2007-03-21

A Multiple-Case Study of Secondary Reading Specialists

Linda Lucille Frost
Brigham Young University - Provo

A MULTIPLE-CASE STUDY OF SECONDARY READING SPECIALISTS

by

Linda Lucille Frost

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of

Brigham Young University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Department of Teacher Education

Brigham Young University

April 2007

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a dissertation submitted by

Linda Lucille Frost

This dissertation has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

3/9/07	Roni Jo Draper, Chair
Date	
3/9/07	Kendra Hall
Date	
3/9/07	A. Legrande Richards
Date	
3/9/07	Leigh Smith
Date	
3/14/07	Janet Young
Date	

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee, I have read the dissertation of Linda Lucille Frost in it final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

3/9/07
Date

Roni Jo Draper
Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Department

Roni Jo Draper
Graduate Coordinator

Accepted for the College

K. Richard Young
Dean, David O. McKay School of Education

ABSTRACT

A MULTIPLE-CASE STUDY OF SECONDARY READING SPECIALISTS

Linda Lucille Frost

Department of Teacher Education

Doctor of Education

This multiple-case study examined the role and educator perceptions of the reading specialist (RS) in the five secondary schools of one school district in the western United States. The purposes of the study were to determine: (1) the actual roles and responsibilities of the secondary RS, (2) whether differences existed in the way RSs, teachers, and principals perceived the role of the RS, and (3) whether the perceptions of the role of the RS were congruent with what the RS actually did. Five RSs, five focus groups comprised of twenty-three teachers, and five principals were interviewed. A survey was also administered to the aforementioned groups as well as to all teachers in the five schools. Results indicated that the role and responsibilities of the RS never included instructing students directly but that RSs focused almost exclusively on teacher leadership. In addition, RSs carried out school-wide assessments, assumed two to three additional major as well as various minor responsibilities within the school, and taught four periods during the day. Perceptions of the RS among RSs, teachers, and principals

differed. Teachers, as a whole, indicated RSs worked with students, mainly taught literacy skills, and did not perform administrative tasks unrelated to literacy. Principals also thought RSs did not perform administrative tasks unrelated to literacy. RSs disagreed with all these perceptions. Principals approved and were generally satisfied with the work of the RSs and felt they were making a difference. However, they were more positive about the RSs' influence than were the RSs. Focus group teachers made positive comments about the RSs but also consistently brought up the need to have literacy inservice fashioned specifically to meet their content-area needs. Discrepancies existed between the perceived roles and responsibilities of the RSs and the duties they actually assumed and carried out.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many, many thanks to:

Serena Tyra – a soon to be EdD, steadfast colleague, and friend without whom I would have been swallowed up in the quagmire of statistics and graduate work

The Five LCs – representatives of the best that there is in education and educators I am glad to know and to have worked with

Drs. Kendra Hall, A. LeGrande Richards, Leigh Smith, and Janet Young – committee members who made time for me and answered my questions with grace and generosity

Dr. Roni Jo Draper – a committee chair whose intellect and spirit I greatly admire and whose insight, patience, and encouragement kept this project and me alive

The Frost Family – a constant source of love and support that I am blessed and privileged to be a member of and from whom I have learned all lessons good and meaningful.

May God bless each of you abundantly for your goodness to me.

I owe Him everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables. xii

Chapter

1. Introduction. 1

Background of the Problem. 1

Development of the Reading Specialist Position. . . 2

Reading Specialists in Secondary Schools. 8

Purpose of the Study. 12

Rationale. 13

Assumptions. 15

Definition of Key Terms. 15

2. Review of Literature. 19

Roles and Responsibilities of the Reading Specialist. 20

Perceptions of the Role of the Reading Specialist. 27

Reading Specialists' Perceptions of the Role of the of the Reading Specialist 28

Teachers' Perceptions of the Role of the Reading Specialist 34

Principals' Perceptions of the Role of the Reading Specialist 38

Summary. 41

3. Methodology. 44

Multiple-case Study 44

Participants 47

Theoretical Framework 50
Quantitative Data 52
Survey Development. 52
Survey Administration 57
Survey Analysis 58
Qualitative Data 59
Time Logs/Weekly Personal Response 59
Observations. 60
Interviews 61
Qualitative Data Analysis 62
Researcher Stance 64
4. Results. 66
The School District 67
Arbor Middle School 71
Demographics of Arbor Middle School. . . . 71
The LC and Her Responsibilities 72
Blaine Middle School 74
Demographics of Blaine Middle School. . . . 74
The LC and Her Responsibilities 75
Claybourne High School 78
Demographics of Claybourne High School. . 78
The LC and Her Responsibilities 79

Dover High School 82

Demographics of Dover High School. 82

The LC and Her Responsibilities 83

East High School 86

Demographics of East High School. 86

The LC and Her Responsibilities 87

Comparison and Contrast of LC Responsibilities in the District. 89

Instruction of Students. 89

Diagnosis and Assessment. 91

Leadership. 94

Professional development meetings. 94

Peer coaching 99

Miscellaneous leadership duties. 104

Summary of Comparison and Contrast of LC Responsibilities in Selected School District . 107

Differences in Perceptions Among LCs, Teachers, and Principals. 109

Research Question Two – Sub question (a). 114

Research Question Two – Sub question (b). 118

Research Question Two – Sub question (c). 123

Summary of Differences in Perceptions Among LCs, Teachers, and Principals 126

Teacher and Principal Attitudes 128

Additional Teacher Perceptions. 133

Additional Principal Perceptions. 141

Current LC Duties and Perceptions of LC Duties. 145

Chapter Summary. 147

5. Conclusions. 150

Roles and Responsibilities of the LC 150

LC Responsibilities and Restrictions vs. Adequate Resources and Compensation . . .151

No Job Description and Flexibility vs. LC Job Description and Manageable Role 152

Conflicting Nature of the LC Duties – the Ideal vs. Reality 156

Differing Perceptions of the Role of the LC. 159

Conflicting Teacher Perceptions about LCs' Literacy Instruction 161

Limitations 164

Recommendations for Further Research 165

References. 168

Appendices. 176

A. Letters of Consent 177

B. Surveys 181

C. Principal Cover Letter 195

D. Daily and Weekly Task Logs. 197

E. Interview Questions. 200

List of Tables

Page

Table 1 – Ethnic background of total secondary student body in the district 48

Table 2 – Format of questions on the LC, principal, and teacher surveys 55

Table 3 – Arbor Middle School 2005-06 student body ethnic makeup. 71

Table 4 – Blaine Middle School 2005-06 student body ethnic makeup. 75

Table 5 – Middle School Literacy Coordinators 78

Table 6 – Claybourne High 2005-06 student body ethnic makeup. 79

Table 7 – Dover High 2005-06 student body ethnic makeup. 83

Table 8 – East High 2005-06 student body ethnic makeup 86

Table 9 – High School Literacy Coordinators 89

Table 10 – Analysis of variance for perceptional differences among LCs, principals, and teachers. 111

Table 11 – English teachers vs. all other teachers. 116

Table 12 – Teachers with any literacy certification/inservice vs. teachers without any literacy certification/inservice. 119

Table 13 – Middle school teachers vs. high school teachers. 124

Table 14 – Analysis of variance for perceptional differences among LCs, principals, and teachers on teacher attitude and the role of the principal. 129

Chapter One

Introduction

Background of the Problem

Since the time of the Industrial Revolution when education for all young people became compulsory and not just for the wealthy, one of the American educational system's goals has been to find more effective and efficient methods and approaches to increase the reading achievement of students (Bond & Dykstra, 1966; Chall, 1967; Davis, 1944; Duke, 2000; Durkin, 1972; Freire, 1970; Gates, 1937; Goodman, 1986; Morphett & Washburn, 1931; NRP, 2000; Pressley, 2002; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; Thorndike, 1917). The intervening century has tremendously increased the knowledge base on literacy, and numerous research-based studies have affected substantial changes in how literacy is taught.

The current study focuses on one such change intended to bolster the reading abilities of students in elementary and secondary schools: the use of reading specialists. The International Reading Association (IRA, 2000) defines a *reading specialist* as "…a professional with advanced preparation and experience in reading who has responsibility (i.e., providing instruction, serving as a resource to teachers) for the literacy performance of readers in general and of struggling readers in particular" (p. 1). In addition, the IRA specifies that the roles of a reading specialist fall into three categories: (a) instruction, (b) diagnosis and assessment, and (c) leadership. While reading specialists have generally been well received and utilized in elementary schools over time, the same has not held true at the secondary level. Issues particular to the secondary level will be discussed

following a brief account of the history and influences that have shaped the reading specialist position.

Development of the Reading Specialist Position

Reading specialists first made an appearance in public schools in the late 1930s, functioning in a supervisory capacity with teachers to boost student achievement by honing and perfecting school reading programs (Bean, 2004a; Robinson, 1967). In the intervening 75 years, the role of the reading specialist has altered to meet the changing understanding of student needs and/or demands of the times. One such role change was having the reading specialist move into struggling readers' regular classrooms to work with those students rather then pulling them out for separate classes (Bean & Eichelberger, 1985; Brownell & Walther-Thomas, 2000). Another role change was that of professional development leader to help teachers meet the needs of a much more diverse student population. This diversity had increased as a result of the passage of Public Law 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act, in 1975 and the mainstreaming of all students (Carvell & Kerr, 1980). Since the 1930s, reading specialists have assumed a variety of roles and responsibilities (Bean, 1979, 2004a; Robinson, 1967) which have carried a multitude of titles, including reading teacher, remedial reading teacher, reading consultant, reading coordinator, reading clinician, reading coach, and so forth (Dietrich, 1967; Robinson, 1958).

Bean (1979) indicates that the roles of the reading specialists can run from one end of the spectrum, focusing solely on the needs of children, to the other, attending only to the needs of the teachers. What duties a reading specialist actually performs are a result of many factors, such as "the type of program, expectations of a specific institution or

agency, as well as the qualifications and values of the individual assuming the role" (p. 409).

In the 1960s, the U.S. government, through legislation and funding was responsible for paving the way for reading specialists to become permanent fixtures in public schools, though at that time usually in the form of Chapter I teachers or remedial reading teachers. Their primary role was that of remediation teacher. In this capacity, their work was almost always of an instructional nature and with students. This first real recognition of the need for reading specialists began in 1965 when the U.S. Government passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which became the largest educational funding source in U.S. history and provided two billion dollars to meet the needs of children who were educationally deprived (Dole, 2004; Georgia State Department of Education, 1977, p. 7). In order to qualify for these Title I funds, the majority of students attending any given school had to be primarily from low socioeconomic status (SES) families. Additionally, Title I funds were to be used exclusively to provide these low SES children, primarily in the early grades, with additional resources and services in fundamental skill areas beyond those already being utilized in the schools (Georgia State Department of Education, 1977). One Title I service that was funded by this act was the hiring of reading specialists and aides to work solely with those students struggling with basic literacy skills. It was with this initial bill that reading specialists became standard members of school faculties, functioning primarily in remediation capacities (Bean, 2004a).

Remediation and/or pullout programs (programs for low income students struggling with basic skills which pulled students out of their mainstream classes for

separate instruction by reading specialists) were created because of the compensatory nature of the Title I programs. Schools had to ensure that Title I funds and the resources they provided were used solely for students meeting Title I qualifications. These pullout programs, while attempting to improve the reading achievement of students, created other problems, the greatest being that Title I students now had *two* reading curricula to learn instead of one (Bean, Cooley, Eichelberger, Lazar, & Zigmond, 1991; Brown & Walther-Thomas, 2000). Little, if any interchange took place between the mainstream teacher and the reading specialist or Title I aides. Other problematic issues included supplemental instruction that focused on workbook completion with little time to read, frustration of classroom teachers over students who were constantly leaving and entering class, and Title I students being labeled as incompetent (Bean, 2004a).

In the 1970s and 80s, as issues about the effectiveness of Title I were being raised, there were also many educators who supported the position that reading specialists should assume more responsibilities, such as working in tandem with mainstream teachers and finding ways of incorporating the reading specialist into the mainstream classroom (Bean, 2004a). Assessment also became more of a responsibility for the reading specialist as standardized testing came under criticism as the sole indicator of student ability. School administrators and educators wanted more authentic means of assessing reading achievement and reading specialists began to work with classroom teachers to develop alternative measures of success in reading. Additionally, as research-based studies began to identify best instructional practices, researchers were advocating that teachers implement more direct instruction and explicit teaching strategies (Bean & Eichelberger, 1985).

As a result of government legislation and funding as well as reading research in the 1970's and 1980's, the number of roles and responsibilities the reading specialist assumed greatly increased. This was possible because Title I was primarily a source of funding and school districts were allowed great latitude in determining the roles and responsibilities of reading specialists. Not surprisingly, roles and responsibilities of the reading specialist varied from district to district and state to state (Bean, 1979; Quadroche, Bean & Hamilton, 2001; Robinson, 1967).

By the end of the 20th century, the number of reading specialists in the schools was declining due to mixed results in the evaluation of the effectiveness of Title I programs. However, this same time period (including the beginning of the 21st century) also brought a corresponding increase in government legislation mandating that reading achievement improve through more effective teacher instruction. For example, in 1998 President Bill Clinton amended the Title II EASA with the Reading Excellence Act containing reading directives which Serafini (2005) summed up in these words:

> [the legislation is] to provide children with the readiness skills and support they need in early childhood to learn to read once they enter school, teach every child to read by third grade, and *improve the instructional practices of teachers and instructional staff in America's elementary schools."* [italics added] (p. 2)

Serafini emphasized the importance and necessity of continually updating and improving the instructional skills of those who teach America's young people. As it has never been realistic to think that all teachers are able to return to universities for professional refresher courses, the conclusion that reading specialists would provide the link between ongoing professional development and the public schools was, and is, a logical one.

In 2001, under President George W. Bush, Title II of the ESEA became the No Child Left Behind Act (South Carolina Department of Education, 2005) which currently mandates how reading achievement will be assessed and how funding can be used to develop and support "high quality" teachers and paraprofessionals (South Carolina Department of Education, 2005). Again, an emphasis had been placed on strengthening the skills and abilities of the individual classroom teacher.

As the roles and responsibilities of reading specialists have developed throughout the last few decades, the IRA has periodically issued position statements in order to bring some definition and consensus as to what the qualifications of the reading specialist are and the duties they perform (International Reading Association [IRA], 1968, 1998, 2000). The current position statement states: "The reading specialist is a professional with advanced preparation and experience in reading who has responsibility (i.e., providing instruction, serving as a resource to teachers) for the literacy performance of readers in general and of struggling readers in particular" (2000, p. 1). Additionally,

> Reading specialists can assume multiple roles in schools, depending on the needs of the student population and teachers in the district….However, all specialists, regardless of role, must be involved in supporting the work of the classroom teacher and in developing the reading program so that it is effective for all students. The major roles of reading specialists, each of which contributes to the improvement of student learning, are instruction, assessment, and leadership. (p. 2)

IRA acknowledges that reading specialists do, indeed, have multiple roles and function in a variety of capacities within a school setting. However, all efforts made by reading specialists should benefit the classroom teacher and the overall school reading program.

Currently, IRA (2000) emphasizes the leadership role of the reading specialist in order to more effectively utilize resources to meet government mandates as well as capitalize on research findings and increase instructional effectiveness (Bean, 2004a; *Coaches, Consensus, and Controversy*, 2004; Neufeld & Roper, 2003). One outcome of this emphasis is the emergence of reading specialists who work almost solely with teachers in a professional development capacity rather than with individual or small groups of students. In this role, they have been called reading coaches or literacy coaches (Bean, 2004a; Buly, Coskie, Robinson, & Egawa, 2004; Dole, 2004; Sturtevant, 2003).

In their position statement on reading coaches, the IRA (2004) recognizes this shift in emphasis and the wide range of variability that exists in the responsibilities that reading coaches assume, many of which are identical to those of the reading specialist. Though there is no specific job description or standards set for a reading coach, IRA (2004) states:

> If reading professionals are serving in these roles [any of the roles of the reading specialist] (regardless of their titles), they must meet the standards for reading specialist/literacy coach as indicated in the *Standards for Reading Professionals, Revised 2003*…. However, in many cases reading professionals employed in these new positions are specifically focused on coaching classroom teachers and supporting them in their daily work within a specific school building or buildings. These reading professionals do not supervise or evaluate teachers but rather

> collaborate with teachers to achieve specific professional development goals. Ideally, these reading coaches would meet the standards for reading specialist/literacy coach in *Standards for Reading Professionals, Revised 2003* and hold a reading specialist certificate. (p. 1)

This excerpt from the current position statement on reading coaches is indicative of the focus of the entire document: what the reading coach must know and do when working with classroom *teachers*. Nowhere in the statement is specific mention made of reading coaches personally interacting with students.

Affirming this shift to an even greater extent is IRA's (2006) most recent standards publication, *Standards for Middle and High School Literacy Coaches*. In this publication, the first specifically targeting secondary schools, the standards set for literacy coaches at the secondary level are all focused on how literacy coaches work with faculty members to improve their abilities to integrate reading and writing skills into their teaching though collaboration, coaching, evaluation of needs, and instruction strategies. Again, there is no mention of literacy personnel working directly with students. Moreover, this publication makes no reference to a *reading specialist* even when referring to those who work in tandem with the literacy coach. This seems to indicate that the literacy coach *is* the reading specialist and in fact, IRA's revised 2003 *Standards for Professionals*, treats the two synonymously.

