stuff like that, I don’t know if I’m like that, I think of discipline as, again, with those high expectations, I think of it as something each one of these kids, they have control their own actions, over their own thinking. You have to be disciplined enough to know that you have to do what you came here to do; you have to get it done. It doesn’t necessarily mean, again, with this punishment or rewards or reinforcements, it doesn’t mean discipline this kids because he didn’t do his work, I’m going to discipline this kid because he was disrespectful to another kid. It means being strong enough and knowing what you have to do to get done and staying on that.

Young: Number five is rewards and reinforcements, you alluded to that one, what does it mean?

Mark: Rewards and reinforcements, I’m not big on handing out a lot of rewards and reinforcements, usually it’s for something dopey, like on Mondays and Thursdays, those are our long mornings, we don’t have any specials, like PE or Music, and our morning isn’t broken up and we’re all in here, so I’ll take maybe 10 minutes, and play Simon Says just to loosen up, that’s the type of things that give rewards and reinforcements for…you
know, reinforcements are again that rapport, you talk to them, if they are doing
something right, you let them know they are doing something right, if they are not, be
real with them and say, ‘hey, you can do this,’ you show them a little of what they can
succeeded at, you can find success in every one of them, that’s what reinforcement is, it’s
showing them that they can be amazing, it reinforces that ‘hey, I’m doing it.’ I guess
rewards and reinforcement…that’s where it’s at.
Young: You indicated that homework was sixth. Let’s talk about that.
Mark: My first year of teaching, I didn’t hand out any homework; it was only because a
lot of teachers would tell me that you don’t get homework back. I guess that’s one of
those expectations, they sent it out for 30 kids and got five back, and the five that brought
it back were the ones that really didn’t need the homework. What actually they do, they
want it, now I do hand out homework, it’s usually in math or usually starting a word list
or reading a certain passage in a book. To me it’s low because the thing still ring true,
half of them don’t bring it back, a lot of them don’t do it, they don’t have that parent
involvement that has them, that shows them that it’s important to do that. At least I’m
giving them the opportunity to do it. If I didn’t do it, like I didn’t do it my first year, I
took that opportunity away from them, they had no option to do it. Now it’s not
something that… I mean if they don’t bring it in, I’m not going to rant and rave about it,
but I still hand it out. It’s not really…it’s usually something they have already covered.
Young: Last you indicated punishment was the bottom of the list, why?
Mark: Punishment. That’s bottom of the list because, not that I don’t believe that…I do
believe that students need to be responsible for their actions, we do have a discipline
matrix that I do follow. For me in the classroom, it just sounds very harsh, and maybe
that’s my own bias, my own experiences kind of dealing with the same background of them, they are already coming from a lot of that, I feel they are coming from backgrounds that are harsh, they don’t need to come to that here. That’s not saying that I’m going to let them have free reign over everything, but I’m not going to just punish them for anything. Every day they come into my classroom, they have a clean slate, it doesn’t matter what they did before, it is a start of a brand new day. It’s not something I’m too big on, some teachers are really harsh and that’s the way they do it. Again, like I said I follow the discipline matrix, if I have to contact parents, I do, again that’s kind of persistency. If you laid down something, a set of rules or expectation, you have to follow yourself, you have to lay that down, as soon as anything happens they realize that. They come to learn your expectations, I think for me, they know that I’m not going to yell at them, I’ve even told them that, I tell them at the beginning of the year, I’m not going to yell at you. I might get upset, I might get frustrated, but I will never do that to you guys. Punishment, it’s not a big deal.

Young: Outstanding. Now as a new teacher, what should I consider success for Native American students?

Mark: Success for Native American students is the same success for any other student. Success is going on to the next grade, success is being proficient in every standard that you come across, being more than proficient, advanced. Success is graduating from high school, graduating from college. Success is trying to make a good life for yourself. No matter who you are, that what success is, it is the same for everybody. I don’t know, that’s…I don’t know what else you want from that question, it’s plain and simple I guess.
Young: As a new teacher, what should I consider characteristics of a successful teacher for Native American students?

Mark: Characteristics of a successful teacher for Native American students? Well, the same the characteristics you see for anybody else. Our students are all…one of the things that I always tell our students is that we are very lucky that we have this kind of ethnic mix in our classrooms, when you guys get out in the real world, that’s exactly what it’s going to look like. Characteristics? I have to answer this for all students, because I can’t just throw in and say it’s just for Native American students. I just want to make sure that you understand that. You know it’s patience, caring about them, being persistent, being respectful, sticking to your guns too. Having those high expectations, hire a monkey just to keep them going all the time. It’s all the characteristics of what you would think of what would be a great teacher; I think they would touch everybody, not just one group of people.

Young: How do you develop those characteristics?

Mark: I think all good teachers…I don’t know how you can develop them. I guess you can go through…I’m not saying I have those characteristics, when I think of great teachers, I think it might be one of those things you just kind of meant to do. There are some teachers even here at Sage Creek, because maybe you shouldn’t be a teacher because it’s not working out and some it just comes natural for. How do you develop? I guess one of the biggest things is pay attention to those who look like they are having success, those that look like they are enjoying their jobs, that’s one of the biggest things I would say to student teacher, that’s what I told my student teacher. Go look at these teachers, go look at some of the teachers in other schools that you might have had as a
kid. Go and notice what they are doing right. That’s a big focus on that, don’t focus on the things that they are doing wrong; we are all doing something wrong. Take the bit’s and pieces and I guess that’s what I have done. I think back to teachers in my past, both of my parents are teachers and so that’s the number one thing they told me to do, they said think back to who your favorite teachers were. And I think about [Teacher at Pasque Middle School], I think of him, he was such a nice guy, he had a sense of humor, you have to have a sense of humor with these guys. Patience, I can’t believe I didn’t even mention a sense of humor all this time, that’s the biggest. I come in here during the lessons; I make them laugh all the time. That’s part of the rapport with them, I can make them smile. Part of me wants to say you’re born with and part is just notice and be open, notice what they are doing right and be open to change.