Reading Specialists in Secondary Schools

Most of the research concerning reading specialists and their roles and responsibilities has been documented in elementary schools. Because of the origin and specifications of the original Title I money, the first classrooms in which reading

specialists were placed were in the primary grades. And for the last 40 years, due to the emphasis on early intervention, the focus has mainly remained there (Bean, Swan, & Knaub, 2003; Dole, 2004; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). Encouragingly, IRA's (2006) *Standards for Middle and High School Literacy Coaches,* signifies that the literacy needs of secondary students are beginning to receive more attention and that more research into this area is being funded. The publication is significant not only because it identifies funding for current adolescent literacy research but also because it identifies for the first time, standards that are specifically set for secondary school literacy coaches. It is also significant because it was drafted and published by the IRA in tandem with the National Council of Teachers of English, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Science Teachers Association, and National Council for the Social Studies. This partnership indicates content-areas other than language arts recognize literacy as an issue.

While attention to secondary reading specialists is growing, they do not yet exist or function to the same degree as they currently do in elementary schools. In elementary schools, it is possible to see reading specialists performing a variety of tasks related to both the reading specialist and reading coach position statements although there seems to be a general trend for reading specialists to assume a stronger reading coach role and work more with teachers on professional development and less with students in an instructional capacity (Bean, 2004a). This emphasis focuses on not only strengthening individual classroom teachers' literacy instruction but also greatly increasing the number of students who benefit from the reading specialist's knowledge.

However, finding, placing, and using certified secondary reading specialists in the secondary schools has occurred at a much slower pace (Moberg, 1967; Ruddell,1993).

Ruddell (1993) and Barry (1994) identified factors that affect this situation. One factor was that initially, there were very few, if any, certified secondary reading specialists. Those positions that did exist were filled by relocated elementary reading specialists or untrained secondary English teachers who did not know how to design or utilize literacy strategies to meet the needs of content-area teachers. This continues to be a challenge today (Bean, Cassidy, Grumet, Earle, Shelton, & Wallis, 2002). Moreover, the nature of the instruction offered to students was usually that of remediation rather than prevention of reading difficulties or collaboration with mainstream teachers.

Another factor affecting the use of secondary reading specialists was that of teacher resistance. The Right to Read campaign, launched in the 1970s with the goal to have all students literate by 1980, stated that all teachers should be reading teachers (Barry, 1994; Ruddell, 1993). This call for all teachers to address literacy originated in the 1920s (Barry, 1994; Ruddell, 1993) and then, as now, has been the cause of contention. Many secondary teachers were and are resistant to this idea as they have not only been unwilling to give up content-area instruction for literacy instruction, but have also felt untrained to do so (Crain, 2003; Darwin, 2002; Walsh, 1986). This situation has created distance between reading teachers and content-area teachers, and attempts by reading specialists to share their literacy knowledge and strategies with content-area teachers often fail.

The subject of literacy training arises when discussing the discrepancy between what secondary teachers have been asked to do and what they feel capable of doing. Barry (1994) and Moburg (1967) note that even had secondary teachers wanted literacy training, the vast majority of higher institutions simply did not have reading methods

courses to offer, nor did state certification agencies require that they be taken. Barry (1994) states

> As recently as 1979, only 9 out of 50 states required one reading course for secondary certification; only 12 states had a reading course requirement as of 1980…and at present [1994] 25 states and the District of Columbia require a reading course for certification for prospective secondary educators. An additional three states require a reading course for those who will be certified to teach English and/or Social Studies. (pp. 19, 20)

This is double jeopardy for secondary school teachers. Not only must they consider how they will implement literacy instruction into their classrooms, but they must also deal with the fact that there are almost no sources to which they can go for support and direction to do so.

Finally, most of the funding for research regarding reading specialists and how they can be utilized has focused mainly on elementary schools. This is based on the rationale that the primary years are the most crucial for developing literacy skills (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; Vacca, 1998). As a result of this focus, plus the scarcity of qualified reading specialists, teacher resistance to literacy instruction, and lack of educational institutions prepared to train secondary teachers in literacy instruction, much less investigation of reading specialists has taken place in secondary schools. Consequently, there is still a great deal to discover about the responsibilities and roles of the reading specialist at the secondary level and how secondary content teachers, as well as local and district administrators, currently perceive the role of the reading specialist.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this multiple-case study is to examine what roles and responsibilities five reading specialists in five secondary schools in one school district located in the western United States actually assume and how principals and teachers in those same schools perceive the role of the reading specialist. Specifically, this study intends to address the following questions:

1. What duties and responsibilities do secondary reading specialists perform and how do these duties and responsibilities compare and contrast from school to school?

2. Is the role of the secondary level reading specialist perceived in a significantly different manner by any of the following groups: reading specialists, faculty members, and school administrators in each of the five secondary schools located within this school district and more specifically, (a) Do faculty members from core content-area backgrounds (math, science, English, social studies) perceive the role of the reading specialist in significantly different ways from those in non-core content-area backgrounds (PE, humanities, art, etc)? (b) Do faculty members with literacy endorsements and/or district literacy inservice perceive the role of the reading specialist in a significantly different way from those faculty members with no such literacy endorsements or inservice? (c) Do faculty members in middle schools perceive the role of the reading specialist in a significantly different way than those faculty members in the high schools?

3. How do the duties currently being undertaken by secondary reading specialists correspond to surveyed perceptions of the role of the reading specialist?

Rationale

There are several justifications for undertaking this study. First, reading specialists seem to be highly valued at the elementary level by teachers, principals, and district administrators alike. While few research-based studies have been conducted to determine if there is a direct correlation between the use of reading specialists and increased reading achievement, many studies indicate reading specialists and the expertise they provide to teachers are considered to be one of the most valuable resources schools have (Baker & Allington, 2003; Bean, Knaub, & Swan, 2000; Bean, Swan, & Knaub, 2003; Blackford, 2002; Quatroche, Bean, & Hamilton, 2001; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). However, there are few studies at the secondary level that examine this issue.

Second, the role of the reading specialist is evolving from one of mainly remediation work with struggling readers to one primarily aimed at professional support and development of teachers. If secondary content teachers and administration are aware of the shift in focus, then reading specialists will be working more with faculty to improve literacy instruction rather than working only with struggling readers on an individual or small group basis.

Third, principals and district administrators constantly make decisions that influence the funding and support of programs designed to reinforce and improve students' literacy abilities. A clearer understanding of what the reading specialist does and how content-area teachers and administrators perceive that role can inform school administrators how reading specialists benefit schools and how best to utilize and support them as well as justify funding their positions.

Fourth, the ongoing concern over the poor reading abilities of secondary level students cited again and again by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) (Applebee, 1994) as well as Mullis and Jenkins (1990), The Nation's Report Card (2003) and Biancarosa and Snow (2004) indicate that students are not becoming better readers and writers. In fact, while reading scores of junior and high school students have not decreased over the last 30-40 years or so, the literacy demands on them have increased (Blackford, 2002; Maleki & Heerman, 1994; Morris & Slavin, 2003). As a result, students are not progressing, but rather falling behind in the attempt to meet the literacy demands placed on them as they move into higher education and the work force. These findings support the idea that literacy education must be an ongoing process through elementary and secondary schools if students are to be successful in school. The question then arises as to what reading specialists are doing and how they are being utilized at the secondary level to help improve literacy achievement.

Finally, the findings from this study may help to inform university secondary education program developers and faculty of the responsibilities and needs of secondary reading specialists and content-area teachers. This information can be used to design courses that prepare the reading specialist to make a difference in the public schools.

Currently, more secondary reading specialists are being placed in public schools as a resource to help promote greater literacy achievement for all students. Given that development and the previously stated rationale, the goal of this study was to provide additional insight into the role and value of the secondary reading specialist.

Assumptions

When the rationale for any study is determined, assumptions are made. Those that were made as this study was considered were that reading specialists have literacy knowledge and expertise that can benefit students and teachers of both elementary and secondary schools (Readence, Baldwin, & Dishner, 1979; Schrekman, 1981) . Though subject matter may be of a depth and focus at the secondary level not thoroughly understood by reading specialists, many literacy strategies and approaches are appropriate for any kind of material and can be adapted to fit particular secondary needs if both reading specialist and content-area teachers work together (Readence, Baldwin, & Dishner, 1979; Schrekman, 1981).

School administrators hold positions of power in determining what goes on within their schools and their support and influence of a program or position can result in positive effects. Therefore, administrators must have a current and comprehensive view of how reading specialists in their schools are perceived and utilized in order to determine what their intended role should be and make decisions that positively affect all concerned: reading specialists, teachers, and students (Readence, Baldwin, and Dishner, 1980; Hutson, McDonell, and Fortune, 1982).

Definition of Key Terms

In this study, key terms are defined as follows:

Administrators – school or assistant principals as well as those administrators at the district level supervising achievement assessment, reading or otherwise; professional development of faculty and paraprofessionals; and curriculum development.

Content-area teacher – a teacher at the secondary level teaching any specific course content, i.e., English, math, history, science, art, and so forth.

English as a second language (ESL) – the term used to refer to a program or class or instruction that focuses on teaching English to non-native English speaking students.

English language learner (ELL) – the term used to refer to the student who is not a native English speaker and requires additional support in learning the English language.

Level 1 reading endorsement – Basic reading endorsement. This includes awareness of the foundations of literacy, content-area and early literacy instruction, as well as reading comprehension instruction, assessment and interventions, the writing process and children's literature.

Level 2 reading endorsement – Advanced reading endorsement. In addition to the basic endorsement requirements, this includes awareness of research in reading and supervision and staff development in reading instruction. A literacy specialist internship is also required.

Learning coach – the term used exclusively by Claybourne High School in this study to refer to the position of the reading specialist. It is synonymous with "literacy coordinator", the term used by all other schools in this study. "Learning coach" is used in the initial introduction and overall description of Claybourne High School as well as in specific reference to that school. In all other occasions, "literacy coordinator" is used.

Literacy coach – a term synonymous with reading specialist as literacy coaches may have some duties similar to the reading specialist. However, the major emphasis of a literacy coach is on working with teachers to improve their literacy instructional proficiency.

Literacy coordinator – the term used by the district in this study to refer to the position of reading specialist. After the review of literature is complete in Chapter 2, "literacy coordinator" is the term used throughout the remainder of this study. However, literacy coordinator is synonymous with reading specialist.

Perception of role – "Way in which a person views his functions as these functions are conditioned by his environment, interaction with others, abilities, and personality" (Davis, 1976, p. 15).

Professional development – instruction of any kind which targets improving the instructional literacy skills and abilities of teachers or paraprofessionals.

Reading coach – A reading coach is a reading professional "specifically focused on coaching classroom teachers and supporting them in their daily work within a specific school building or buildings. These reading professionals do not supervise or evaluate teachers but rather collaborate with teachers to achieve specific professional development goals" (IRA, 2004, p. 2).

Reading specialist - "The reading specialist is a professional with advanced preparation and experience in reading who has responsibility (i.e., providing instruction, serving as a resource to teachers) for the literacy performance of readers in general and of struggling readers in particular." (IRA, 2000, p. 1) To qualify as a reading specialist, "reading specialists must possess the appropriate graduate education credentials, certificates, or degrees required by their state education body and demonstrate the proficiencies listed in the *Standards* [*Standards for Reading Professionals*]... and prior classroom experience." (IRA, 2000, p. 2) Reading specialist will also be used in place of "reading consultant" or "literacy specialist" both of which are synonymous terms.

Sheltered ESL class – a content-area class composed entirely of English language learners. Because all students are in the process of learning English as well as content material, the teacher modifies instruction of content to coincide with the students' language ability as well as includes English language learning instruction.

The remainder of this study is comprised of three chapters. Chapter 2 provides a review of literature regarding the secondary reading specialist's roles and responsibilities. Chapter 3 delineates the research design and methodological approach, participants, data collection and analysis, as well as the researcher stance and limitations of the study. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the data, while Chapter 5 discusses the ramifications and recommendations that are posited as a result of this study.

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

Most studies examining reading specialists and their roles and responsibilities have focused on the elementary school level. This is most likely the result of an emphasis on early prevention of reading difficulties and concurrent funding to provide elementary schools with the resources, like reading specialists, to help overcome such difficulties. This emphasis has resulted in many elementary schools acquiring a reading specialist for each particular site or if that is not feasible, one or more schools will share the services of a reading specialist. Studies specifically examining secondary reading specialists' roles and perceptions are small in number when compared to elementary reading specialist studies or those studies which have combined both elementary and secondary levels. This lack of secondary studies exists not only because funding for this emphasis at the secondary level has been scarcer, but also because of difficulties in recruiting qualified reading specialists (Ruddell, 1993). There have been substantially fewer secondary teachers trained to function as a reading specialist at the secondary level (Bean, Cassidy, Grumet, Earle, Shelton, & Wallis, 2002).

Because studies focused specifically on secondary reading specialists are so few, this review of literature examines studies of both elementary and secondary level reading specialists. While combining both levels obscures differences that might be revealed in an exclusively secondary study, these combined studies also provide a broader and more substantiated understanding of what reading specialists do and how they are perceived. The purpose, then, of the review of literature is to examine: (a) the roles and responsibilities of the reading specialist since the reading specialist position was first

created and illustrate how they have constantly been in a state of flux, and (b) the perceptions that reading specialists, teachers, and administrators have of the role of the reading specialist.

Roles and Responsibilities of Reading Specialists

The position of the reading specialist was first established in the 1920s. Since that time, the position has become more established though the titles of the reading specialist have varied widely. The number and extent of responsibilities corresponding to the position has also fluctuated but the responsibilities have generally fallen into three or four main categories. These fluctuations have been affected by the pervading educational emphasis of the time but also by the needs of the institutions in which a reading specialist has been located. As a result, there has been little consistency in role titles and responsibilities over the years.

In the first half of the 20th century, the emphasis was on remedial reading in both elementary and secondary schools, and almost no formal studies of the position were made. Moreover, the term *reading specialist* was rarely used though a multitude of other titles referring to the specialization of reading instruction and supervision were. These included: supervisors of reading, remedial reading teachers, reading clinicians, reading consultants (Mosby, 1982; Robinson, 1967; Tucker, 1970). Robinson (1967) also stated that the reading professionals of that time were basically untrained for their jobs and that while it was possible to describe some characteristics of the past reading specialist, there was such a multitude of titles, definitions, and responsibilities that it was impossible to identify any one description.

In 1958, Alan H. Robinson was one of the first researchers to report on the spectrum of titles and responsibilities. He carried out one of the first substantial studies dealing with the role of the reading specialist. Moreover, Robinson (1958) focused on the *secondary* reading specialist. His study detailed the role of the reading specialist from survey responses completed by 401 secondary level reading specialists in the five largest cities of 41 states and the District of Columbia. He found the position was referred to somewhat arbitrarily by many titles: reading specialist, remedial reading teacher, reading teacher, reading consultant, director of reading, reading supervisor, reading coordinator, and a variety of other titles. However, there was no significant difference in the tasks they performed. All did basically the same work, which Robinson classified into three divisions: diagnosis, teaching, and consulting.

Diagnosis involved not only administering formal and informal reading measurements, scoring and interpreting them, but also administering intelligence, visual, and auditory tests. Teaching involved working with individuals, small groups, or whole classes of students in developing reading proficiency. At the secondary level, as at the elementary level, the focus was on remedial reading: teachers worked solely with students who were substantially behind in their reading proficiency, and almost always in whole class settings. Moreover, in addition to teaching reading to struggling readers, 50 % of the reading specialists also had teaching responsibilities in other content areas. Only a few reading specialists actually conducted faculty inservice (Robinson, 1958). Consulting encompassed duties such as meeting with parents and faculty, helping faculty obtain appropriate reading materials, and modeling lessons. In addition to these main responsibilities, a myriad of other tasks ranged from lectures to the community to doing

research to preparing budgets to writing and revising reading materials. A few reading specialists reported additional tasks related to supervision of the library, discipline, attendance, student teachers, and special programs. These tasks were in addition to those extra duties considered routine for secondary school teachers – club sponsors, PTA representatives, departmental and faculty committee members, and so forth.

In the 1960s, the emphasis in the reading field shifted from providing remediation to focusing on preventative reading instruction. However, this shift did nothing to standardize the titles of reading specialists. The position continued to be referred to by a variety of names. This variety of titles not only existed at individual school sites, but was also evident in discussions taking place at the national level. Dietrich (1967) reported that a work conference under the auspices of the International Reading Association (IRA) defined the following role titles: reading teacher, reading consultant, reading coordinator, reading clinician, college instructor.

So great was the range of titles and references to the reading specialist that Moburg (1967) went so far as to say that a person in charge of a reading program who has had substantial training in reading, "is, in reality, a reading specialist, regardless of his 'official' title" (p. 520). However, he then went on to say that new reading consultants should be prepared to face confusion from the faculty members as they begin their jobs because of poor role definition. Moburg (1967) said that a reading consultant was "*not* a teacher or administrator. Instead, he is a staff member who serves the schools as a resource person, adviser, in-service leader, investigator, diagnostician, special instructor, and evaluator" (p. 521) and like Robinson (1967), said the role was constantly being

redefined. Thomas (1967) agreed with Moburg's (1967) description of the reading consultant but made no distinction between it and a reading specialist.

Though the reading emphasis during the 1960s shifted from remediation to preventative reading instruction, that shift seemed to have little effect on the responsibilities of the reading specialist. There was no indication that the major responsibilities of the reading specialist changed. They continued similar work in the areas defined by Robinson (1958): diagnosis, teaching, and consulting with the vast majority falling into student instruction of a remedial nature.

During the 1970s, and even more so in the 1980s, reading programs became a more integral part of most secondary schools (Ruddell, 1993). This growth and a corresponding move to a consultative reading emphasis added to the ongoing disagreement over the titles and role descriptions of reading specialists. Individual educators and associations struggled to make sense of the position. Mason and Palmatier (1973), Robinson and Petit (1978), and Readence, Baldwin and Dishner (1980) said reading specialists were non-remedial and primarily consultants and referred to them in a variety of ways: helping teacher, reading resource teacher, and lead reading teacher. Mosby (1980), in a large study with a random sample of 50 school districts from the largest 100 school districts in the U.S., found that out of the 8,467 employed reading personnel, 25.7% used the term reading specialist while 74.3% used another title.

There was such a range of disagreement regarding the reading specialist position that Robinson and Petit (1978) referred to the reading specialist as a reading teacher and suggested that each reading teacher should personally define the position and act in accordance with that definition. In many senses, that was exactly what was happening in

districts and individual schools. Administrators and faculty members were defining what literacy issued needed to be addressed at their sites and then fashioning the reading specialists' role to fit those needs.

As titles for the reading specialist continued to vary, so did the responsibilities. Garry in his 1973/74 study referred to reading specialists as specialized reading personnel and identified 50 competencies that they should possess. Bean and Eichelberger (1985), carried out a similar study, and identified 30 such competencies, while Mosby (1980) analyzed existing job descriptions for the reading specialist and came up with 416 tasks. Hutson, McDonnel, and Fortune (1982) equated the reading teacher to the reading specialist, specifying that they were individuals who served students directly but also carried out other consulting roles. They identified eight roles of the reading specialist: resource person, advisor, in-service leader, investigator, diagnostician, instructor, evaluator, and remedial teacher.

Bean (1979) serving on the IRA Evaluation Committee grouped reading specialists' responsibilities into four major categories: (a) instruction; (b) administration and planning; (c) diagnosis; and (d) resource person for parents, teachers, and principals. These major divisions paralleled those Robinson (1958) had identified with the exception that Bean (1979) identified one dealing specifically with administration and planning. However, Bean (1979) also reported that reading specialists spent the majority of their time dealing with student instructional issues and diagnostic work.

In the last 15 years, the educational emphasis has stressed collaboration among faculty members. Several researchers (Barry, 1997; Bean, 2002; Bean Swan, & Knaub, 2003; Brownell & Walther-Thomas, 2000; Henwood, 1999/2000; Jaeger, 1996; Tatum

2004; Vacca & Padak, 1990) have identified the need for collaboration and the benefits when teachers work in tandem with specialists. Teachers have a greater knowledge of students, while reading specialists have a broader and deeper understanding of the reading process. By combining the expertise of both teachers and reading specialists, students benefit more. To accomplish this, the reading specialist's role should include faculty professional development, instructional problem solving, assessment, and working with parents and other educators.

Perhaps the current collaborative role that has received the most attention is that of the reading or literacy coach (Bean, 2004b; "Coaches, consensus, and controversy," 2004; Dole, 2004; Hall, 2004; IRA, 2004). The responsibilities attached to this title are directly related to the reading specialist working solely and directly with teachers in a professional development capacity. The emphasis focuses on strengthening the teachers' instructional literacy abilities. This direct work with teachers is thought to improve more students' reading skills and abilities than if reading specialists were to work with the students individually or in small groups.

Studies of reading specialists in the last 15 years did not indicate that collaboration had become the major focus of reading specialists. However, studies did reveal that the roles and responsibilities of the reading specialist varied (Pipes, 2004) and were emergent and responsive to the environment and sociopolitical forces (Haab, 2001). Two case studies dealing specifically with the secondary level reading specialist found similar results. Sarno-Tedeschi (1991) reported that while the main role of reading specialist was that of remedial teacher, there were over 15 supporting roles that also factored into what they did and those were influenced by roles of power and authority.

Darwin (2002) indicated that the roles of the reading specialists were complex and that the school culture as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the individual reading specialists affected the roles that were enacted. These cases studies provide critical insights into the roles of the reading specialist because they provide that which is not present in the other cited studies: a context for the role description to fit into. All refer to the complexity of the reading specialist's job as it relates to the school setting and the faculty members who work there.

Over the years as the reading position developed, IRA issued different position statements in an attempt to clarify the role. In 1968, IRA mentioned special teachers of reading, reading clinicians, reading consultants, and reading supervisors. However, in 1978, IRA's Guidelines for Professional Preparation of Reading Teachers acknowledged that titles varied widely and began to refer to actual practices instead of titles in an attempt to avoid the name game. Currently, IRA's (2000) position statement on the reading specialist indicates that because of the differing needs of students and educators, reading specialists can assume multiple roles in a school. IRA specifically referred to three major divisions of responsibilities: instruction [of students], leadership, and diagnosis and assessment. In 2004, IRA published a position statement on reading coaches. This position statement reflects the current educational emphasis on collaboration as it emphasizes that reading coaches work with classroom teachers to increase student reading proficiency. This position statement on reading (IRA, 2004) also recognizes that there is wide range of job descriptions for this position and ties the reading coach to the reading specialist by linking it to instruction. However, even using

roles to define positions does not escape the overlap of responsibilities and therefore, titles.

In summary, since the inception of the reading specialist position, the role of the reading specialist has fluctuated as a result of a host of influences. Vague role descriptions, pressing site and personnel needs, authority and school culture issues, as well as the characteristics of the reading specialists themselves have made it difficult for reading specialists to know exactly what to do. Consequently, reading specialists have assumed a variety of roles and responsibilities within the school which may or may not lead them to a sense of focus and accomplishment in promoting literacy achievement for students within the school.

Additionally, it appears that roles and responsibilities may never be clearly defined so as to present a consistent and prescribed job description from school to school, let alone nationally. Should this continue to be the case, then what becomes essential is not the job description of the reading specialist but the perceptions that faculty members have of that role. In the absence of specified criteria, what people expect the reading specialist to do will provide the impetus toward or away from the current emphasis of collaboration.

Perceptions of the Role of the Reading Specialist

Perceptions regarding self, others, or issues largely impact how a person will conduct him or herself in any given situation (Charon, 1989; Eisenhart, Cuthbert, Shrum, & Harding, 1988; Isenberg, 1990; Nespor, 1987; Stryker, 1980). This holds true for reading specialists and those who work with them (Thompson, 1979). Reading specialists' beliefs about what is important in their jobs influences what and how they

approach the variety of responsibilities they have. Beliefs determine what kinds of goals reading specialists will set, with whom they will work and for how long, what kind of instruction or support they will provide, and what kinds of leadership duties they will assume. Teachers and principals are similarly influenced by their own beliefs.

To the extent that faculty members coincide in their perceptions of what reading specialists do, the more likely it becomes that the reading specialist will be more effectively utilized. Conversely, the less congruent the perceptions are, the more likely conflicts are to occur when considering the work of the reading specialist. Scholars assert that, "Such disagreement could negatively affect the effectiveness of public programs" (Rupley, Mason, & Logan, 1985, p. 38).

The present study was interested in how reading specialists, teachers, and principals *currently* perceive the role of the reading specialist. Of most interest was the literature written since 1990. This seemed a logical starting point to begin the review as in the late 1980's Title 1/Chapter 1 guidelines for reading specialists changed as the effectiveness of Chapter 1 programs came under scrutiny. The outcome of these studies resulted in legislation that shifted the emphasis from reading specialists pulling students out of class for instruction to reading specialists moving into classrooms to work in conjunction with the classroom teacher. The following sections examine the studies on how reading specialists, teachers, and principals each perceive the role of the reading specialists.

Reading Specialists' Perceptions of the Role of the Reading Specialist

There is scant literature in the last 15 years that focus on perceptions of the roles of the reading specialist. However, most of what has been published focuses on the views

reading specialists have about their own role and suggests that the roles of the reading specialist are complex and overlap. They also indicate that reading specialists consider many of these responsibilities to be of great importance even when pressed to identify the most significant one.

Serafini (2005), in a qualitative study working with reading specialists in the Nevada Reading Excellence Act (NREA) from 2001-2004, examined how reading specialists' perceptions of their own roles evolved. Serafini identified three factors which influenced their perceptions: (a) administrative support, (b) rapport with classroom teachers, and (c) the literacy base and amount of experience reading specialists had. Administrative support concerned the principals' level of understanding and support of literacy. This determined the degree to which the reading specialist was able to stay focused on literacy issues or was pulled away to perform unrelated tasks such as subbing or discipline, and so forth. Rapport with classroom teachers highlighted the importance of reading specialists being able to work well with the classroom teacher. If incongruence existed between reading specialists' goals and content-area teachers' goals, it was much more difficult to gain access to teachers and their classrooms. Finally, the literacy knowledge base and amount of experience reading specialists had influenced their philosophy and view of education. This in turn, affected decisions regarding how assessment would take place and the content of professional development meetings. Reading specialists' literacy knowledge and experience may also have had bearing on the credibility with which they were viewed by other faculty members.

Serafini's (2005) observations are particularly relevant as the current emphasis on and collaboration in schools is encouraged. Reading specialists are employed in schools

because they have a knowledge base about the nature and instruction of reading that exceeds the average classroom teacher's understanding. Reading specialists should not only be able to model and share effective literacy strategies but they should also be able to help classroom teachers understand the theory behind their instructional practices and why they work. This can be facilitated if the reading specialist has established credibility through experience. Conversely, classroom teachers should have greater insight into the students: how they learn and what they know and do not know. In order to share these knowledge bases and benefit the child, collaboration must take place. To the extent that reading specialists and teachers collaborate and are supported by the administration, the more likely it is that school wide literacy goals will be met. However, successful collaboration is often dependent on how one professional perceives the other.

For example, if reading specialists and faculty members perceive reading specialists to be remedial reading teachers, then most likely the expectation will be that reading specialists will work primarily with individuals or small groups of students who struggle with reading proficiency in pull out programs. If perceptions are that reading specialists are a resource for teachers, then the role of reading specialists would be to support teachers as needed. However, if reading specialists are perceived to be collaborative consultants and professional development leaders, then one would reasonably expect to find them working primarily with teachers in a professional development role.

The literature suggests that reading specialists perceive their role in different ways. One of the main perceptions that reading specialists have of their role is the role of instructor which harkens back to the remedial reading programs begun in the 1930's

(Barry, 1997) and which do not reflect the current focus on collaboration. Six studies (Barclay & Thistlewaite, 1992; Bean, et al. 2002; Crain, 2003; Kulesza, 2001; Quatroche, Bean & Hamilton, 2001; Vacca & Padak, 1990) found that reading specialists reported this was the most vital role they played and the majority of their time was spent in working with small groups or individuals in pullout or inclass programs.

Both Barclay's and Thistlewaite's (1992) and Bean's et al (2002) studies dealt with surveys sent to self-identified K-12 reading specialists across the nation. Both studies found that the primary role which was considered very important was that of student instruction. In Barclay's and Thistlewaite's (1992) reading specialists reported a ten to one ratio of those working in instructor roles as compared to consultative roles. Instruction was the only role that was considered very important. Acting as a resource for teachers and providing more formal teacher inservice were somewhat important. Similarly, in Bean's et al (2002) study, 90% of the reading specialists reported that instruction was a very important daily role in which they spent the majority of their time. Serving as a resource to teachers was considered important. Reading specialists in both studies indicated that over the last five years a need to function as a resource to teachers and a need to plan with teachers had dramatically increased but emphasis was still on instructing students.

Kulesza's (2001) elementary study echoed the previous two. Reading specialists rank ordered their roles as first, pull out remedial specialist (94% of their instructional time was in the pull out mode); second, support for teachers; and third, administrative or supervisory duties, (playgrounds, etc.). Eighty-four percent of reading specialists thought that providing early intervention was their primary responsibility. Only 6% thought that

acting as a resource for teachers was most essential. However, only 29% of the reading specialists said their role matched their beliefs. Crain (2003) in interviewing two secondary reading specialists found that they considered their primary role to be teachers of students who required specialized help in literacy as well as a resource for teachers. In these studies, reading specialists identified their main responsibility as one of instruction. However, they also indicated a need to expand the parameters of what they did and with whom they worked.

For other reading specialists, consulting and collaborative roles were more important (Bean, Travato, & Hamilton, 1995; Darwin, 2002; Haab, 2001; Henwood, 2000; Lapp, Fisher, Flood, & Frey, 2003; Vacca & Padak, 1990). This is not to say that reading specialists were no longer interested in assisting low achieving students, but that the manner in which they were served changed. Emphasis shifted from working directly with students in an instructional capacity to focusing on developing the instructional proficiency of classroom teachers.

Henwood's (2000) case study details her collaborative role as a reading specialist in her high school for two years. Initially sought out by her principal to increase collegiality and create a community of learning in which both student learning and professional growth could take place, she was left to her own devices as to how to accomplish this because she found no guidance in the literature at that time. She became an agent of change by first defining her role as a partner and collaborator with faculty members and proffering choice: she would help as requested. A critical component in this endeavor was that the principal released her from all teaching responsibilities in order to collaborate with faculty members. Teachers would approach her with different needs, a

time would be set in which to discuss what was needed, suggestions would be made, and teachers would choose what was appropriate for their classroom setting. This included having Henwood model or teach or provide some resource. After said activity was carried out, both Henwood and the faculty member would meet again, debrief, and discuss the outcome.

Henwood's (2000) study indicated that she had indeed moved into a collaborative role at the high school level. She worked solely with teachers and not with students, and had seen teachers grow professionally as they reflected on their practice, examined their instructional strategies, and built collegiality working in teams. She reported that through collaborating with different content-area teachers, it was possible to meet more of students' literacy needs.

Reading specialists in Bean, Travato, and Hamilton (1995) perceived a consultative and collaborative role as most important; however, they felt least prepared to carry it out. Like Henwood (2000) they had been given little guidance as to how. They also felt strongly that student needs should be the guiding force behind the roles the reading specialist assumed. Lapp, Fisher, Flood, and Frey (2003) reported that the reading specialists in their study spent 50% of their time in consultative or collaborative activities such as reflective conversations, lesson demonstrations, and professional development presentations, and 40% in tutoring struggling readers. However, part of this time was spent training and mentoring aides, a more consultative role. The study did not account for how reading specialists accounted for the remaining 10% of their time.

In the last 15 years, perceptions of reading specialists seemed to mainly reflect the remedial reading orientation of the 1920s – 1950s: working directly with individual or

small groups of students. The revised government guidelines of the late 1980's emphasizing collaboration and consultative roles caused some movement towards more collaborative roles. However, these findings concerning the reading specialists' perceptions of their own role were based on very few studies and none, with the exception of Henwood's (1980) case study involving herself as the sole reading specialist, dealt exclusively with secondary reading specialists.

Teachers' Perceptions of the Role of the Reading Specialist

Since the late 1980's, the emphasis has been for reading specialists to work in a more consultative and collaborative role with classroom teachers. With this charge, reading specialists and teachers were to come together to pool their resources in the best interests of the students. This was a new role for both and both expressed unease and frustration about how to do so. Serafini (2005) noted the importance of building rapport and credibility with classroom teachers so that reading specialists could work with classroom teachers and gain access to their classrooms.

Two factors that can help build rapport and credibility come from sharing similar content disciplines and having common goals. When considering the content-area background of reading specialists, the vast majority have come from English or language arts departments. Gibson as early as 1937 reported that initial reading specialists were normally recruited by the principal from the English or language arts department. Other studies also noted the English or language arts background of most people involved with teaching literacy (Barry, 2004; Draper, Smith, Hall, & Siebert, 2005; Robinson 1958/59, 1967). While English and language arts teachers may be the most knowledgeable concerning literacy and how to teach it, there may also be mismatches between applying

English/language arts based techniques to content areas that differ dramatically from English, i.e. areas such as math and science.

As of the time of this study, no study had examined or evaluated the effectiveness of a content-area specialist functioning as a reading specialist. However, it seems reasonable to assume that if the reading specialist and the classroom teacher shared a common understanding of the content, presenting and implementing effective literacy strategies would be facilitated. Sharing content-area background also proves advantageous when it comes to understanding content-area goals and focus as another factor comes into play: having common goals.

A goal that has generally not been in common for reading specialists and content-area teachers is summed up by the slogan, "Every teacher, a teacher of reading." This idea that every teacher should be a teacher of reading dates back to the 1920's and the National Society for the Study of Education (Barry, 1994; Dilley, 1944). This may have precipitated the idea that if all teachers would focus on developing solid reading skills in their students as they taught their content area material, the need for special reading classes would disappear. However, the reality was that by the 1930's, remedial reading teachers were in place in many public and private schools at both elementary and secondary levels (Bean, 2004a; Stauffer, 1967) as they still are today. Additionally, the catch phrase is still circulating and continues to generate discussion among content-area teachers as to who is responsible for teaching what.

When considering content-area teachers and reading specialists, the subject of literacy in content-area classes must be considered. In the last decade or so, there has been heightened interest in this subject: what it is and what it looks like. O'Brien,

Stewart, and Moje (1995) and Ivey and Fisher (2005) postulated that content-area teachers struggle to see how literacy instruction fits into their content instruction. They reported that after many decades of trying to improve reading and writing in secondary content-area classes, not much has changed. They hypothesized that failure to improve was due to the mismatch between the differing goals of content reading and content literacy. Content reading focused on teachers and texts presenting in traditional manner technical information that is difficult for students to access. Content literacy positioned the student as a constructor of knowledge and did so using a variety of activities and texts which make meaning more accessible but less in line with what students would be tested on. Draper, et al. (2005) discussed how this dualism was not accurate and should not be propagated. Literacy instruction is not relegated to any one discipline and when it is taught without reference to specific content matter, it loses its power to help students read, write, and think in a critical manner. It also may result in leading content-area teachers to believe that literacy instruction is something for which they are not accountable.