Young: As a new teacher, how do I differentiate between a successful teacher for Native American students and other teachers who might not be as successful?

Mark: Differentiate?

[Young repeats question]

Mark: I don’t know how to answer that question, only because I feel like those types of questions have this almost, you know, segregated feeling to them. I honestly don’t look at my students as you guys are Native American and you guys are White, and I don’t look at other people’s classrooms, I look at them as my students, I look at them as their students, so I really don’t know how to answer, all I can answer is as a whole, you can tell the differences, you can tell, you look at classroom management, if their class is out of control, if they are struggling in certain content areas, as a whole, I don’t just think Native American. Like I said, I don’t feel some of these, like that questions, just feel like
they have this segregated feeling, to me doesn’t feel right. I’m just being honest. I’m trying to be respectful. I feel like I don’t even want to answer that question, I almost feel that that is almost offensive to other teachers, I guess, that are Native American, other teachers that, I guess, who are the same boat. I guess that what I see it as.

Young: Ok, well I want to thank you for both your time and insight; it is very, very helpful. I appreciate it.
Question Five: Number of years at current teaching site

APPENDIX 4
SUPPLEMENTAL DATA
Teacher Age by School Site
College Courses Native American Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA/AI History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lakota Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lakota Teachings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anthropology of Early America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA/AI Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cultural Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SD Indian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Human Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Indian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>History &amp; Culture NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lakota Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Do Not Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Career Development facilitator training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Did Not Take Any NA Culture Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Education of Culturally Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>District Mandated Cultural Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Storytelling Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Literature of the West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Racial &amp; Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bi-Cultural Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>NA Art &amp; Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NA Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>NA Poetry &amp; Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Comparative Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tribal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>NA Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Reclaiming Youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplemental Data: Questions Fifteen and Twenty Eight**

**High School Divergent_Deficit_Graduation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 Define Educational Success</th>
<th>Q28 Success for NA students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning adequate social skills to contribute to society and Graduating from High School</td>
<td>Graduating from high school and deciding on a life-long career before graduating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The joy of learning - being engaged in the learning process.</td>
<td>Graduating from high school. Good attendance. No skipping classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking what you have learned and applying it somewhere else in life.</td>
<td>graduating from high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student understanding</td>
<td>graduation-getting to class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having the students &quot;get it&quot; in a fun way</td>
<td>Success is learning the material and getting a passing grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High School Divergent_Deficit_Societal Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 Define Educational Success</th>
<th>Q28 Success for NA students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaching at least one child and making them realize their potential.</td>
<td>It seems to be at this point staying out of JSC for skipping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of what a student has learned, he/she is able to have a happy successful life.</td>
<td>I think being employed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High School Divergent_Deficit_Passing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 Define Educational Success</th>
<th>Q28 Success for NA students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
students have an enjoyable learning experience and are able to perform desired skills in the target language. I would hope that it would be to feel like they have mastered the material presented and make a connection to the info presented in the course. That they feel good about what they know and want to know more. They have made a connection to young people in German speaking cultures. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When a student is able to demonstrate that he or she can perform the standards for a course and is able to pass that course.</th>
<th>When they can pass a course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When students learn something they didn't previously know.</td>
<td>Learning knew (sic) skills and enjoying school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The successful building of relationships with students in order to facilitate their learning.</td>
<td>Having a sense of belonging at school, and from that position learning enough to progress through the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having the students "get it" in a fun way. Success is learning the material and getting a passing grade. 

*High school divergent_deficit_image*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 Define Educational Success</th>
<th>Q28 Success for NA students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>engaging students in a learning environment that encourages risk taking and student reflection and participation</td>
<td>feeling safe and comfortable enough in the classroom to find and use their &quot;voice&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

students have an enjoyable learning experience and are able to perform desired skills in the target language. A student doing their personal best and a love of learning. Good self-image and success in life. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When students learn something they didn't previously know.</th>
<th>Learning knew skills and enjoying school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having the problem solving skills and the means to go out and find information necessary to solve problems that are encountered in the real world.</td>
<td>Being able to provide for their family and be a part of community...a noble member of society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher makes a connection with the student, the student falls in love with the subject matter and makes it his/her own, the doors of possibility open to go to college.

Being on time, being engaged in the subject matter, showing up for concerts, being happy during the school day, feeling safe, and being connected to what is going on.