While there are only a couple of studies that deal specifically with how secondary content-area teachers perceive the role of the reading specialist, Maleki's and Heerman's (1994) study reveals some of the disconnect described previously. One hundred and fifty-one experienced middle and secondary-level classroom teachers in rural Kansas were asked to complete a 16-item questionnaire identifying what they perceived were the major responsibilities of the reading specialist. Responses indicated that while content-area teachers definitely felt that they should be using reading and writing instructional strategies in teaching their subjects, they were much less supportive of having a reading

specialist that could coach them in these endeavors. Nor did they think that reading should be taught in a separate class for students reading at or below the third grade.

Instead they indicated that the major responsibilities of the reading specialist were to be knowledgeable of the English or language arts curriculum as well as with the materials such as trade books and so forth that could be used to teach adolescent and young adult literature. They were also to be adept in the use of reading and writing instructional techniques and be willing to work with parents to create literacy awareness. These content-area teachers seemed to be aware that reading difficulties occurred in content-area materials and that literacy strategies belonged in their classrooms. However, they did not want, for whatever reason, to address the issue with a reading specialist nor did they think separate reading classes or attention to struggling readers should be a major part of the school's reading program.

Crain (2003) reported some different findings. Crain (2003), a reading specialist herself, began her study as a result of starting a reading program in the high school where she was employed. She was unable to find any studies that included the voice of the content-area teachers in the designing of such a program. She was interested in how the reading specialist's role was perceived at the high school level and how the reading specialist could best assist content-area teachers in improving student literacy proficiency. As a result, she interviewed two reading specialists and 21 content-area teachers from two high schools in a large suburban school district in southeastern United States.

Content-area teachers primarily saw the reading specialist as one who works with below grade-level readers to help bring them to grade-level proficiency. This was

consistent with how the two secondary reading specialists viewed themselves, although they also considered some of what they did as acting in a consultative role with teachers. However, teachers also viewed reading skills as important. They wanted all students entering high school for the first time to take a mandatory reading class which would build content-area reading skills and students' self-confidence in their ability to handle the required textbooks. Content-area teachers also desired that reading specialists assist classroom teachers in widening and strengthening their repertoire of strategies to improve students' reading skills through the modeling of strategies to their content-area classes as well as working with them one on one regarding needs specific to their classes as they had not had training in how to do so.

Maleki's and Heerman's 1994 study appears to be just the opposite. They found that the secondary school teachers were not interested in what a reading specialist might offer or in adapting to meet low-achieving readers needs. It was not clear why content-area teachers responded in different manners but it does seem reasonable to suggest that content-area teachers had different perceptions of the reading specialist as well as different goals and ideas about how deficiencies should be addressed. Having so few studies that provide content-area teachers' voices concerning the reading specialists' role and literacy makes it impossible to know how the reading specialist can best serve content-area teachers.

Principals' Perceptions of the Role of the Reading Specialist

Principals are not directly involved in meeting the needs of low-achieving readers. Yet, as administrators, they have been identified as one of the most influential determinants of successful reading specialists and reading programs (Bean, et al, 2003;

Readence, Baldwin, & Dishner, 1980; Hutson, McDonell, & Fortune, 1982). This is true largely because principals determine the tenor of the school environment. By visibly and positively supporting a person or program, success is more likely. However, information about the influence of the principal was also scarce.

Only one study was located in the last 15 years that included information dealing with the perceptions of principals. Bean et al. (2003) focused specifically on the perceptions of principals in schools with exemplary reading programs. These principals came from 39 schools considered to have exemplary reading programs either by evaluation from the IRA, Title I, or institutions that determine schools who have "beaten the odds" (p. 2). Surveys elicited information about what responsibilities the reading specialists carried out as well as their perceived importance of having reading specialists. Over 97% of the principals agreed that reading specialists should be involved in instruction, diagnosis, and assessment. Principals also indicated that reading specialists played an important or very important role in the success of the reading program.

Kulesza (2001) provided some insight into how principals view the reading specialist but in a second hand way - through the eyes of the reading specialist. This, then, does not reflect what principals stated, but how reading specialists *thought* the principals saw them. Kulesza (2001) interviewed 12 reading specialists about how principals perceived their roles. Comments ranged from principals making them a jack of all trades with the variety of tasks they were asked to do to only being interested in teaching what would be on standardized tests to allowing them to work autonomously.

Bean, Trovato, and Hamilton (1995) looked at reading specialists', teachers' and principals' perceptions at the same time. In order to obtain information on how to best

design effective Chapter I reading programs, Bean et al. grouped 25 reading specialists, 25 teachers, and 27 principals in mixed focus groups on three different occasions to discuss their perspectives as Chapter I educators. The theme they specifically focused on was the role of each group and how each group perceived the roles of the other groups. All groups basically agreed on the role of each group. Reading specialists stated that the classroom teachers were the principal teachers of students and responsible for major decisions regarding instruction but they also expressed frustration with the changing guidelines of Chapter I and how they affected what they were to do. Perhaps the chief source of frustration came from the lack of clarity in those roles. Classroom teachers saw reading specialists as knowledgeable sources of information about reading (resources that could aid them in making instructional decisions) and positive influences on the development of the school wide reading program. They also expressed the belief that they were "kid specialists" (p. 215) and should also be considered valuable sources of information. Principals were considered by all groups to play a key role in developing a solid Chapter I reading program. Their expertise and perspective needed to be considered when making decisions regarding the program.

In the last 15 years there have only been a handful of studies dealing specifically with the perceptions of the role of reading specialists and the majority focus on how reading specialists view their own role. There seems to be even less information on how teachers and principals see the role of the reading specialist. Teachers and principals appear to give most emphasis to the instructional nature of the reading specialists' job. Principals also seem to consider that the reading specialist is an important component of a

successful reading program but details pertaining to the why and how that happens are lacking.

Summary

It is clear from the review of literature that the role and titles of the reading specialist has been in a constant state of change since the position was first created. Roles and titles have been determined by various factors such as educational philosophy; the culture of the school; the influence of the principal or the reading specialists themselves; and federal, state, or local government stipulations; and so forth. These roles are also often broadly stated and therefore, a myriad of tasks are given to or assumed by reading specialists. Some studies reveal that even with a role description, the jobs reading specialists perform may not reflect the criteria. This lack of specificity and continuity about what it means to be a reading specialist makes it is impossible to ascertain just what reading specialists do within their institutions. It also reveals the need to know how faculty members perceive the role of the reading specialist. When defining criteria is absent or not attended to, then perceptions become the catalyst for action or reaction.

It also appears that perceptions of reading specialists about their own role differ. Many reading specialists still see themselves primarily in an instructional capacity working directly with individual or small groups of students. Others assume a consultative or collaborative role. This division continues in spite Chapter I guidelines intended to foster collaborative work among teachers and reading specialists. Moreover, while there is little information available about how teachers and principals view the role of the reading specialist, what little information there is suggests that both teachers and principals see the reading specialist functioning in more of an instructional capacity.

Despite the paucity of literature and its inconclusiveness, perceptions appear to be the key to determining what the role of the reading specialist is as those responsibilities vary from school to school. To date, very few studies have been found which deal specifically and solely with the secondary reading specialist. Additionally, no study within the last 15 years has taken an in-depth look at how the reading specialists, teachers, and principals perceive the role of the secondary reading specialist. There is a need to document and analyze those perceptions and highlight their impact on the faculty's interactions with each other and how it affects job performance and satisfaction.

Therefore, this comparative case study seeks to answer the following questions about the secondary schools in one district located in the western United States:

1. What duties and responsibilities do secondary reading specialists perform and how do these duties and responsibilities compare and contrast from school to school?

2. Is the role of the secondary level reading specialist perceived in a significantly different manner by any of the following groups: reading specialists, faculty members, and school administrators in each of the five secondary schools located within this school district and more specifically, (a) Do faculty members from different content-area backgrounds, i.e. math, humanities, arts, PE, etc. perceive the role of the reading specialist in significantly different ways? (b) Do faculty members with literacy endorsements and/or district literacy inservice perceive the role of the reading specialist in a significantly different way from those faculty members with no such literacy endorsements or inservice? (c) Do faculty members in middle schools perceive the role of the reading specialist in a significantly different way than those faculty members in the high schools?

3. How do the duties currently being undertaken by secondary reading specialists correspond to surveyed perceptions of the role of the reading specialist?

Chapter Three

Methodology

This chapter outlines the methodology of the study. It covers: (a) the rationale for the choice of methodology, participants, and theoretical framework, (b) a detailed description of the data collecting procedure, and (c) an overview of the data analysis and the limitations of the study.

Multiple-Case Study

Stake (1994) emphasizes that "case study is not a methodological choice, but a choice of object to be studied. We choose to study the case." (Stake, p. 236) The object or case can then be qualitative or quantitative in nature, but it must exist or function within a bounded system focusing on the specifics, not generalities of that object and system. This statement suggests, then, that behavior taking place within that system has patterns that surface consistently and regularly. These requirements are what distinguish the case and also make it possible to examine and understand it. Also central to the type of case study undertaken is the purpose behind the study. Stake (1994) lists three purposes: intrinsic (motivated by personal desire to know more about the particular case chosen), instrumental (chosen with the intention to generate theory or greater insight; the specific case becomes secondary), or collective (applying instrumental study to multiple cases within the same system in order to gain insight and generate or refine existing theory of the larger research topic).

The purpose of this multiple-case study was to examine closely five secondary literacy coordinators (LCs), each bounded by the school within which they worked, and the faculty with whom they worked. The motivation behind this study was intrinsic, as

the intention was to gain insight into one district's secondary school faculty members' perceptions of the roles and functions of LCs. To accomplish this, the study employed a mixed methodology approach and the researcher gathered both qualitative and quantitative data. By using both types of data collection processes, multiple sources of information came together to reveal and reinforce consistent and regular behavior patterns within and across each case.

This study was conducted in a school district located in the western United States. In order to protect the confidentiality of participants in this school system, a name is not given to the school district and it is referred to simply as *the district.* Additionally, pseudonyms were given to each LC and school. In an attempt to keep each LC more easily linked to her assigned school, both LC and school name begin with the same initial sounds: Ann at Arbor Middle School, Britta at Blaine Middle School, Claire at Claybourne High School, Debra at Dover High School, and Eve at East High School.

The study examined the roles of the LCs through the first half of the 2005/06 school year. As the second semester began, all willing secondary faculty members from the five schools participated in an electronic survey concerning the roles of the LC, while four to five teachers from each school also participated in a focus group. The study terminated at the end of March, 2006. This time period was chosen because it allowed sufficient time to acquire an understanding of the ebb and flow of the school and the corresponding duties of the LCs.

Data collection began the week of August 15 with an initial interview conducted with each LC before students arrived the week of August 22. At this time, each LC also signed a "Consent to Act as a Research Subject" form (See Appendix A for a copy of the

form). Data analysis began immediately with interviews being taped, transcribed, and analyzed.

Case studies depend principally on qualitative data. Patton (2002) identifies three types of qualitative data collection methods that can be used in case studies: in-depth, open-ended interviews; direct observation; and written documentation. Interviews, observations, and written documentation were used in this study to create a well-rounded, holistic, and insightful look into the role of the reading specialist. Geertz (1975) refers to this "thick description" by saying it is only by looking at and including the surrounding context of any given phenomena being examined that understanding can be constructed.

In addition to the qualitative data gathered, quantitative data were also a component of this study. Hammersly (1992) sees no conflict between qualitative and quantitative studies, but rather places cases studies towards one end of the same research continuum which includes surveys and experiments at the other. Crotty (1998) simply states, "We should accept that, whatever research we engage in, it is possible for either qualitative methods or quantitative methods, or both, to serve our purposes…without this being in any way problematic" (p. 15). Therefore, the depth of understanding one gains through qualitative data, the ecological validity of examining relationships taking place in natural settings, can be complemented by gathering and aggregating information from large numbers of people and the effective generalization of findings to larger populations.

The quantitative tool chosen for primary data gathering was that of a survey. Surveys have a long history of use, ranging from ancient Egyptian civilization and an association with census taking (Babbie, 1990) to modern day universities which devote entire courses to survey research (Rea & Parker, 1997). While survey research generally

deals with samples in order to generalize to a larger population (Rea & Parker, 1997) this survey was used with this school district's entire population of secondary education faculty with no intention of generalizing to any other district. Both Babbie (1990) and Rea and Parker (1997) agree that survey research is an appropriate method of obtaining information from and about large numbers of people.

There were 300 faculty members teaching at the schools where the five literacy coordinators worked. It was essential to the purpose of this project to obtain as many of their perspectives about the literacy coordinator as possible. For this reason, an electronic survey was designed to solicit faculty members' responses and emailed the last part of February, 2006. This occurred after the first school semester ended and teachers had submitted their final grades. The date for sending the survey was chosen in order to allow participants the entire first semester in which to become familiar with and experience the literacy environment and resources in the school as well as interact and build rapport with the LC and each other. The survey results provided quantitative data that were used to generate descriptive statistics.

Participants

The school district served all of the school-aged children in the 113,459 resident city (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005a); had 14 elementary schools, 2 middle schools, and 3 high schools, one of which was an alternative high school; and contained both urban and suburban areas. The city's population was fairly homogenous and primarily of Anglo descent as the minority population was about 15-16% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005b). The overall ethnic demographics were broken into the following groups and percentages: Caucasian, 88.5%; race with Hispanic origin, 10.5%; Asian, 1.8%; Pacific Islander,

0.8%; Native American, 0.46%; African American, .5%; from other races, 5.1%; and from two or more races, 2.4%. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005c).

However, though ethnic minority numbers were small, the area had experienced substantial minority growth. Since 1992, the influx of foreign born individuals into the area had been dramatic. While the overall school enrollment in the district had remained more or less constant, the English Language Learner (ELL) population in the schools had risen from 5% in 1992 to 21% in 2007 (J. Kendall, personal communication, March 5, 2007). The overall ethnic background of students in the district can be seen in Table 1. The ethnic makeup of each secondary school's student body is listed in Tables 3-7 in Chapter 4.

Table 1

Ethnic Background of Total Secondary Student Body in the District

	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other	Total
# of students	159	52	4137	1133	75	137	10	5703
% of total student population	3%	< 1%	73%	20%	1%	2%	<1%	100%

In the summer of 2005, school populations were affected by the realignment of school boundaries. This impacted both the middle and high schools as elementary feeder schools were reassigned. In addition, a middle school was closed causing the remaining two middle schools to absorb those students. Both middle schools' population rose but Arbor Middle School was most affected as they received 100 new ELL students. Blaine Middle School's population also rose but the new students did not change the ethnic or language diversity of the school.

As to the reason for the selection of this district for the study, it is necessary to consider the literacy focus and resources of the surrounding area. The district chosen for this study was one of five school districts participating in a public school partnership with a large university located within the city. This public school partnership was under the direction of the teacher improvement center in the school of teacher education. One of the teacher improvement center's main goals was to improve literacy instruction at the secondary level. District literacy specialists from each of the five districts met regularly with the organization's director to address and discuss literacy issues at the secondary level, and to conduct summer literacy conferences and institutes that focused particularly on integrating literacy into content-area classrooms. This organization of district literacy specialists also specifically worked with a cohort of inservice secondary teachers with whom they emphasized the development of literacy and the instructional methods with which literacy could be integrated into content-area matter. This cohort of teachers then took this instruction and integrated it into their teaching at their respective schools.

The public school partnership's emphasized increasing literacy awareness and proficiency through the use of LCs and improving content-area teachers' instruction at the secondary level. Because of this emphasis, it was pertinent to ascertain the current perceptions of those secondary faculty members regarding the roles and responsibilities of secondary LCs and to determine what duties LCs fulfilled. However, only one of the five school districts within the public school partner ship, the district chosen for this study, had a literacy coordinator assigned to every secondary school. The other districts chose to either have a traveling district LC meet the needs of all their secondary schools or to have several schools within a district share an LC. As a result, this district provided

a prime opportunity to gain greater insight into the roles, responsibilities, and perceptions of the LC at the secondary level. Therefore, this multicase study examined the perceptions of the LC and respective faculty members in each of the secondary schools within this district.

The five LCs functioned as LCs part time. All taught four out of seven periods a day in regular content-area classes. Of the remaining three periods, one was their preparation period, and the other two periods were used to perform the tasks of the LC. Two schools, Arbor Middle School and Claybourne High School, had new LCs in the fall of 2005. The other three LCs, beginning their fifth year as LCs, had been such since the district opted to begin assigning an LC to each secondary school in 2001.

Theoretical Framework

As data were gathered and analyzed, it was necessary to distinguish through which theoretical lens the participants and events were viewed. While people's perceptions, understandings, and interpretations of their environment may be explained in many ways, Blumer (1969) identifies three principles in his conceptualization of symbolic interactionism that are pertinent to this study:

> 1. Human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them.
>
> 2. The meaning of things is derived from, arises out of, the social interaction one has with one's fellows.
>
> 3. The meanings of things are handled in and modified through an interpretative process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounters. (p. 2)

This, then, signifies that human beings create their own meaning as a result of their interaction with each other and then respond to events, people, etc. based on that meaning. It is a social process. Additionally, human beings have the capacity to assess and interpret the significance of the events and modify meaning as needed. As one comes to understand the importance of symbols and shared meaning among people, it is possible to understand their behavior. Patton (2002) states the benefits of symbolic interaction is that "the study of the original meaning and influence of symbols and shared meanings can shed light on what is most important to people, what will be most resistant to change, and what will be most necessary to change if the program or organization is to move in new directions" (Patton, p. 113).

From this theoretical standpoint it is necessary to examine the perceptions and thought processes of literacy coordinators as well as their behavior and responses to events as they interacted with faculty members. By recording these events over time, it was possible to see how the literacy coordinators' thoughts and behaviors were established, developed, and/or maintained. It was also possible to see how activities and their meaning informed the symbol or role of the literacy coordinator. The collected data reflected both the literacy coordinators' actions and their impressions and responses about the roles or activities they performed. It also gave insight into content-area teachers' perceptions of the literacy coordinator. To this end, both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered and data analysis carried out to locate activities and their meanings. The findings were used to compare and contrast what the literacy coordinators did to what secondary faculty members thought they did. The findings revealed the differences in expectations that existed among secondary faculty members, and illustrated

as Patton (2002) stated, those aspects of the role of the LC that were most important to faculty members as well as indicated what beliefs or assumptions needed to be addressed if the LC were to have as positive an effect as possible on the literacy environment of the secondary school.

Quantitative Data

Quantitative data refers to data that is standardized, objective, reported in numbers, and measurable, or as Worthen, White, Fan, and Sudweeks (1999) say, "most reasonable persons who are confronted with the available measurement data would score and interpret it in the same fashion." (p. 6) However, it is entirely possible that any two people might use the resulting statistic in a subjective manner to come to different conclusions. When collecting standardized data from individuals, the same procedures must be used with everyone to gather the same information (Worthen, White, Fan, & Sudweeks, 1999).

A survey was chosen as the most timely and cost-effective method of gathering descriptive, behavioral, and perceptual information from all secondary faculty members within the entire school district. The survey solicited both demographic and perceptual information. The demographic information provided a picture of who the participants were while the perceptual responses allowed insight into what faculty members believed the role of the literacy coordinator to be. These descriptive statistics, measures of central tendency and dispersion, illustrated the distribution of data.

Survey Development. The impetus of the survey used in this study came from one originally designed and administered by Bean, et al (2002) in their national survey of reading specialists. Bean, et al (2002) asked participants to indicate their perceptions of

importance of various duties that fell into four main areas: instruction, assessment, resource, and administration by indicating how much time they spent doing each. The survey employed in the current study used similar categories but merged resource and administration into the category of leadership as the researcher felt that both categories of responsibility justifiably fell into the leadership designation based on the description found in the IRA's 2000 position statement on reading specialists. By doing so, three categories – instruction, diagnosis/assessment, and leadership – were formed. These categories reflect the major division of responsibilities that the IRA (2000) has identified for the reading specialist. Demographic questions relating to secondary school teachers and specifically to professional development carried out in the district were added. Moreover, the survey was modified for each of the three groups involved in the case study: secondary LCs, content-area teachers, and principals. In effect, three different forms of the survey were administered, each worded to elicit information from one specific group (see Appendix B for a copy of each survey).

Before the survey was sent, it went through several stages of development. The initial survey draft was first viewed by the five public school partnership district level LCs to obtain feedback regarding the focus and scope of the questions. The revised survey was then piloted with two LCs in a neighboring school district as well as with two secondary content-area teachers, neither of whom were involved in the current study. The pilot survey resulted in minor rewordings and the addition of demographic response options. Finally, the district's LC supervisor, as well as the district administrator over research, reviewed the survey to ensure that any areas of interest to the district had been included. A brief description of the overall format of the survey follows.

The first part of each survey focused solely on demographic information with an emphasis on the professional education each participant had completed in their content-area and also in literacy. Specific questions about the type of recent (within the last two years) professional development teachers had participated in were also added. Additional sections focused on perceptions regarding LCs, principals, and teachers. These statements differed in number depending on which group was responding to the survey. The last part of the survey focused on the three roles of the literacy coordinator: instruction, diagnosis and assessment, and leadership which were *a priori* categories (Johnson & Christensen, 2000). With the exception of the demographic questions, all other statements were positioned on a Likert response scale and participants were asked to indicate on a five point scale how strongly they agreed or disagreed with each statement. Table 2 presents a summary of how the statements on each survey were categorized. The following paragraphs detail the form sent to LCs, content-area teachers, and principals.

The LCs' survey form contained the demographic questions. It also included a section unique to the LCs. It probed how LCs viewed their job description and their professional relationship with members of their schools and other district LCs. These six statements were included because the literature indicated that definitions of the LC position are broad and that this can result in indiscriminant use of the specialist. Some studies recommend that job descriptions be tighter while others find the flexibility more in the interest of the school (Crain, 2003; Gates, 1958; Mosby, 1982; Robinson, 1967). These questions were inserted in order to ascertain whether the LCs in this study felt their job descriptions helped or hindered their role.

Table 2

Format of Questions on the LC, Principal, and Teacher Surveys

	LC Survey Questions (Total #)	Teacher Survey Questions (Total #)	Principal Survey Questions (Total #)
Demographics	1-15 (15)	1-10 (10)	1-9 (9)
Job Description	16-21 (6)		
Perceptions about principal	22-31 (10)	22-25 (4)	10-22 (13)
Perceptions about teachers	32-40 (9)	11-21 (12)	23-31 (9)
Perceptions about district	41-42 (2)		32-33 (2)
Perceptions about whom the LC works with	43-48 (6)	26-31 (6)	34-39 (6)
Questions based on *a priori* categories	49-71 (23)	32-55 (24)	40-63 (24)

The second section of the LC survey contained statements about the interaction of principals with the LC and their influence on the literacy environment within the school. Research reflects that the principal's attitude toward literacy and level of support of the literacy coordinator is one of the most influential contributions to role determination and success of the reading specialist (Darwin, 2002; Usova, 1973). In order to substantiate or contradict the findings about the influence of the principal in schools, ten statements soliciting the LCs' opinions about the influence of and interaction with their principal were added. The next section contained statements about LC perception of their professional relationships with the content-area teachers and the teachers' attitudes toward literacy. These nine statements were included to determine whether the reading specialists perceived themselves as being approachable as a colleague and whether they viewed teachers as being receptive to literacy development. The next two statements solicited information about their perception of the district regarding literacy. The next to

the last section of statements had to do with whom the LC worked, while the final section of the LC survey of 30 statements explored the *a priori* categories of instruction, diagnosis and assessment, and leadership.

The survey sent to content-area teachers contained the demographic and *a priori* categories, but it also included two sections geared toward teacher response. The first probed teacher attitude toward literacy. These 11 statements were included because attitudes or perceptions influence decisions and responses to any given person or situation (Eisenhart, Cuthbert, Shurm, & Harding, 1988; Isenberg, 1990). By probing teacher attitude toward literacy it was possible to gain some understanding of how teachers saw the role of the LC, and consequently, provide LCs with information that might better facilitate interaction with their colleagues. The statements were written based on Vaughan's and Estes' (1986) criteria for constructing direct measures. The second additional section of four statements focused on content-area teachers' perception of the principal's and district's orientation toward literacy. These were included to help understand the teachers' larger perception of the emphasis on literacy within the district.

The survey sent to principals was similar to the teacher survey. This form included a demographic and *a priori* section. In addition, the second section of 13 statements focused on the administrator's attitude toward literacy and how he or she interacted with the reading specialist. Responses to these statements indicated how the principals saw their role in and support of literacy. This was followed by three additional sections: the first, dealing with principal perception of teachers' attitudes toward literacy; the second, dealing with principal perception of the district's attitude toward literacy; and the third, dealing with whom the LC worked. Responses to all these statements were used

to determine the similarity to or difference among educators and their perceptions of literacy and their own as well as others' roles in it.

Survey Administration. The survey, in electronic form, was emailed to all secondary content-area faculty members the final week of February, 2006, after the first school semester ended. Hard copies of the survey were handed to the LCs in the final interview at the end of the semester for them to fill out and mail back. Similarly, principals were given hard copies after they were interviewed in December. All five LCs and all five principals completed the survey for a return rate of 100%. Faculty members received, via their principal, an email of explanation (see Appendix C for cover letter) about the study and a request they participate in taking the survey. The introductory email contained a link to the survey site, SurveyMonkey.com, which automatically directed them to the appropriate survey. Their completion of the survey constituted their willingness to participate and their permission to use their responses in this report. Moreover, faculty members were assured that their identity would remain anonymous.

In the survey, faculty members were asked to identify themselves but only for follow-up purposes if they did not complete the survey. Only the researcher and her assistant were able to identify who had or had not participated, or to access an individual teacher's responses. This was done in order to preserve teacher anonymity. Beyond contacts encouraging response, there was no other contact with, nor were there consequences for, those who chose not to respond.

Faculty members' anonymity was also preserved in the analysis of their responses. Faculty responses as a whole were analyzed only by content-area, degree of literacy training, and school level (middle or senior high). This was done so that district

administrators and individual school principals were able to view the study's results holistically but not by individual school or by individual faculty member. The survey was sent to 300 faculty members, of which 195 responded. This resulted in a 65% return rate.

Survey Analysis. Quantitative data were analyzed to provide descriptive statistics. Measures of central tendency and dispersion were calculated to describe the distribution of data (Rea & Parker, 1997) and aggregated according to category of respondent. Descriptive statistics on demographic information of faculty members was reported by school and included gender, ethnicity, years teaching, and educational degrees.

Research Question Two required two different statistical procedures. ANOVA was used to answer the primary question – Is the role of the secondary level reading specialist perceived in a significantly different manner by any of the following groups: reading specialists, faculty members, and school administrators in each of the five secondary schools located within the district? Pairwise comparisons were then generated to determine where significance lay.

T-tests were performed to determine significance of comparisons on the three subquestions of Research Question Two: (a) Do faculty members from core content-area backgrounds (math, science, English, social studies) perceive the role of the reading specialist in significantly different ways from those in non-core content-area backgrounds (PE, humanities, art, etc)? (b) Do faculty members with literacy endorsements and/or district literacy inservice perceive the role of the reading specialist in a significantly different way from those faculty members with no such literacy endorsements or inservice? (c) Do faculty members in middle schools perceive the role of the reading specialist in a significantly different way than those faculty members in the high schools?

Qualitative Data

Qualitative data, data which are generated through observation in a natural environment, can perhaps provide the best possible view into a person's thinking and motivation for action. For this reason, various types of qualitative data, (i.e., personal logs and responses, individual and focus group interviews) and observation were utilized in this study to provide access to faculty members' efforts of making meaning of what they do.

Time Logs/Weekly Personal Response. All secondary LCs kept two week's worth of self-report logs at three different times during the study: at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester being studied. For each two-week time period, LCs received daily logs which contained the list of job responsibilities found on the survey. These job responsibilities were based on the *a priori* categories of instruction, assessment/diagnosis, and leadership as defined by the IRA (2000) position statement on reading specialists. An "other" category was also included for any task they undertook that was not found on the list. At the end of each week during the logging period, LCs reflected on that week's activities and journaled briefly on one experience they thought went well and one they were not satisfied with. This allowed LCs to detail events that revealed additional insight into their roles but that were not elicited by the checklist. Because each literacy coordinator was teaching regular class periods the majority of the day, and because this study did not focus on classroom interaction, LCs recorded for only those 2-3 daily periods in which they actually carried out duties related to the LC's position (see Appendix D for example of reading log).

Each item in each category on each set of logs was then subjected to a frequency count to determine in which *a priori* categories the LCs' fulfilled the most responsibilities. Means were generated for each item in each category. Means were also generated for each category as a whole. The frequency counts and journaled responses were then compared to the results of the LC interviews and survey to help triangulate LC responses. The logs did not require the LC to track the amount of time spent accomplishing any one task. Therefore, it was not possible to determine how demanding or lengthy the task was simply by counting the number of times the task was checked. As a result, the percentages generated for each category did not represent time invested in the task, only the number of times the task was carried out during the logging period.

Observations. To supplement the self report logs of the literacy coordinators' activities, a 50-60 minute observation of their activities by the principal investigator took place between each logging period. Each observation time period extended over two periods of the school day, meaning it began halfway through one period and ended halfway into the next.

Observations were mainly non-participatory in nature. I sat quietly and took notes on what I saw taking place. This happened when I observed the LCs coaching and conducting faculty meetings, which accounted for two of the three observations. However, I also observed LCs in their rooms using their time to prepare for other responsibilities. During these times, LCs would narrate what they were doing as they moved from task to task, but more frequently, they would want to discuss what was going on in their work. They would ask about resources or about my perspective on what they were preparing or how an observation had gone or express the frustration they felt as they

tried to deal with multiple responsibilities. The two new LCs, in particular, were desirous to talk about what they were doing. On these occasions, I offered suggestions concerning resources; questioned them as to what they had observed, what they thought and why; and offered encouragement.

Overall, observations provided three hours of field notes on each reading specialist that were analyzed to provide additional verification of the responsibilities undertaken by the LCs. Field notes were analyzed after each observation to assess what responsibilities the LC carried out, to determine whether additional interview questions needed to be asked, and to build a better understanding of the scope of the LCs' job.

Interviews. LCs participated in four individual 40-45 minute interviews during the course of the semester. The first interview was held the week of August 15, 2005, before formal classes began and provided a baseline for subsequent data. The second interview took place at the end of September. By this time, LCs had enough time to become somewhat acquainted with their responsibilities and to begin interaction with faculty members in an LC capacity. The third interview took place in the middle of November when LCs had typically established some sort of routine to deal with their responsibilities and had had the opportunity to interact with more faculty members. The final interview took place the last week of January, 2006, or the first week of February, just before the semester ended and when a more established pattern of behavior had developed. Logs were reviewed before the interviews so that any questions, patterns, or comments that the logs generated could be discussed in addition to structured questions planned for each interview (see Appendix E for interview questions). Interview questions were generated

from the review of literature and targeted information about the LCs' preparation, scope of responsibilities, strengths, challenges, plans, and reflection on the role of LC.

Both principals and faculty members were also interviewed in their respective schools. The principal in each of the five schools was interviewed for one 45-50 minute session (see Appendix E for interview questions). At this same time, each principal also filled out a "Consent to Act as a Research Subject" form (See Appendix A for a copy of the form). Interviews in the form of focus groups took place with four or five secondary content-area teachers (see Appendix E for interview questions) in each school and lasted from 45-50 minutes. Teachers participating in the focus groups in each school were recommended by that school's literacy coordinator as being generally supportive of literacy efforts within the school. Some of the teachers in each group had received additional district literacy training in the form of summer conferences specifically targeting middle and high school literacy instruction and some had not. All interviews with all individuals or groups of participants were taped, transcribed, and analyzed.

Qualitative Data Analysis. Qualitative data were examined for themes, patterns of response, behavior, or thought, and coded according to the properties and categories that emerged from the groupings. After taped interviews had been transcribed, the transcriptions were entered into the computer and using the software program, NVivo, coding began. This took place by first reading through the data and highlighting information that contained similar properties, which could then be placed in a representative category. Often the data related to more than one category and were placed accordingly. Data initially placed into categories were examined extensively as the

categories were explored for emerging themes and relationships. As the process continued, subcategories formed as related ideas emerged and developed.

Open coding began by starting with the *a priori* categories of instruction, assessment and diagnosis, and leadership. In addition, additional new themes became evident. One such category was that of job description, from which emerged the subcategories of obstacles to job, insignificant tasks, and positive aspects of being an LC evolved. Other categories dealing with teacher response to the LC, preparation to be LC, effective LCs, time constraints, emotional demands were also identified.

After the interview, data were coded into categories and subcategories, they were then reviewed a number of times. This was done to check for accuracy of placement as well as to discern whether initial categories could be collapsed or necessitated expansion. Items that were coded into a number of categories were also analyzed for fit of placement and to discern possible relationships with other themes. Additionally, original transcripts were reviewed to ensure that all information had been considered for placement in any relevant node.

Qualitative data gathered from the interviews and logs were examined, coded, categorized, and evaluated in a holistic, inductive, ongoing process in order to sift out those regular occurrences and behavioral patterns (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and to provide triangulation. Triangulation, corroboration of information from different sources, of the coded data was verified by the self report logs and observational field notes. In the instance of disconfirming evidence, original data was reviewed to determine whether the evidence had been coded correctly. In addition, member checks took place as needed.

Sometimes they took place in follow up interviews. At other times, contact was made with the person in between interviews.

Data analysis was done on an ongoing basis throughout the study and the findings sometimes modified or completely altered the questions asked in subsequent interviews. These data were used to provide a thick description (Geertz, 1975) so as to gain a greater understanding of each LC within her own school. These data were also used to perform cross-case analysis among schools in order to determine the similarities and differences that existed across the cases. These similarities and differences will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Researcher Stance

In a qualitative study, the researcher is considered the primary research tool. As a result, I give a brief overview of my experience and background to acknowledge that influence as I analyzed and interpreted the data.

I am an insider in that I have been an educator who has worked at both the elementary and secondary levels as a mainstream and ESL teacher for 11 years as well as an ESL program administrator for six years. I have also taught international students at the university level for eight years as well as preservice teachers for three years. I have completed three years of doctoral coursework in literacy and am currently completing the dissertation requirements of my program with this study.