**High School Similar_Identical**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A success career choice.</td>
<td>A step toward a desired career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students being able to understand, apply and utilized information that has been presented to them</td>
<td>Same as above student should be able to understand, apply and utilize information presented to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational success is achieved when students learn how to effectively and independently problem solve; and when students learn how to direct their own learning.</td>
<td>Achieving educational success as I defined it earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the students learn the curriculum that is taught</td>
<td>Same as anyone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational success is the ability to learn what is required. It is often demonstrated through success in completion of class work and tests and through participation in discussions in class.</td>
<td>The same as for other students. Learning the material, learning how to learn, demonstrating that they have met the standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When they develop a desire to learn on their own.</td>
<td>Success is success. Singling out a group for this definition is implying a lower level of ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational success is the ability to impress upon students the importance of learning and of making mistakes and learning from them.</td>
<td>The same as success for other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing students the tools to be productive adults.</td>
<td>Gaining the tools to be productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine or my Students?????????</td>
<td>The same as it is for everyone else. To get through high school with a diploma and a focus on the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student is successful if they leave high school with the tools they need to do well in whatever course they choose (college, tech school, military, job training, etc)</td>
<td>The same as it is for other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student has reached educational success when they have learned valuable skills he/she can use in life and a future career.</td>
<td>Understanding the Content and learning life skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the students learn the required material/tasks</td>
<td>the same as everybody else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When students achieve at or above their ability and have the skills necessary to succeed after they leave high school.</td>
<td>Achieving at or above their ability and having the skills to be successful after high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success in my classroom is when a student leaves feeling a sense of accomplishment and having learned something that he/she didn't know before.</td>
<td>I think this answer would be the same as what I answered for number 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to achieve personal academic success at a level that will allow a person to become a productive member of society in the profession of his/her choice.</td>
<td>The ability to achieve personal academic success at a level that will allow a person to become a productive member of society in the profession of his/her choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When students understand the curriculum and are interested in learning more.</td>
<td>Same as for all students: good attendance, understanding of curriculum, becoming productive adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create lifelong learners</td>
<td>Same as for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mind that is engaged. Elie Wiesel said, &quot;The opposite of life is not death, it's indifference.&quot;</td>
<td>An engaged mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational success for a counselor is enhancing the social/emotional, academic and career well-being of all students.</td>
<td>Enhancing the social/emotional, academic and career well-being of the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That we produce young adults who are well-rounded.</td>
<td>The same as success for all students: to work hard, learn about themselves and the world, be proud of their accomplishments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High School Similar_Reactionary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowing a student the ability to reach his/her optimal potential in the related subject matter, as well as with one's personal character and self-respect.</td>
<td>I can't speak for someone else. Success is different to everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally - when a person has learned enough to be able to practice a chosen profession / career / hobby; professionally - when I have helped guide a student to achieve the above</td>
<td>Only Native Americans?? To lead a productive life and contribute to society; be content - same as for everyone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When they develop a desire to learn on their own.</td>
<td>Success is success. Singling out a group for this definition is implying a lower level of ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When students understand the curriculum and are interested in learning more.</td>
<td>Same as for all students: good attendance, understanding of curriculum, becoming productive adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student working to their ability to achieve their goals</td>
<td>I do not try to define what is success for someone else. Each person must define what success is to them. Academic success is working to your potential and achieving a diploma.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High School Diff_not_Deficit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning how to apply to the outside world</td>
<td>For several of my students it is achieving their goals they set for themselves at the beginning of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning for success in a changing environment</td>
<td>Learning and applying knowledge to their future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving students the tools that they need to be successful in the next phase of their lives, students having the knowledge to be competitive in a world market.</td>
<td>That can only be defined by an individual. This can not become a blanket answer for an entire race of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>showing each students that they can succeed and improve where they haven't before</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving it your all &amp; taking charge of your education!</td>
<td>I would think it depends on the individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving my students the tools and desire to learn at their highest innate level.</td>
<td>Same as for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Showing up to class and engaging in the day's lesson.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When my students either show or demonstrate their interest from beginning to end and have positive assessment results I don't like grouping them according to the question as each is an individual.

**Middle School Divergent_Deficit_Graduation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being able to have a conversation about what you know. Use knowledge to increase the learning of others.</td>
<td>For students it is being able to get a job and have a place to live other than a motel. My feeling is being a contributing member of society and success with their choices. I think it is imperative these students graduate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Middle School Divergent_Deficit_Societal Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being able to function in the real world</td>
<td>learning to be responsible and learning skills to help them in high school and later in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a learning environment that will allow students to stretch and grow as students and individuals. Create an environment of trust to investigate the subjects that all of us face in life and use literature to see how others have solved those issues. Create an environment in which students can grow and learn to love and accept themselves.</td>
<td>Success is somewhat the same as for any student. Achieving a goal, getting an education, passing a grade though I believe that their family and the issues at home supersede those goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation or fostering of the continued desire to seek greater skills and knowledge of the subject being studied.</td>
<td>For me, success is found through the intrapersonal discovery of their individual and community worth before they are ensnared in the ever-growing and all-to-attractive grasp of gang life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to have a conversation about what you know. Use knowledge to increase the learning of others.</td>
<td>For students it is being able to get a job and have a place to live other than a motel. My feeling is being a contributing member of society and success with their choices. I think it is imperative these students graduate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Middle School Divergent_Deficit_Passing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When students have gained in their knowledge and abilities upon leaving your class.</td>
<td>Learning and passing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion on academic test, daily work assigned</td>
<td>To be successful as a Native American students is to pass academically in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When students know how to use the big ideas in real life and how to access information for the finer points.</td>
<td>Staying in one school the entire school year, attending school every day (unless you are really sick), participating, working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational success is the development of a life-long learner.</td>
<td>Meeting their goals - what ever they choose for themselves. In my class, the idea of successful was that students would try math problems without giving up. Recently, success includes the idea of persistence and self monitoring of understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a learning environment that will allow students to stretch and grow as students and individuals. Create an environment of trust to investigate the subjects that all of us face in life and use literature to see how others have solved those issues. Create an environment in which students can grow and learn to love and accept themselves.</td>
<td>Success is somewhat the same as for any student. Achieving a goal, getting an education, passing a grade though I believe that their family and the issues at home supersede those goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a difference in a student's life</td>
<td>Coming to class on a daily basis  Completing work assigned  Passing the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mixture of hard work and enjoyment for what you are doing.</td>
<td>They want to come to school and work with me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle School Divergent_Deficit_Mainstream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing what is right for kids? That is a simple definition.</td>
<td>Making all of our Native students feel they are part of the educational system. We have to also help our Native students feel they can stand up for their rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If my students want to be in my class and if they enjoy learning.</td>
<td>If they enjoy learning and coming to school every day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Middle School Divergent_Deficit_Image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A person experiences educational success when he or she is able to access the pertinent information needed to solve problems and actively participate in civic affairs. Thinking independently and questioning effectively are also indicators of educational success. Aesthetic appreciation is another product of a successful education. Students who are given opportunities to metacognitively approach life's experiences should then be able to more successfully function in the rest of their lives.</td>
<td>Achieving a personally set goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational success is the development of a life-long learner.

Meeting their goals - what ever they choose for themselves. In my class, the idea of successful was that students would try math problems without giving up. Recently, success includes the idea of persistence and self monitoring of understanding.

Doing what is right for kids? That is a simple definition.

Making all of our Native students feel they are part of the educational system. We have to also help our Native students feel they can stand up for their rights.

Learning what you need to make you successful in your life

Success is that they can be successful in what ever they want to do with their lives. That they feel important and successful as a person.

Middle School Similar_Identical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 Define Educational Success</th>
<th>Q28 Success for NA st?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational success is when a student is able to understand the content at their grade level. Another key is that they are usually engaged in a learning practice and do not continually state that he or she is bored.</td>
<td>Success for Native American students is the same as any other student. To learn skills needed to become a productive member of society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational success for students is when students can demonstrate their knowledge at or above their current grade level. Also a desire to improve and challenge themselves to become a high achieving adult is a component of educational success. For the student I would define it as a process of enabling the student to become an independent, productive member of society. Achieving to one’s potential in order to become a knowledgeable, productive adult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational success for students is when students can demonstrate their knowledge at or above their current grade level. Also a desire to improve and challenge themselves to become a high achieving adult is a component of educational success.</th>
<th>Same as all students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for the student I would define it as a process of enabling the student to become an independent, productive member of society</td>
<td>same as for any student to become an independent and productive contributing member of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving to one’s potential in order to become a knowledgeable, productive adult</td>
<td>Becoming knowledgeable productive adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a learning environment that will allow students to stretch and grow as students and individuals. Create an environment of trust to investigate the subjects that all of us face in life and use literature to see how others have solved those issues. Create an environment in which students can grow and learn to love and accept themselves.</td>
<td>The same as it is for any student - achieving goals, having high self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy smiling faces when the students &quot;get it&quot;</td>
<td>the same as success for all students regardless of their ethnicity, I would imagine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Middle School Diff not Deficit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 Define EdSuccess</th>
<th>Q28 Success for NA st?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take a child from where they are and help them grow academically and socially so they are prepared to handle life situations w/o your help.</td>
<td>the feeling of accomplishment, independence, self confidence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to think flexibly about the ideas explored in a given content area</td>
<td>Achieving what every other child achieves regardless of their skin color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to apply content standards to other situations.</td>
<td>Building a desire for success, and persistence in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding what society demands of you and knowing how to succeed within the realms of this society.</td>
<td>Success is keeping one's culture yet understanding how to live and succeed in homogenous culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enjoying what you do</strong></td>
<td>I want to see my students succeed and become better readers in my mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transferring understanding to novel situations and applying knowledge.</strong></td>
<td>In my class having fun and learning to be physically active for a healthy life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational success is the ability to communicate with others.</strong></td>
<td>Being able to demonstrate a skill successfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational success is when you are willing to take healthy risks, be competent and confident in yourself and being autonomous</strong></td>
<td>Finding something that you are happy doing and that you can share the rewards of that success with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational success is when you are willing to take healthy risks, be competent and confident in yourself and being autonomous</strong></td>
<td>When kids feel confident, competent, and autonomous.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elementary School Graduation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating from college</td>
<td>staying engaged in school day  consistent attendance parents being part of school community staying in school until high school graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased skill performance  increased social poise  maintaining friendships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elementary School Societal Value*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having basic knowledge in core subjects but beyond that being able to think and find answers to questions.</td>
<td>Feeling that they are as good as anyone else in the community and having the skills to be respected by everyone in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are learning content in a safe environment</td>
<td>becoming contributing members of a community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a student leaves knowing at least most of the requirements and they still love to be in school</td>
<td>Feeling like they have done something well and being praised for it, achieving a goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have always strongly believed that I have just as much responsibility to model good citizenship for my students as I do to have them become proficient readers, writers and math problem solvers.</td>
<td>Being a healthy, happy, productive member of the community in which they live.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elementary School Passing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I define educational success by having all students have the same opportunities in the classroom to achieve academic success.</td>
<td>Being able to feel comfortable in the classroom and to do grade level work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students learn to learn new things</td>
<td>Finishing the task and not having to redo it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making progress toward the mastery of State Standards</td>
<td>acquiring the ability to read, writing &amp; do math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when the child works to their very best and puts forth the effort, they are successful</td>
<td>When they are working up to their best potential, and put forth their best effort, that is success. When they are feeling welcome, happy, loves school and thinking school is awesome that is success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational success isn't just being proficient; it is making progress from where we started...sometimes even small amounts of progress.</td>
<td>When they have an a-ha moment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elementary School Mainstream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 How do you define educational success</th>
<th>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>increased skill performance increased social poise maintaining friendships</td>
<td>staying engaged in school day consistent attendance parents being part of school community staying in school until high school graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having basic knowledge in core subjects but beyond that being able to think and find answers to questions.</td>
<td>Feeling that they are as good as anyone else in the community and having the skills to be respected by everyone in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a student leaves knowing at least most of the requirements and they still love to be in school</td>
<td>Feeling like they have done something well and being praised for it, achieving a goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have always strongly believed that I have just as much responsibility to model good citizenship for my students as I do to have them become proficient readers, writers and math problem solvers.</td>
<td>Being a healthy, happy, productive member of the community in which they live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 How do you define educational success</td>
<td>Q28 What is “success” for Native American students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I define educational success by having all students have the same opportunities in the classroom to achieve academic success.</td>
<td>Being able to feel comfortable in the classroom and to do grade level work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when the child works to their very best and puts forth the effort, they are successful</td>
<td>When they are working up to their best potential, and put forth their best effort, that is success. When they are feeling welcome, happy, loves school and thinking school is awesome that is success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping children to feel successful and to enjoy learning.</td>
<td>Feeling worthy-good about themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 Define EdSuccess</th>
<th>Q28 Success for NA st?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are self motivated and engage learners that are learning at or above their ability</td>
<td>Students are self motivated and engage learners that are learning at or above their ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I define educational success by achieving an understanding of what’s being taught.</td>
<td>Success is the same for everyone. Getting good greats, doing what you’re supposed to do, working hard. Meeting the expectations of your teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By seeing students learn and pick up on the skills taught and needed to ready them for Kindergarten. Others, success is measured in smaller increments. When I see kids learn, I measure that as success.</td>
<td>The same as success for all students. Success is when students learn, enjoy school, are well rounded including social and communication skills. Being happy and feeling good about themselves is also success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success can be defined when students continually seek to learn and are intrinsically motivated to learn and succeed. Educators are the key to their success.</td>
<td>Success is the same for students of all races. Students are proficient or advanced in school to measure it in one way. Students who are successful are solid enough that they can continue the learning process on their own with good instruction. They continue to be successful in this way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a child progresses from where he/she is</td>
<td>It is the same as for any other student, making progress and developing skills that can be used outside of school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe that our goal is to ensure students are educated with the skills and knowledge necessary to lead a healthy life. The same as success for any student!