Though my teaching experience has not taken place in this school district, it has given me an understanding of the public school setting and the rewards and challenges of teaching literacy and of working with other educators who have had varying degrees of success in accommodating the literacy needs of ELLs. My experience as a magnet ESL

program coordinator in a junior high also familiarized me with the needs and demands of the administration within the school and at the district level. As a result, I was in a unique position in this study to view issues not only from an educator stance but also from an administrative position.

While this familiarity was helpful in sensitizing me to the workings of the participants involved, it was also an issue I had to consciously consider as I conducted this study, particularly the interviews. I tried to remain as objective as possible by not interjecting my perspective into the conversation but rather attempted to listen intently, ask relevant questions, and allow the participants to respond freely.

Chapter Four

Results

This study focused on the roles and responsibilities of literacy coordinators at the secondary level. Literacy coordinators are not new to the educational system being an integral part of the elementary school setting. However, it is much more unusual to find LCs at the secondary level. As a result, it was deemed important to investigate what LCs do at the secondary level as this setting differs from the elementary setting and because literature dealing with the secondary level is somewhat lean. This study also examined whether the perceptions of the roles of the LC differed from LC to principal to faculty member. Therefore, this comparative case study specifically addressed the following questions:

1. In the selected district, what duties and responsibilities do secondary reading specialists perform and how do these duties and responsibilities compare and contrast from school to school?

2. Is the role of the secondary literacy coordinator perceived in a significantly different manner by any of the following groups: literacy coordinators, faculty members, and school administrators in each of the five secondary schools located within the district and more specifically, (a) Do faculty members from different content-area backgrounds i.e. arts, English, math, PE, science, etc. perceive the role of the secondary literacy coordinator in significantly different ways? (b) Do faculty members with literacy endorsements and/or district literacy inservice perceive the role of the secondary literacy coordinator in a significantly different way from those faculty members with no such literacy endorsements or inservice? (c) Do faculty members in middle schools perceive

the role of the secondary literacy coordinator in a significantly different way than those faculty members in the high schools?

3. How do the duties currently being undertaken by secondary literacy coordinators correspond to surveyed perceptions of the role of the reading specialist?

This chapter first presents an overview of the LCs and school demographics at the five secondary schools in the district. First, the LCs at the two middle schools are presented, followed by the LCs at the high schools. The LCs' roles and responsibilities are revealed through in depth LC interviews and talking with principals and focus groups from each site, self recorded LC logs, researcher observations, and survey responses. These data sources provide information that addressed Research Question One. Additionally, at the conclusion of the LC overview, the findings regarding the LCs' duties are compared and contrasted across sites. Research Question Two is then addressed through the results of quantitative statistics run on survey responses. Finally, the Research Question Three is examined through both survey responses and teacher focus groups and principal interviews.

The School District

The school district was located in a city of 113,459 residents with a large university in a western state. The district encompassed both urban and suburban areas with a mostly Caucasian student population. In 2001, the district invested a substantial amount of money in literacy development. This resulted in the assignation of literacy coordinators (LCs) in the secondary schools as well as intensive training for those in the position. Training included 6 weeks of on site work in California where the literacy program, "Second Chance at Literacy Learning", was introduced. Second Chance is a

secondary professional development program developed by the Foundation for Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning (CELL) and "promotes best classroom practices for reading and writing as well as small group intervention for struggling readers in secondary classrooms to meet state and district standards" (*Foundation for Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning*, 2006, p.1). The main elements of this program are read aloud, shared reading, reciprocal teaching, literature discussion groups, content investigations, independent reading, interactive writing, interactive editing, independent writing, and test-taking strategies. Of the five literacy coordinators in the district, three received this initial training. The other two LCs, new to the position for the 2005-06 school year, received the training over the course of the school year by attending training under the district's supervision. The Second Chance elements basically became the core of the district's literacy focus and were emphasized from 2001 on.

In addition to the Second Chance training, the district also opted to send secondary faculty members to a week-long Jeff Wilhelm seminar on reading comprehension. This professional development was geared for middle and secondary teachers and focused on a range of reading strategies teachers could use to improve the reading engagement and comprehension of their students. Ongoing Wilhelm training took place during the annual two-day summer literacy conferences with another one or two-day meetings scheduled during the school year. Because of limited space at the training, the district was only allowed to send 15 teachers. As this training began, the district determined that because the content-area departments in the middle schools were much smaller than those at the high school level, more teachers and students would benefit if the high school faculty members participated. Therefore, while all five of the original

LCs attended the Wilhelm training, only additional faculty members from the two large high schools, Claybourne and Dover, participated. Each school determined which of their faculty members would go. At the time on this study, only high school faculty members attended this training. As a result, these two high schools had a Wilhelm-trained cohort made up of a variety of faculty members in different content-areas. These cohorts were to work with the LC at their school to help implement literacy strategies and act as a resource to other teachers within their specific content-area.

In 2001 as the district began this literacy focus, the district administration requested that those teachers who assumed the LC position commit to serving as such for at least five years. This was done to capitalize on the district's substantial financial investment in the Second Chance and Wilhelm training given to the LCs as well as to provide for consistency in the literacy approach within the schools from year to year. As the 2005-06 began, both Arbor Middle School and Claybourne High had new LCs. Blaine Middle School and Dover High had LCs who were completing their fifth year and had chosen not to continue on in the position when the school year ended. East High's LC, who was also completing her fifth year, intended to continue on as the school's LC.

After five years of working to strengthen literacy proficiency of secondary content-area teachers using Second Chance, Wilhelm, and other literacy programs, LCs reported being responsible for a wider variety of duties than just instructing faculty on how to implement literacy elements or strategies such as reciprocal teaching. They also indicated that there was a very mixed teacher reaction regarding the relevance and effectiveness of the Second Chance literacy emphasis in their content-area classrooms.

All secondary literacy coordinator positions in the district were considered half-time and each LC received a $1200 yearly stipend for accepting the position. The district office paid for three released periods for each LC at every secondary school. This resulted in the LCs teaching four out of seven regular class periods. The remaining three free periods were to allow LCs to attend to literacy related issues (e.g., carrying out district testing, peer coaching, researching for general and specific teacher needs, preparing for professional inservice meetings). However, this half-time title was misleading as it suggested that each LC actually had three free periods to deal with these issues. This did not take into account that each LC taught at least three classes of different content material, which still required a period to prepare for teaching responsibilities. This, then, narrowed the free periods from three to two.

In addition to daily teaching and the LC duties, LCs normally assumed other substantial responsibilities. For example, three out of the five LCs were either ESL coordinators or so heavily involved with the school's ESL population that one of their "free" periods was exclusively devoted to that. Another LC had also been ESL coordinator and had just relinquished that responsibility after having served four years as both ESL coordinator and LC. No doubt ESL fell under the literacy umbrella but when 20-30% of the school was considered ESL, it was easy to see that in addition to literacy issues, there would also have been frequent communication and logistical problems to deal with such as translating for teachers, parents, and students.

While the district had given some general guidelines about the responsibilities of the LC position, there was no specific formal job description for any of the LCs in place. This left the individual site basically free to determine the specifics of the LC role.

However, it was understood that each LC would conduct monthly professional development meetings, peer coach, and oversee testing. There was also some flexibility for the LC at each site to respond to the specific needs or directives at her school in the manner she though most appropriate, so the roles and responsibilities of the LC varied from, as well as corresponded to, those of LCs at other sites. It was, therefore, prudent to understand the background of each LC, the student and teacher demographics of each school as well as the LC duties performed at that site. The following sections first cover the two middle schools: Arbor and Blaine, after which, the three high schools: Claybourne, Dover, and East are examined. After LC background and school demographics are presented, Research Question One: In the district, what duties do secondary reading specialists perform? is addressed.

Arbor Middle School

Demographics of Arbor Middle School. Arbor was one of two middle school sites serving the district. It was located on the east side of the district and while the student population drew from all socioeconomic backgrounds, it was predominantly Caucasian middle and upper middle class. Table 3 indicates the student ethnic makeup of the 974 students attending school.

Table 3

Arbor Middle School 2005-06 Student Body Ethnic Makeup

	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other	Total
# of students	40	6	719	181	12	15	1	974
% of total student population	4%	< 1%	74%	19%	1%	<1%	<1%	100%

The realigning of school boundaries and subsequent reassignment of teachers as well as all other teacher relocation resulted in 21 new faculty members joining Arbor's faculty along with 30 returning teachers. The realignment of school boundaries also redirected 230 new students to the school and more than doubled Arbor's ELL population: up from 80 to 190. The faculty was about 90% Caucasian with an almost three to one ratio of women to men. Almost half of the faculty had taught for 16 or more years and 20 teachers had completed master's degrees.

The literacy coordinator and her responsibilities. Ann, the literacy coordinator at Arbor Middle School, was a sixth-year teacher and a member of the English department. She had a BA in English teaching and an ESL endorsement but no reading endorsement. In addition to being the LC, Ann was also the ESL coordinator and only ESL-endorsed teacher in a school where 190 students were designated ELL. She was also one of the few faculty members who spoke Spanish. She taught one class of beginning ESL and one class of intermediate ESL as well as two periods of enriched English to 8th graders, resulting in three different preparations.

This was her first year as an LC, though Ann had worked at Arbor for five years and was well known at the school. She was asked to take the LC position when the previous LC moved to another state. She was the third LC in five years at Arbor, but had had some exposure to the position before assuming full responsibility. This was because as a first-year teacher, her mentor was the LC. As Ann was mentored by the LC, she was also exposed to the responsibilities of the position. Ann said,

> M. was my mentor my first year here. So, as she did Second Chance stuff and was learning how to be literacy coordinator, I heard a lot about that and because I did Second Chance training that year [as a faculty member], and even when I was

> teaching Spanish, you know, I would collaborate with her on other things and kind of get Second Chance stuff as it went.

Then, two years later, she was also a good friend with the then current LC and collaborated with her on several projects and referred to herself as "the unofficial literacy coordinator assistant for the last two years." In spite of this familiarity with the work of an LC, Ann struggled to define what her role was throughout the year.

As the school year began, Ann was most worried about teacher resistance and presenting to the faculty. She continued to comment on both throughout the year indicating that the stress of presenting had to do with both preparing "to teach [the teachers] something that they're not exactly excited about" and then presenting it in a very limited time period. There was never enough time in the faculty guided meetings to effectively teach all that she felt needed to be covered. However, she articulated her overall desire and concern,

> Part of [my concern] is that it won't be something that's useful. I don't want it to be just hoops that we jump through because the district says we have to… I think that we have a foundation already with those Second Chance elements. What I want to do is take those elements that the majority of the teachers here are familiar with and talk about the idea of how do you modify them so they fit your curriculum and accomplish the purpose. And the other thing I want to do is introduce other kinds of strategies. Some that I know, that I've learned, instructional strategies that work with ESL kids or instructional strategies that work with gifted kids, that deal with text. And kind of give them, because I think it's a tool box, is the way I like to look at it…teachers need more options… it's worth it for them to learn some of the Second Chance elements and other things…[but] they shouldn't have to force fit it every time. They should be able to modify it and change it and make it fit… I want it to be something teachers actually use in their classrooms and they can see that it helps their students.

Ann was torn between the value of using the research-based Second Chance Program elements and her realization that many of the faculty at her school did not think them relevant to their classes. She also had her own qualifications of the applicability of the Second Chance program as well. She said,

> The biggest problem I have with Second Chance is that it's focused on reading remediation – kids that are low readers – and when you do that school-wide, since I'm also doing stuff with gifted and talented students, it's ridiculous to require them to do that when they don't need it and it doesn't help them.

She, therefore, not only wanted to comply with the district's implementation of the Second Chance Program, but she also wanted to share other literacy strategies with teachers that they could use in their content-area instruction to ultimately benefit their students.

Ann communicated directly with the principal concerning her responsibilities and concerns as LC. Though she did not meet regularly with him, Ann often talked with him informally and could count on his support as she strove to carry out her responsibilities as LC.

Blaine Middle School

Demographics of Blaine Middle School. In contrast to Arbor, Blaine was located on the west side of the district and the student body came from a middle to lower socioeconomic background. There were 945 students and 54 faculty members at Blaine. New boundary changes and a school closing resulted in 300 new students coming to Blaine along with 20 new faculty members. The demographics of the new students did not alter the overall demographics of the school which are presented in Table 4.

The ELL population at Blaine was 30%. The faculty was almost 90% Caucasian and had a two to one ratio of women to men. Almost half of the faculty, 45%, had taught for 16 years or more and 13 had masters degrees.

Table 4

Blaine Middle School 2005-06 Student Body Ethnic Makeup

	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other	Total
# of students	13	10	605	280	17	23	0	945
% of total student population	1%	1%	64%	30%	2%	2%	0%	100%

The literacy coordinator and her responsibilities. Britta, the LC at Blaine, had taught for 18 years, all at Blaine and all in the English department. She was in her fifth and final year as LC. Britta had completed a BA in English and history, a master's degree in reading pedagogy, Level 1 and 2 reading endorsements, an ESL endorsement, and the Wilhelm training. She planned to begin a doctoral program in the fall of 2006 in instructional psychology and technology.

During the first semester of the 2005-06 school year, Britta taught four periods: two gifted and talented English classes, one advanced ESL/language arts class, and one creative writing class. However, as the second semester began, she was also asked to teach a US history class. She had been the gifted and talented coordinator for five years and in addition to running that program within the school, she was also administering a grant and supervising the National Junior Honor Society and Future Problem Solvers club.

Britta had additional responsibilities on the ESL committee helping with testing and curriculum for ESL/English classes and working on the Teaching and Learning Committee to do staff development with the district's current instructional model for English language learners. She met bimonthly with each of the ESL and English departments. She had also served as the ESL coordinator for four years and reading/thinking specialist for six years prior to the 2005-06 school year. Finally, as the new school year began, Britta was asked to share the responsibility for carrying out new teacher inservice for 8-9 teachers with the interning assistant principal. The district had previously fulfilled this responsibility.

Five years ago, the principal asked Britta to become the literacy coordinator. When asked about what prompted her to become the literacy coordinator she responded,

> Because when I first started teaching …. all of a sudden I get a student who reads flawlessly and cannot comprehend a thing. Wow. I had no training. Zero. So I went back and got my MA in reading instruction…No student should ever go through school not being successful. There's ways to get a student reading and writing well. So, let's do it.

Britta regularly attended literacy professional development in the form of district, state, and national conferences and read a great deal of professional literature. At home, she normally devoted about ten hours a week to reading various professional journals and books. She considered herself up to date on what was happening within the field of literacy and called herself passionate about it. She attributed coming to know how to be a literacy coordinator to reading the pedagogy. When asked what her LC responsibilities were at her school, she responded,

> The number one thing is to promote the program I've been trained in, which is CELL/XCELL Second Chance, where teachers are using school-wide an array of strategies. And of course, that's reading and writing. And basically the best way to explain the program is probably the gradual release of responsibility, where

> you've got a lot of teacher direction, a lot of strategies that are teacher directed and [then you move] to the middle, you know, student and teacher [working equally in tandem]. And then of course, you're aiming for student independence in both reading and writing. It kind of looks at teacher reading, group reading, guided reading, and then independent reading. The same way with writing. So, it's to get those strategies learned and then practiced through peer mentoring and through observation.

Regarding observing and mentoring, Britta indicated that this year she would be "restricted by logistics and lack of a formal literacy staff development plan to visiting teachers one on one – mostly new teachers." In previous years, she had worked much more with the entire faculty.

In the past, Britta met with the principal on a regular basis, however, this year meetings were quite sporadic and communication and support unpredictable. Britta was ready to turn over the LC responsibilities to a new faculty member indicating that new blood and new perspectives were needed. Her frustration centered not only on infrequent administration interface and support but also on teacher mind set,

> [The teachers] haven't caught it. It's not elements [of the Second Chance program]. It's not specific little things you do, it's best practices and a mind set. A whole different way of looking at presenting the idea that, you know what, until the kids get it, you haven't taught it…The thing that causes me the most stress is knowing that I can't get to everybody and make a difference with everyone…I feel like I'm the only one out there.… This is our fifth year…that we've asked the teachers to go and visit other classes. At this point, we should be requiring certain things, we've got SIOP [Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol – the school's current instructional model] and Second Chance protocols…Instead, it's ahh, whatever, you know. Just go and visit.

Britta, in her fifth year as LC, was struggling to stay optimistic and involved in encouraging her faculty to continue moving forward with the Second Chance elements but having a difficult time maintaining either because of ongoing teacher resistance and lagging administration support. Table 5 provides a summary of the demographics of the middle school LCs.

Table 5

Middle School Literacy Coordinators

LC	Degree	Content Area	Endorsements	Years Teaching	Years as LC	Additional Major Duties
Ann	BS	English	ESL	6	1	ESL Coordinator
Britta	BA	English and History	Level 1 and 2 reading, ESL, Wilhem Training	18	5	National Jr. Honor Society, Future Problem Solvers Club, Gifted/Talented Program
	MA	Reading				

Claybourne High

Demographics of Claybourne High. Claybourne High was one of two traditional high schools and was centrally located within the district. Claybourne served 49% of the district's 3,781 high school students. The student body came from a wide socioeconomic background with the majority falling in the lower to middle classes. The student body was about 30% minority (See Table 6 for make up of student body ethnic background) with 15% of those participating in some phase of the ESL program. Another 12-13% of the student population was special education and another 2-3% attended the special problems unit which served the entire district. Claybourne had a faculty of 92 teachers with a woman to man ratio of almost one-to-one. The faculty was 91% Caucasian with almost 50% having taught 16 or more years and 30 holding advanced degrees.