| Increased information through a variety of techniques. | The same as all of my students; learning and loving to learn. |
| Being able to learn and apply learning to living. | Same as other students-for them to see themselves as capable learners. |
| Possessing the skills that enable you to know what to do, even when you don't know what to do. | The same for all students: believing in yourself as a learner and working hard to get there. |
| enjoying learning | The same as it is for any other student |
| When my students are engaged in the learning process and enjoy learning. | They same thing as all other students. Enjoying learning and understanding what is being taught. |

**Elementary School Diff_not_Deficit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15 Define EdSuccess</th>
<th>Q28 Success for NA st?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I define educational success by achieving an understanding of what’s being taught.</td>
<td>Success is the same for everyone. Getting good greats, doing what you’re supposed to do, working hard. Meeting the expectations of your teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing the best that you can do</td>
<td>Being able to work to the best of their ability always striving for proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking the kids from where they are at and moving them forward.</td>
<td>To be able to go forth and do whatever they choose to do in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing scaffolded support that enables every child to become mathematically proficient and fostering in each child, the confidence to be a persistent mathematician.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplemental Data: Questions Twenty One and Thirty**

**Sage Creek Elementary School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q21 ID Good T Chars</th>
<th>Q30 Char Succ T for NA st?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher is organized, knows the content area and has good relations with his/her students.</td>
<td>Caring, doing what it takes to make them successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring and dedicated to their craft</td>
<td>Successful teaching is successful teaching each child is an individual with their own world perspective, interests and abilities and that where good teachers start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding and persistent</td>
<td>Calm, enthusiastic, non judgmental, sense of humor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable and creative</td>
<td>High expectations, knowledge and respect of their students culture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Love theirs students, empathize, don't back down, strait forward, patient, GOOD SENSE OF HUMOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A successful teacher is one who keeps the needs of ALL their students in mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upbeat, positive, willing to adapt to kids' needs, willing to learn and try new ways of teaching, a love for children, willing to go outside of own comfort zone to try something, update knowledge (classes),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The same characteristics for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers who &quot;Know&quot; their students, how they learn and are able to identify student needs, organization, positive relationships built with their students, ability to work/communicate with parents and other staff</td>
<td>Researching and putting forth the best practices. Always using the testing to guide their students to the next level of success in learning. Keeping an open mind and willing to go the extra mile to help a student to learn. They put the time and effort into their teaching and are well prepared. They communicate with the parents on how well their children are doing and send home weekly notes in the homework. They are positive, good attitude, willing to change their style of teaching for the better of the children and love to teach. They also accept the children where they are at and take them to the best ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One that does not see them as a Native American but a child and expects all children to do their best and to succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy, friendly, invested in kids, sense of humor</td>
<td>Cultural Awareness, Mentor, Role Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring, positive, hard working, empathic,</td>
<td>One who looks at each child individually, takes them where they are at, and moves them forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A successful teacher will try to know their Native American students, find out about their culture, find out how to use the culture in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving, caring, trusting,</td>
<td>Patience, clam, loving, and supportive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of continuum of skills, works at building relationships with students, maintains respectful demeanor when reprimanding students</td>
<td>respecting students as a human being first - then embracing the notion that we are a school family and a community of learners who take care of each other, spread good-will to others and we are all equally important - when students are gone - still naming them and hoping they are well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trustworthy, caring, organized</td>
<td>A successful teacher of any child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring, understanding, always trying new programs to improve students understanding.</td>
<td>The same as any other teacher!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate, understanding, well educated, flexible, multi-taskers, personable, easy going.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable  Caring  Look at each students needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind, caring, flexible, strong, organized.</td>
<td>Structured, consistent, fair, organized, caring, kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle ways, organized so they are relaxed to teach, flexible, use different teaching methods and not just out of the book, infuse technology whenever possible.</td>
<td>Someone who is sensitive to them, a listener, not a shouter, asks them to do things that take skill, ask about their life, and include them in decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good teachers look at individual kids, know their content, take classes to improve their own skills, and have a sense of humor and compassion.</td>
<td>Same as for any other kid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring, enthusiastic, knowledgeable, flexible, and learning</td>
<td>Again, a successful teacher for Native American students is the same teacher that is a success for other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful, happy, lots of energy for the students know the content that is being taught, can control behaviors calmly.</td>
<td>Caring, listening, enthusiastic, genuine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion, empathy, high expectations, life-long learners' team players</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of our students, willingness to incorporate Native American values into lesson plans.</td>
<td>Utilizes cooperative learning, willing to be open to the values of other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patience, organized, prepared, loving, knowledgeable</td>
<td>Someone who is kind, caring, loving, knowledgeable, with high expectations for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient, caring, calm, dependable</td>
<td>Making any all students feel successful and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High Standards  Pro-Active Classroom Management  Warm, Empathic, and Caring  Excellent "kid watchers"

**Pasque Middle School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q21 ID Good T Chars</th>
<th>Q30 Char Succ T for NA st?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher must be patient and have compassion. We must take the time to listen to everything our students need to talk about. Including things that occur outside school.</td>
<td>A successful teacher is one that treats all students equally. Their race or religion does not determine how they are treated. We just need to look at each student as an individual and determine what his or her needs are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring, dedicated, intelligent, hard working</td>
<td>caring, consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring, positive, knowledgeable, respectful</td>
<td>One who cares and expects a lot from the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing, trustworthy, honest, upfront with each student and co-workers</td>
<td>Non judgmental, accepting, not critical, Positive attitude toward their students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They show they care, and they are good at getting the students involved in their education. The workshop approach is very valuable.</td>
<td>One who cares, builds relationships, and teaches the value of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistency in expectations high expectations for students they set out clear, explicit instructions for new tasks and model these instructions have a good rapport with students and staff they always consider individual differences in ability and backgrounds and adjust expectations as needed</td>
<td>Same as I listed in #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience, calmness, on even keel, perseverance, high expectations, humor, laughs w/ students.</td>
<td>caring, calmness, fairness, perseverance, high expectations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about students and curriculum, willingness to work hard, willing to try new things (risk takers.....good communication skills</td>
<td>openness honesty caring educated knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm, caring, teach at the students level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent routines, procedures, systems, and rituals.  High professionalism A sense of urgency in the classroom: We have much good work to do today.&quot; They communicate a sense of hope and a belief that all kids</td>
<td>Someone who believes that Native American students have a unique culture that should be respected and valued. A teacher who understands the demands of the dominant culture knows that students from all cultures must have certain skills in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can learn.</td>
<td>to survive and go beyond survival to succeed in the world at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to student achievement, Caring for students, Differentiation</td>
<td>First building a relationship with the student, and expecting success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop interpersonal skills with students. Empathic Firm but understanding</td>
<td>They don't see culture as a handicap and expect less!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative, enthusiastic, caring, hard-working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relationships with students, good knowledge of dealing with children of poverty, good content knowledge, caring, involved, show a love of life long learning.</td>
<td>Know the culture, understand poverty, know how they respond differently from other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent, dependable, willing to help solve problems, has relationships with both students and teachers</td>
<td>compassion, good listening skills, good at building a rapport with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers who have built relationships with their students. These teachers show they care and are cheerleaders for their kids.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated, hard working, care about the students, never give up on the student no matter what the behavior or background issue. They care about the student and their fellow teachers and support each other throughout all of the trials and tribulations.</td>
<td>I feel that the most important element that I have brought to the class is respect for them and their culture. I also believe that holding them to high standards is also imperative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited about their subject matter A true love for children at this age Good sense of humor Knowledge of their content area</td>
<td>Being sensitive to their needs and their culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love and respect their kids good class management relate subject to kids</td>
<td>same as any successful teacher, I would imagine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids centered. Good communicator. Willing to put in the extra time. Willingness to change their teaching practice, especially if it is good for kids.</td>
<td>Recognizing the need to do things differently for each student. We cannot treat our students the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Dedicated Efficacious Familial Knowledgeable</td>
<td>Caring, honest, fair, and impartial. Understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having fun with the kids and with what you are teaching</td>
<td>be fair and take an interest in there lives outside of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humor, flexible, love of their job, listener, creative, high expectations</td>
<td>The same as for all students that I listed before. I would add culture to the list but again for all students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understand their students  Forge strong relationships with their students  have high expectations of their students

Inquiyery and workshop models where students build their own understandings.