Table 6

Claybourne High 2005-06 Student Body Ethnic Makeup

	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other	Total
# of students	44	13	1324	384	21	55	8	1849
% of total student population	2%	< 1%	72%	21%	1%	3%	<1%	100%

The district had a school choice program. If students preferred to attend a school other than the one in which boundaries they lived, they could get special permission to attend the desired school. Claybourne's principal indicated that this had affected the enrollment at Claybourne High as it was a Title I school and as such had several programs for which Dover High did not qualify. He stated that access to these programs drew 92 of Dover's most needy students to Claybourne High while 69 of Claybourne's students had chosen to attend Dover. Additionally, he noted that the realignment of school boundaries now directed what used to be Claybourne High's most affluent elementary feeder school to Dover High. He regretted this because Claybourne would now lose many well-prepared students that had traditionally come from that elementary school.

The literacy coordinator and her responsibilities. Claire, the literacy coordinator at Claybourne High, had taught for 16 years, all at Claybourne High. She had a BS in Child Development and Family Relations, a secondary certificate in Art Education with an English minor, certification to teach Spanish, a bilingual/ESL endorsement, and the Wilhelm training but no reading endorsement. She had also taught ESL/multicultural classes for both the city's large university and for the district. She was a member of the

art department and taught an AP art history to tenth- to twelfth-graders along with an AP history class. She had just started a "Latinos in Action" class. In this class, she placed and supervised all ability-levels of ELL students at Claybourne as mentors in three elementary schools and Blaine Middle School. Her goal in designing the class was to give students the opportunity to not only learn how they could contribute to their community but also to experience the confidence building that resulted when they were considered expert sources of knowledge by other students.

This was Claire's first year as an LC. The person who would have been the LC had left to pursue a doctorate. However, as Claire's good friend, she urged Claire to take the position because one of the emphases for the coming school year was to work intensively with the sheltered ESL class teachers to meet the needs of ELL students. These sheltered content-area teachers worked with classes composed solely of ELL students in which the curriculum had been modified to accommodate for English language learning as well as content. Claire emphasized the use of literacy accommodations to help teach content material. Claire had the necessary ESL background and training to mentor these teachers. Moreover, she thoroughly enjoyed working with ELLs saying,

> I have a passionate interest in the ESL kids and their education and development. So, the reason I said "yes" to the job is that I love the idea of working with sheltered teachers and that means I'll be in class with those kids as I observe. So helping them achieve literacy and acquire a second language is really important to me.

The current principal, in his second year at Claybourne, had been vice principal at Claybourne some years previously. In returning to the school, he found teacher morale low and tension high. He believed that in order to change the morale, communication and

collaboration needed to improve. Further, the school needed a new perspective regarding literacy. He believed the previous literacy emphasis on Second Chance elements had resulted in many negative responses among the teachers. After convincing Claire to take the position, together they opted to change the title of the LC position to that of "learning coach". They did this in an effort to emphasize that the position's goal was to improve the learning of the students and the faculty rather than call up a particular set of literacy strategies. Claire described it this way:

> How we framed it at faculty meeting is that I'm thinking of myself as a "learning coach" instead of a "literacy coordinator" because, of course, literacy and learning are closely connected. And instead of [when] I stand up and they all see an English teacher and more reading crammed down the faculty's collective throat, they're seeing an non-English teacher who's after learning and maximizing good teaching and student learning. And so, it was very positive. And the response was very positive.

Claire had indicated that she would not be able to do the literacy work in the same manner as the previous LCs as her background was not specifically English. The principal thought this might be to the school's advantage because the faculty had such a negative attitude towards literacy and in Claire's own words, "when the English teacher stood up to talk about literacy, the faculty just sort of checked out." Therefore, he and Claire determined as the LC, she would address principles that supported and motivated faculty cooperation and development. Her approach was not to focus on Second Chance or Wilhelm strategies, but to work on communication, collaboration, and contextualization in an effort to improve relationships as well as literacy. Claire described her job:

> I'm in charge of heading up the focus groups [voluntary groupings of teachers who gather to discuss issues e.g., avoiding teacher burnout, making school a socially fun place to be, acceptance of all students, scheduling issues] …Also, I do the Crucial Conversations training, we do lunch every other Friday, and we

> take a chapter from the Crucial Conversations book. My three pieces are contextualization, communication, and collaboration. So the focus groups are collaboration, crucial conversations are communication. Then I teach professional development almost once a month, and we do some piece that deals with communication and contextualization and collaboration at every one of those faculty developments. So I, to collaborate, I'm using teachers to do things that are, so that they're teaching as part of those presentations. I also work with the department coaches and help them know what needs to happen in their 45 minute session with their departments. And I also run peer coaching. Those are all things that cluster specifically around the LC. And then [the principal] has also asked me, as part of the LC, but which I see as a separate thing, to mentor the sheltered teachers. So I've met with them, I've taught some SIOP [Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol] principles, I've had some conferences with them and some visits to their classes. So that's my job description.

In relation to her job, Claire stated, "I think that that's kind of, maybe my approach: going underneath strategies and going kind of to the feeling level, because…if you just get strategies, strategies, strategies, you just tune out."

Claire felt strongly that teachers needed to buy into the literacy training and for that to happen, they had to see the relevancy of what she was presenting to their personal educational situation. She focused on making those connections clear. Claire also had a close working relationship with the principal and they met often to discuss faculty needs and literacy issues. She stated that she had the freedom to focus her efforts as she saw needs arise and knew the principal would support her.

Dover High

Demographics of Dover High. Dover High was the second of the two traditional high schools in the district and was located on the northeastern boundary of the district in one of the most affluent areas of the city. Though located in the most affluent area of the district, bussing also brought students in from less affluent areas. Dover had the most homogenous student body in terms of ethnicity with 81% Caucasian as reflected in Table 7.

Table 7

Dover High 2005-06 Student Body Ethnic Makeup

	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other	Total
# of students	61	12	1342	178	16	37	1	1647
% of total student population	4%	< 1%	81%	11%	<1%	2%	<1%	100%

Twelve percent of the students at Claybourne were ESL. The principal indicated that the boundary changes had as yet had no real effect on the school enrollment. Most of the students slated to attend Dover in the 2005-06 school year, but who had been attending Claybourne High previously, elected to remain at Claybourne High. The same was true of the new incoming 9th graders. Ninth-graders planning on attending Claybourne High before the boundaries were changed, but after the realignment then lived within Dover's school boundaries, still chose to attend Claybourne. Conversely, under the school choice option, 69 students who because of boundary changes were then slated to attend Claybourne High, chose to remain at Dover.

Dover had 86 faculty members with a Caucasian ethnicity of about 98%. There was a 1.5 ratio of women to men and 20 teachers indicated they had taught for 16 or more years. There were 19 teachers who held advanced degrees.

The literacy coordinator and her responsibilities. Debra, Dover's LC, was in her fifth year as a secondary school teacher and as LC. She had been at Dover for her entire teaching career and taught English to 10-12th graders. Moreover, she had five years experience teaching ESL to adults in an intensive English program at the city's large university. During the same period, she also taught literacy classes to preservice

undergraduate students minoring in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) at the same institution. Debra had a BA in speech communication and a master's in TESL as well as a Level 2 reading endorsement and the Wilhelm training. She was a member of the English department at Dover and supervised the professional development committee in the school. She described her job this way:

> There are several different facets to the job. One of my responsibilities is professional development. I'm the leader of six teachers who are over six parts of professional development. Every single teacher in the school is assigned to one of those teams and meets a couple of times a year to discuss, to generate ideas about what we need to do…We [teacher leaders] meet every month with the principals and discuss our areas and anything else the principal wants us to do. So, we're kind of over professional development, plus we're teacher leaders…I'm also in charge of what happens [in faculty meeting] every third Wednesday. Another area I deal with is the new Basic Skills Competency Test that the students have to take to graduate… They depend on me to figure out what we're going to do with those kids [all students, not just seniors, who don't pass it]…I'm doing the biannual district wide reading and writing assessments…I'm the liaison between the district and the school, so I go to meetings once a month with the LCs…[In addition] another teacher and I have created a kind of professional study group… we'll be doing readings and talking about them [monthly] and then we'll be peer coaching each other…each time we meet we're going over another piece of what we learned during that [Wilhelm training] week and teach it to the new teachers which will help those of us who've just done it this year…Plus, we've started peer coaching [with the faculty].

Debra routinely read professional articles and attended and presented at professional workshops and conferences. She encouraged others in her school to do the same. As a fifth-year LC, Debra was now comfortable with her job because as she said,

> I pretty much have designed it…I just sort of had an instinct for what needed to happen, so this year, over the years, I've sort of gotten things to the place I wanted them. So, I think I really am enjoying the fruits of my labors as far as that goes.

At this point, Debra understood her own and the faculty/administration's limitations and had devised options that allowed her to focus as much as possible on what she felt was most important. As a result, she emotionally distanced herself from

disagreeable faculty members and school politics and focused on creating and working with professional development teams revolving around literacy development.

Her greatest concerns were teacher involvement and accountability, the new requirements for graduating seniors, and how to ensure that all seniors would be able to pass the required state test. She also stated,

> If you'd asked me that question [about what most concerned me] two years ago, I would have been obsessed with the bad attitudes of some of my faculty. But I think that you get wiser as you do this job, and at this point in my tenure as LC, I'm not really worried about those teachers because I've really learned that I just focus on…those that just love to try something new…and as these teachers try out new things and are successful in the classroom you get converts that come over.

Debra was in her final year as LC and while not satisfied with how all the literacy aspects in the school were or were not being addressed, had come to grips with the situation and determined what she thought realistic. She devoted the majority of her time to those areas she thought most important as well as to those teachers who were receptive to literacy improvement. While she had seen some positive changes in teacher literacy instruction, she was ready to pass the responsibilities onto others for a variety of reasons. She had fulfilled the five year commitment she had made to the district and felt like someone with "a different set of eyes…can maybe see things [I] didn't see" plus she had "almost become cynical from the faculty abrasion and so if you can get someone who's kind of fresh, who hasn't been worn down, I think it would be a positive. Plus, I really love teaching."

Debra had met with her principal regularly over the years, though more so in the beginning of her LC stewardship. She confidently expressed herself on any issue and could usually count on administrative support. However, at times she felt support was lacking. Debra particularly felt like the administration did not hold teachers accountable

for participating in professional development activities like peer coaching and therefore, teachers did not take the assignments seriously.

East High

Demographics of East High School. In addition to the two traditional high schools, there was also an alternative high school in the district: East High. It was a smaller school with only 285 students and sat on the western edge of the school district. Students attending East had been referred from the other middle or high schools in the district for issues such as absenteeism, custody conflicts, behavior problems, and substance abuse. The ethnic makeup of the student body (shown in Table 8) was more diverse at East than at any other secondary school in the district, though the majority was still mainly Caucasian. Of the students who attended East, 28% had been identified as ELLs. Of these, 43 students were actually enrolled in an ESL class, while the remaining 24 had been mainstreamed and were only being monitored.

Table 8

East High 2005-06 Student Body Ethnic Makeup

	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other	Total
# of students	1	11	147	110	9	7	0	285
% of total student population	<1%	4%	52%	39%	3%	2%	0%	100%

Twenty-one faculty members taught at East with 90% identifying themselves as Caucasian. There was an almost one-to-one ratio of women to men with three teachers holding advanced degrees and four teachers having taught more than five years.

The literacy coordinator and her responsibilities. Eve, the LC at East, had taught at East all of her five years as a secondary school teacher. She had a BA in history with an English minor. Eve was a member of the English department but she had regular interaction with all the other faculty members because there were only a total of 21 faculty members in the high school. She taught English to ninth through twelfth graders and had three different preps. She accepted the LC position as a first year teacher. When asked how she became the LC, her response was,

> It was kind of an accident almost. Like that wasn't what I was looking for. I was just looking for a teaching job. History was actually my major and English was my minor. I teach English here, which was my minor but I kind of came here for an interview. I didn't even call this school, they called me…I'd never even heard of this school…I didn't even know if I wanted to work in an alternative school but I came and did the interview and felt good about it. And they said, "We want you to teach English and also be the literacy coordinator half the time." And they kind of explained what that would mean and that I'd have to go to these trainings… They wanted someone who'd already been here, but they only had one English teacher that was staying on for the next year...but then was going to be having a second baby…So, she was going to stay one more year and train me and get me going in the school… So, I kind of became the English department chair and everything after she left. So, it was just kind of an accident. They needed someone to do the coordinating of the literacy and they didn't have anyone else in the school to do it and that was what they hired me for.

Because that was the first year that the district had created the LC position, Eve learned how to be an LC by talking with the other LCs at the Second Chance training in California and at other district meetings. She said, "[The LC position] was a new thing with secondary. They've done it with elementary but never with secondary so it's not like anyone knew what we were supposed to do, we kind of made it up."

When Eve was asked to describe her LC responsibilities, she replied,

> There's training for the faculty in literacy strategies, so I'm in charge of one faculty meeting a month that involves literacy. And I kind of do whatever I want with it but it focuses on Second Chance elements and teaching the teachers other strategies they can use for literacy, reading and writing, basically. Then going into

> their classrooms, observing, coaching, and trying out the strategies. Testing. Any kind of reading and writing test, I'm put in charge of: administering, getting the teachers the materials for the test, making sure the teachers know how to give the test, making sure they know how to score the test. Then I'm in charge of the day when we actually get together and score it. Then I have kind of my random things…like library. We don't actually have a librarian. We just have a lady that works in the library that's paid part-time and she has no library training at all, so I end up ordering all the library books and helping her with that stuff and putting reading levels in the library books to kind of level the books. Things like that.

Eve had participated in some of the Wilhelm training but because East was an alternative school and had a small student body, the faculty had not been invited to participate in the Wilhelm training. Eve had been the sole exception. She was working on an ESL endorsement but did not have a reading endorsement. A reading endorsement was something Eve wanted to obtain, but to that date, training had not been available in the summer when she was free of teaching responsibilities. Eve regularly attended literacy inservice and read professional literature.

Unlike Britta and Debra, Eve believed she would continue on as LC at East, though she was a little hesitant. She said, "It's just a lot of work and that's why I kind of hesitate but I don't mind it really." For the first three years as LC, she met with her principal on a monthly basis to discuss what she was doing. When the principal changed two years ago, the monthly meetings stopped. However, Eve felt fine about her job and how things were progressing. She also felt quite positive about the support she received from her current principal. Table 9 provides a summary of the demographics of the high school literacy coordinators.

Table 9

High School Literacy Coordinators

LC	Degree	Content Area	Endorsements	Years Teaching	Years as LC	Additional Major Duties
Claire	BS Secondary Certificate	Child Develop Art Education English Minor	Spanish, ESL, Wilhelm Training	16	1	Latinos in Action, Mentoring ESL sheltered teachers
Debra	BA	Speech Communication	Level 2 Reading, Wilhelm Training	5 (also 5 at university level in ESL)	5	Head of professional development
Eve	BA	History English Minor	ESL (in progress), Wilhelm Training	5	5	Mentoring new teachers, Department chair

Comparison and Contrast of LC Responsibilities in the District

None of the LCs had definite job descriptions, but all had general guidelines about their roles and responsibilities, either from the training they each received regarding the Second Chance Program or from seeing a previous LC at work. As a result, each LC had some tasks that varied, but the majority of the basic roles and responsibilities among LCs was congruent. These responsibilities can be divided into three categories defined by the IRA: instruction of students, diagnosis and assessment, and leadership.

Instruction of Students

Each LC primarily considered herself a teacher who worked with various types of students ranging from beginning ELL to mainstream to gifted and talented. However,

in the capacity of an LC, no one worked directly with individual, small groups, or a classroom of students. All LCs drew a distinct line between being a teacher of students in their content-area and being an LC. Frequency counts from self-report logs bear this out. LCs rarely checked that they worked with students in any kind of capacity as LC. This was also confirmed by observational records. At no time did the researcher observe an LC working with students.

Moreover, all LCs reported that their job was to work with the faculty members in their school to build teacher proficiency in literacy instruction so that students would benefit. When asked if they would consider taking a full time LC position if it were offered, four LCs indicated that they probably would not, mainly because they enjoyed teaching students. Eve's comment represents the LCs' feelings on the whole,

> I don't think I'd like [being a full-time LC] because I like working with kids. That's like the whole reason I went into teaching and if I couldn't do that then it would be like, "Why am I here? What's the point?" Not that I don't like working with teachers but working with kids is more rewarding and fun and fulfilling.

However, both Ann at Arbor Middle and Claire at Claybourne qualified their responses. While teaching was most paramount to them, they also enjoyed having responsibilities that broke up the routine of teaching students and offered them opportunities to develop professionally.

Britta at Blaine Middle School, the only LC who would have liked to have been a full-time LC, was firmly convinced that the best way to benefit students and improve their literacy skills was to work more with the faculty on literacy instruction. So, while she enjoyed teaching, she felt that more could be accomplished for the students if there were a full-time LC in place.

LC self-report logs indicated that two to three LCs marked working with different groups of students somewhat frequently. When questioned about this, all indicated that they were had marked it when working with students in the capacity of a classroom teacher. All LCs remained adamant that they did not work with students at all when using their time as LC. None of the LCs were ever observed working with or planning for working with students.

In summary, no LC directly instructed students in any capacity when functioning as an LC. As LCs, they were to work primarily with teachers to help them develop their literacy instruction proficiency. In spite of this professional development focus, all the LCs primarily considered themselves teachers of students, a responsibility they thoroughly enjoyed. The desire to work with and benefit students was the attraction that first drew these women to teaching. Because of this desire to maintain student interaction, four of the five LCs indicated they would not assume a full-time LC position if one were offered.