Patience  High expectations  Love of learning  Dedication  Sense of humor  Respect

The students like them. They have a sense of humor. Uses the constructivists approach to teaching  Enjoys their job.

Understanding, friendly, open nonjudgmental, build strong relationships, consistent

A builder of relationships with the students and if possible the families, caring, fair, supportive hands on teaching, patient, understanding of cultural norms, and insist on excellence from all students.

Those who care, teach.

A teacher that is willing to understand the culture and adjust teaching styles to the different learning style of the Native American. The values and things that are important are very different.

Again, they need to provide the tools for every individual, no matter what ethnic class to be successful.

For me, I teach writing from a writer's workshop approach. They must feel safe and learn to trust. My students trust me and continue to come see me and call me. I have been to baby showers, weddings, and funerals. That is because they knew I care and in the workshop approach, you can conference one on one and help them.

**Western High School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q21 ID Good T Char</th>
<th>Q30 Char Succ T for NA st?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Try to create positive experiences  Tries to have a one on one conversation with each student in every class over a months span. Understands student learning differences  Tries to turn a negative into a positive</td>
<td>Anyone who makes an effort to get to know them a little better than the first day they came to class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring, high expectations, follow through, energetic, enthusiastic, engaging, role model, take time for kids, respectful, innovative,...</td>
<td>One who can reach, mentor and help the student make that career step.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relate to them, Can't just let them be themselves. You have to get to know who they are and challenge them to be their best
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relate well to students, Know their subject matter and set high standards &amp; expectations for their students</td>
<td>cares about her students and her material. Wants learning to be meaningful and enjoyable and tries to instill skills to help students master the material and take pride in their achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma, passion for teaching, sense of humor, knowledge of material, responsible, caring, non-judgmental, forgiving, accepting of all learning abilities, compassionate.</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers that have clear expectation for students Teacher that presents information in various learning strategies. Teachers that have the respect of the students.</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimenters, innovators, hands-on activities, integration of culture and integration of technology</td>
<td>One who shows respect and trust toward a student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable, understanding, friendly, caring, hold students to high standards</td>
<td>One who is caring, who takes the time to earn the students trust, who can get the student to buy into doing the homework, and who has a student with educationally supportive parents in the home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They care about their individual students. They are willing to examine their own practices in order to improve. They are tolerant and respectful of differences in style and belief. They are willing to move outside their own comfort zone in order to do the best for their students.</td>
<td>Caring, respectful, patient, persistent, insistent on high standards, fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring, humor, and challenging</td>
<td>Having knowledge about the culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard working, care about students, knowledgeable</td>
<td>Treat them equally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, good people skills can get students to buy into what they teach.</td>
<td>Don't know what a &quot;successful' teacher for N.A. students is? What do you define as a &quot;successful&quot; teacher of N.A. students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personable and sensitive to student needs</td>
<td>Learning and applying knowledge to their future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable, compassionate, patient, high expectations</td>
<td>One that offers them all of the opportunities to learn along with all students. A teacher who understands that the material needs to be relevant and useful for future success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers who are successful design and implement effective lesson plans, offer understandable explanation, offer assistance outside of class time, work with students who are struggling, hold students to high standards, make their expectations clear, and try to find ways to connect with every student.</td>
<td>The same as for a teacher of any students. See my answer above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience, compassion, dedication</td>
<td>good example of promptness and attendance; relate well with students / take a personal interest in students; organized; solid understanding of content; work well with other teachers; work well under authority; participate in small- and large-group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine caring  Love of Learning  Going the extra mile</td>
<td>Open mindedness and caring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personability, compassion, good listening skills, knowledge of subject, ability to convey said knowledge.</td>
<td>Successful is successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good teachers at Central sincerely care about their students and have an overwhelming enthusiasm for their subject area. They demonstrate respect for themselves, their colleagues, and their students. Good teachers put extra time into preparing lesson plans that will be engaging and appropriate for the grade level taught and students taught. They are also flexible and are able to laugh at themselves when they make mistakes. Good teachers teach by example how to be good citizens and create in their students the curiosity needed for lifelong learning.</td>
<td>Somebody who understands the culture and makes connections with the students. Being understanding, respectful, and non-judgmental are all important characteristics of a successful teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude, sincerely care of students, enjoy teaching.</td>
<td>They need to like the teacher and know the teacher likes and cares about them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual, professional (not sharing with the world), structured, organized, caring, willing to differentiate, willing to understand where student is coming from, consistent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy, relationship builders, caring, knowledge.</td>
<td>Same rules and expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Good Knowledge of content</td>
<td>see # 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic flexibility, ability to notice when a student is sinking, ability to work with students to bring them back up</td>
<td>Never giving up and being persistent. Realizing that some students have very harsh lives and live in a bad environment which affects their school life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The good teachers I know have a solid knowledge of their subject matter, have a passion for teaching, and enjoy the company of their students. These three things are what make them work so hard day in and day out.</td>
<td>In order to be successful with Native students, I think a teacher should be flexible and genuine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive with students energetic lessons Experts on the content talks to students know material</td>
<td>the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong personal skills, empathy, rapport, uses different modes of instruction, strong knowledge base and understands the age group in which they teach.</td>
<td>Rapport, empathy, personable, strong knowledge base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicates with students, goes the extra mile for students, is student driven not curriculum driven</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High standards, rigorous curricula, humor with students, good rapport with students, solid knowledge of content,</td>
<td>This teacher would probably try to get to know the student on a personal basis. He/she would be available for more one-on-one work with the student. Most importantly, he/she would have high expectations for Native American students just like he/she does for the rest of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great communicators, captivating, interested in their students and their student’s activities, willingness to teach across curriculum if it makes sense for the topic at hand.</td>
<td>Someone that understands native culture, patient, willingness to listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for students for help and make-up work; Fair and consistent; Enjoys being around teenagers.</td>
<td>Not any different than one for any other student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring about the students more than caring about what is being taught</td>
<td>Helping students see a connection between school success and work success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind, responsible, innovative lessons, technology usage, differentiation of instruction, organized, involved</td>
<td>I would say that a teacher is just understanding of each student’s needs, not just Native American students. They are aware of what may help encourage a student to do well, but they also hold each student no matter who, accountable for learning at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care about all kids-flexible-sense of humor</td>
<td>the end of the day. NO excuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring  Friendly  Enthusiastic  Desire to Continue Learning  Love Teenagers</td>
<td>establish trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm, hard work, keeping curriculum fresh, relevancy of primary sources.</td>
<td>Understanding...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest  Integrity  Organized  Knowledge of course content  Compassion  Passionate about the teaching field</td>
<td>same as for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build relationships  fair  listen  put in extra time</td>
<td>A trustworthy adult  Personal knowledge of that person's life  Knowledge and reflection of their culture in the classroom  Availability to help them achieve success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude. Energy. Creativity. Fun.</td>
<td>See #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated  Good Communication Skills  Humorous  patient, good listeners, flexible, real people</td>
<td>A teacher that engages them in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate, understanding, attends extra-curricular events, takes a real interest in the lives of students, lives in the &quot;gray&quot; area of life rather than only seeing black and white.</td>
<td>A teacher that you can count on to be consistent and give you a sense of belonging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexible, good discipline, mastery of block scheduling, well designed lessons</td>
<td>I don't know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have relationships with their students. They know their subject. They are able to get the ideas across in a fun way.</td>
<td>Again - understanding the outside lives of these students. Most live in poverty and could really care less about your homework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest, high expectations, non-judgmental, flexible, understanding.</td>
<td>Flexible, caring, willing to adapt instruction as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relationships with students, enjoy their subject area, organized, fun, high expectations, good classroom management</td>
<td>It is a teacher who can relate to the student, have a relationship, and thus get the material across.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One that can relate to all students and is fair and understanding, yet firm with high standards.</td>
<td>Same as I wrote for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relationships with students, enjoy their subject area, organized, fun, high expectations, good classroom management</td>
<td>The same as a generally successful teacher: enjoys students, teaching, and their subject area, with passion, organization, and determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One that can relate to all students and is fair and understanding, yet firm with high standards.</td>
<td>I don't know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Very cheerful with the students. They talk to them individually and know what is going on in their lives. They go the extra mile. For example, the orchestra teacher came in before going to jury duty each day. I am proud to be his colleague.

All students are treated in a unique and valuable way, Native students have expectations placed on them that are no different than any other culture, honoring the special days that honor native American heroes, getting the students to share stories that their ancestors shared with them.

Teacher Characteristics Questions Twenty One and Thirty

Humanistic Collapsed

Relational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships/ Caring/ Love</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance/ Respect</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded/ Non-judgmental</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same rule/expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy/ understanding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved/ Available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interpersonal Skill**

- Communication/ listen  | 9 | 4 | 5
- Friendly/ kind         | 2 | 1 | 4
- Patient               | 5 | 4 | 4
- Humor                 | 6 | 5 | 4
- Professional          | 3 | 1 | 0
- Dedication            | 5 | 5 | 3
- Role model            | 2 | 0 | 1
- Enthusiasm            | 4 | 2 | 5
- Flexible              | 9 | 0 | 8
- Enjoy teaching        | 2 | 3 | 0
- Energetic             | 3 | 0 | 1
- Withitness            | 1 | 0 | 0
- Fair                  | 4 | 4 | 1
- Consistent            | 3 | 5 | 1
- Persistent            | 2 | 0 | 1
- Genuine               | 1 | 0 | 1
- Honest                | 2 | 3 | 0
- Integrity             | 1 | 0 | 0
- Creativity            | 1 | 2 | 1
- Engaging              | 2 | 0 | 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion for teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People skill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends extra-curricular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes connections w/st</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-long learner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love of learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go extra mile</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interest in students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy going</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Characteristics Questions Twenty One and Thirty
Academic

Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid content</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigorous curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach across</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
curriculum

- Innovative 3 0 0
- Experimenter 1 1 1
- Technology 2 0 1
- Connect school/work 1 0 0
- Knowledge/ PDK 2 3 5
- Relevance 1 0 0
- Enjoys their subject 1 0 0
- Research best practice 0 0 0
- Testing guides instr. 0 0 0

Skills

- Multi-modal 1 0 1
- Student accountability 1 0 0
- Differentiation 4 3 0
- Organized 5 0 8
- Understand learner differences 1 2 0
- Challenge 2 0 0
- High expectations 5 9 3
- High standards 7 1 1
- Clear expectations 2 1 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for kids</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates w/students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student buy-in</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student centered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fresh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works well w/others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works well w/authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t back down</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight forward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-tasking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>Count 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop-learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Kid watcher”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perseverance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate content to student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of poverty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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