Diagnosis and Assessment

Regarding diagnosis and assessment, LCs had similar responsibilities. The sole exception to this was Claire. Claire's principal had relieved her of all testing responsibilities so that she could focus her efforts on teacher development issues. The remaining four LCs were all responsible for administering the district-wide reading and writing assessment tests given in the fall and spring. This responsibility entailed not only distributing and overseeing the test taking, but also the training of teachers to evaluate student essays. Further, the LCs were involved in determining how to help those students who tested below grade level progress.

All LCs indicated that the main responsibility in testing was seasonal but at those times very demanding. LCs put in many extra hours at these times of year and other LC duties were forgotten. One LC summed it up saying,

> I'm amazed how much time it takes to administer, train, and coach the faculty for the two school-wide assessments. Scrambling to get materials in and back, as well as make-ups for the tests has consumed most of my free time. I even had to bubble in sheets that were not done correctly.

Another mentioned having to sort hundreds of scan sheets by grade level and being disgusted that dozens of sheets were unusable because of student sloppiness which was not corrected by teachers' supervision. Yet, another reported that she spent a full week doing makeup testing with students who had missed the district tests. All four LCs expressed frustration over the amount of time testing consumed and took away from more important LC tasks.

Occasionally, an LC might be asked to evaluate an individual student's reading proficiency level if there were some question about appropriate placement. She was then to share her assessment results with teachers and discuss implications for instruction but this was not a frequent responsibility.

While LCs all reported similar major responsibilities, three LCs reported slightly different responsibilities related to testing. Ann at Arbor Middle School was responsible for using the outcomes of the year-end tests to place students in the appropriate reading class. However, she felt this was the responsibility of the English teachers who actually knew the students, and who would not base placement solely on one test score as she was forced to do. Debra, at Dover High School, monitored test scores to see which students needed extra help to ensure that they received it. She was also working to develop a way to identify which of the new incoming ninth grade students might have problems with the

competency tests and place them into a class that would prepare them to take the tests. Finally, Eve at East High School was in charge of interpreting test statistics and disseminating the information. She also oversaw other school-wide tests that were conducted at her school.

Other than at district-wide testing times when testing demands were all consuming for LCs, assessment obligations were light. This was somewhat less true for Eve, who indicated that a great deal of testing went on throughout the year at her school. Overall, LCs supervised the biannual district-wide testing and teacher training associated with its evaluation, but resented the time it took away from doing their much more central task: working with teachers to improve literacy instruction. Some LCs reported having additional testing tasks. These took the form of occasionally assessing an individual struggling student referred by a teacher or determining student class placement based on testing scores or administering other school-wide tests.

These outcomes were substantiated through the LCs' self-report logs. Frequency counts for this area of responsibility were non-existent for Claire, who had been relieved of testing responsibilities. Britta, Debra, and Eve all reported more testing responsibilities at the beginning of the semester when district-wide testing was taking place than at any other time during the study. This period accounted for 61% of Britta's total testing responsibilities during the logging periods, 44% of Debra's, and 100% of Eve's. Ann was the sole exception; testing during the first logging period accounted for 25% of all testing responsibilities. This increased to 33% for the second period and 42% in the third period. Testing was never addressed or attended to in any of the observations that I conducted.

Leadership

The third category of leadership was by far the area in which the LCs spent the majority of their time, and the one which all agreed was most needed in their schools. This was supported by the LC self-report logs. In all marking periods, all LCs indicated that from 58-87% of their work originated in this area. Additionally, two of the three observations involved LCs peer coaching and conducting faculty meetings. Debra stated, "Leadership [is the most important category] because even if you had a full-time reading specialist here, they wouldn't be nearly as effective at being able to get everybody involved [if the LC were not working with teachers]." LCs worked to inform, motivate, and involve teachers in the literacy efforts. Tasks common to all LCs focused on preparing and presenting professional development, observing and coaching, and researching or staying current with the literature. LCs occasionally mentioned assuming an administration responsibility related to leadership. Their comments also revealed that their priorities in and responses to literacy efforts differed. A description of the leadership responsibilities assumed by the LCs follows.

Professional development meetings. Four of the five LCs agreed that preparing and presenting monthly professional development was the most time consuming and demanding task. This responsibility was stressful for several reasons: (a) the LCs' had high expectations to present helpful and relevant information to teachers; (b) it took a great deal of time to research and adequately prepare for the presentation; (c) some faculty members displayed negative attitudes and responses to the content and instruction; and (d) time allotted for their presentations was always too short.

Britta, from Blaine Middle School, an experienced LC of five years, described her feelings about organizing and training teachers for the district-wide writing assessment after much preparation,

> I was very nervous, having 21 teachers on our faculty who were new to our system of reading and grading these papers, as well as using a new rubric. In fact, I didn't sleep well the night before, and had to get up very early to make copies at Kinko's.

At the high school, Claire, in her first year as LC, described the pressure of presenting,

> I find the most difficult part of my job, pressure-wise, is to keep performing at those professional development sessions. I feel like I've got to have something worthwhile, something new, something catchy, something engaging. And that's kind of always hanging over my head and taking more time and energy than anything else. I haven't been able to mentor the sheltered teachers as much as I would like to, and I think part of it is because I always think, "Oh, oh, another training coming up," and then I have to kind of read or do the Wilhelm stuff so I've got to be growing it [growing in her own understanding of a concept or practice] to be able to model it for them. And I guess that's a part of my job description that is not visible, is that I have to keep pushing myself so that I have some new depth to plumb to share with the teachers.

Ann expressed frustration over time and logistical issues. She wanted to group the teachers by discipline so that she could present literacy instruction related to their content matter. However, the amount of time needed to prepare personalized instruction and various materials was prohibitive. She was also frustrated about the short amount of time in which she had to present. There simply was not enough time to present to teachers a rationale for using the literacy instruction, model how the strategy could be implemented into their teaching, and then have the teachers practice it in some way. Eve was the only literacy coordinator who did not find presenting stressful. She felt comfortable working with her small faculty but did indicate feeling some pressure relating to time when it came to gathering materials and setting up.

Overall, presenting was unsettling for both the new and experienced LCs. Not only were they concerned about doing a professional job, they also faced negative faculty reaction. All five LCs used negative terms or phrases e.g. resistant, nasty task, abrasive, hostile, tease, heckle, literacy goddess, snide comments, completely checked out, to describe some teachers and their responses. Such responses concerned not only professional development meetings but also participation in activity initiated by or under the supervision of the LC. Ann commented, "They kind of tease me and heckle me too, 'Are we going to have to do this again? This is so boring,'…I'm the one who takes the flack out front."

Claire put it this way:

> My first time in front of the faculty, I had to kind of get them on my side and pick things to address this year that I thought would be useful to them… the previous LC had hit literacy really hard, and he was a really good teacher, and he really knew his stuff, but everybody was just completely checked out. [Afterwards] I had so many people tell me, "Good work Claire. I wouldn't touch what you're doing with a ten-foot pole." I've even had people say, "I do workshops all around the country, and I wouldn't do your job."… It is tough and if I hadn't seen how they [some of the faculty members] treated [the previous LCs] - that's what taught me what I needed to do … this undercurrent, little snide comments, off-task things. I just wasn't going to go there.

Presenting to the faculty seemed to be a constant pressure even for those who had done if for years. Though Debra was in her fifth year as LC, she still said that she experienced antagonism from teachers that was difficult to deal with.

Eve, at the smaller alternative high school, interacted on a fairly regular basis with all the faculty members, and was more positive:

> [The faculty] is pretty positive because they do see results in literacy… They're pretty positive most of the time, although they never like having to have another meeting. Most of them are pretty willing about me coming into their rooms and like getting feedback. There are just a few that are resistant.

Dealing with the consistent negative response from some faculty members was the reason two of the experienced LCs were ready to turn the responsibility over to someone new next year. They were worn down from the continual conflict and not seeing much progress being made.

All the LCs were acutely aware of their responsibility and intensely desirous to help teachers see the importance of literacy in their content-areas. They were also almost painfully cognizant of those teachers who were resistant. As a result, the LCs often labored over their presentations trying to make them as professional and as engaging as possible. Eve was the only LC to state that presenting was not her greatest pressure as LC. Interestingly, though most LCs stated that preparing and conducting professional development meetings was the most difficult and stressful job they undertook in their LC role, all who carried out such presentations reported that they felt like their faculty trainings went well and that they were getting positive feedback from more teachers as the semester went on.

When discussing professional development, the issue of content arose. The focus of the district had been for LCs to help teachers implement Second Chance elements into their content-area instruction. LCs indicated that these elements were not always a good fit for teachers. Both teachers and LCs reported that these literacy strategies often seemed irrelevant or at least not conducive for use with their content-area matter. Ann at Arbor Middle School said,

> [Second Chance training has] helped me to realize the importance of literacy in classrooms and helped me realize better ways of being a coach… but I think they're [the strategies] helpful for language arts teachers in a secondary setting and not for everyone. So it's kind of frustrating to learn things that I think work really well for me and for my colleagues who are language arts teachers, but that I can't share that way with the science teachers or PE teachers.

Claire was not even using Second Chance elements as she focused on building teacher morale and professional attitude. Debra was most critical about the content of the Second Chance Program and accompanying training:

> The training was awful. A waste of money…They basically took all this elementary stuff that they had and just tried to tweak if for secondary… I said [to one of the presenters], "This really wasn't designed for secondary content-area classes, was it? And she goes, "No." …I could see that content-area reading stuff was what we really needed, so I focused on that, and I never even called it Second Chance. I've never used that expression in my school because that's not what I'm doing. I'm focusing on content-area reading and how I use it in writing in the content-areas which is more based on my endorsement training… plus my ESL training is what I use. I mean that's one of the things about Second Chance training is that we were being taught by people who had never taught in a secondary classroom…they had never tried out these strategies in a science high school classroom and… it was obvious that it wouldn't work…I have really encouraged the Wilhelm training at my school because I felt like the best place to try out reading strategies to teach science teachers is in the science classroom, so I thought the best thing to do was to get content-areas teachers trained where they could actually try out the strategies and then teach their peers because then it made sense.

Eve, who indicated that her faculty members were generally receptive to literacy training, currently did not use Second Chance elements in her presentations. However, faculty members who were not first-year teachers were familiar with them as she had taught them previously. Instead, she used a series of books which addressed literacy from different content-area perspectives. Finally, even Britta, who was most supportive and enthusiastic about the Second Chance Program, indicated that it wasn't really a program that allowed for differentiation as had been touted and they had had "to invent their own things."

All the LCs readily admitted that literacy instruction was a necessity, and most could see ways of implementing Second Chance elements into their instruction to some degree. However, all LCs agreed to some extent, that outside of language arts and history,

the Second Chance elements were harder to use with content matter. Therefore, LCs opted for modifications which ranged from tweaking the Second Chance strategies to selecting completely different strategies they felt would be more beneficial to faculty members. Both experienced and inexperienced LCs opted to use literacy materials and strategies not related to Second Chance. Experienced LCs had already addressed Second Chance elements in some form during the previous four years. However, Ann, a first-year LC, used the Second Chance program because she saw value in it being a research-based program and because there was an expectation that she would. However, she also modified the content and introduced other strategies as well. Claire, the other new LC, with the support of her principal, was not addressing Second Chance elements at all because the faculty members at Claybourne High School were so unreceptive to them.

Because LCs were so committed to presenting valuable literacy instruction to their faculty members, they agonized over and spent a great deal of time preparing professional development. Additionally, it appeared that the content matter of those presentations generated teacher resistance. This seemed to be particularly the case when the Second Chance Program was the focus of the professional development.

Peer coaching. Peer coaching was another duty that all LCs assumed in the leadership role. They considered it to be one of the most important things they did because it provided opportunities to determine how and to what degree literacy was being implemented within the school.

Time was always an issue when trying to fulfill this responsibility. The coaching process necessitated a preconference before the observation, the actual observation, and then a post conference follow up. When peer coaching, all LCs recorded what they saw

so that they could discuss the lesson with the teacher at a later time. Of the three phases of coaching, the actual observation was the task most easily accomplished, while trying to meet before and after the observation was usually more difficult. One LC reported that once or twice she had conducted pre or post conferences through email. Another indicated that she had occasionally carried out a pre or post conference as she and the teacher walked down the hall together.

All LCs indicated that they spent some time observing and coaching their peers, but had varying degrees of success accomplishing it. For Eve, observing was almost a daily event, so this task was where she spent the majority of her time. She was not only responsible for observing all faculty members but also for mentoring six new teachers. While her faculty was comparatively small, Eve spent the most time with the new teachers. She reported that she usually ended up helping them with classroom issues e.g., behavior management, lesson plans, rather than literacy. She tried to observe the other faculty members once every other month, and indicated that this was usually possible even though one or two teachers proved elusive. For Eve, scheduling the conferences and observations was the LC responsibility that caused her the most stress.

Claire also observed and coached but focused only on the 11 teachers teaching content classes solely for ELLs. She had no plans to observe the rest of the faculty. She was however, working to develop a peer coaching model within the school using department representatives as the agents. She worked with them and they were to coach those in their departments.

At Arbor Middle School, teachers had been directed by the principal to include Second Chance methodology in the lessons that Ann observed. At a later date in the

semester, Ann submitted a report to the principal indicating which teachers had fulfilled the peer coaching assignment. She commented that she had seen some good use of literacy strategies in classes but some of the effective literacy instruction had not used Second Chance methodology. As a result, she couldn't report to the principal that these teachers had fulfilled their obligation. Ann wanted to see the literacy instruction criteria modified so that teachers using effective literacy strategies were not penalized if those strategies were not Second Chance elements.

Britta was a teacher who referred to the Second Chance elements repeatedly. While she talked about other literacy strategies as well, it seemed important to her that Second Chance elements were observable in teacher instruction. For whatever reason, she did not present often nor observe in many of the teachers' rooms during the time of this study. However, in previous years, Britta reported observing and coaching teachers on almost a daily basis.

Debra's main frustration as LC was getting in to observe teachers. She felt that this was really difficult, if not impossible, to do. She had little success with teachers outside of the English department. This frustrated her to no end as she was not able to discern what, if anything, was being done in the classroom. Professional development was happening but she was not able to ascertain if it was having any effect. Debra and Britta, the LCs most vocal about teacher resistance, were also the ones who were giving up the job after five years as LC.

Ann, Britta, and Debra were three LCs that indicated they had not observed as much as they would have liked to because of teacher resistance. When asked about what caused teacher reluctance, the general responses LCs reported were as follows: (a)

teachers felt vulnerable to peer criticism; (b) teachers considered the LC to be the eyes and ears of the principal and worried about a negative report getting back to the principal and having it used against them, which was rumored to have happened under a previous LC; and (c) teachers resented having to put on a "dog and pony show" focusing on something they did not intend to use afterward.

For the three LCs not satisfied with the peer observation they were doing, teacher accountability was an issue. Teachers at all schools were aware that the coaching process was a part of their literacy training and something they were to participate in, yet it was the LCs' responsibility to see that it happened. However, none of the LCs had the power to ensure that it took place or took place beneficially. They could facilitate the setting up of the observations but if teachers did not sign up or were resistant to having someone observe, the LCs were effectively shut down. One LC described a peer observation, "[The teacher] wanted to get it over with. She was not willing to listen to any of my suggestions or change her lesson in any way."

The LCs wanted the coaching to take place because they considered it a valuable, collaborative, and insightful learning opportunity for teachers. However, they did not want to be put in the position of requiring teachers to participate. Rather, they saw this responsibility as that of the principal, and felt that until the principal somehow required teachers to be accountable for coaching, teacher resistance and response would not change. One LC did say that her principal addressed coaching in his individual conferencing with teachers at the end of the year, but she was not able to see that this affected teacher performance during the year. All LCs commented that getting in to observe teachers that were not new teachers tended to be difficult. Sometimes it was

because time was the issue but usually it was because of teacher reluctance and/or lack of administrative accountability within the school. In fact, all LCs agreed that positive involvement, in peer coaching as well as any other facet of literacy that the LCs presented, hinged on the support and attitude of the administration towards literacy.

In direct contrast to the difficulty LCs encountered in accomplishing the peer coaching, every LC indicated that observing other teachers, seeing what was going on in other classes, and getting an opportunity to talk about it with them, was the aspect of the job they most enjoyed. They also indicated that one of the most encouraging aspects about their job was observing literacy strategies of any kind, not just Second Chance strategies, being utilized. They reported that usually these strategies were used successfully. Ann said,

> I look forward to observations, which is funny because I didn't think that I would, but it's really fun to go in, probably because a lot of things I've seen so far have been very positive and very good…Like today, if the PE teacher had handed each girl a heart monitor and then handed her the instruction book and said, "Read this and do it," there would have been some kids who could have done it quite easily. But there would have been others, three of my ESL kids were in that class, and one is a Japanese speaker who came here at the beginning of the year and there's no way she can read that English, but she could do that assignment with everyone else because they did it as reciprocal teaching. So it's fun to see stuff like that.

LCs were not only desirous of observing others in their LC capacity, but also of being observed by their peers. Three LCs commented that they appreciated being observed by others and getting a chance to discuss their own teaching. They felt like they still had a great deal to learn and welcomed the opportunity to get feedback on what they were doing, thereby improving their own instructional proficiency. They also felt encouraged when faculty members asked for suggestions or shared success stories with them as they conversed.

Miscellaneous leadership duties. Staying current in the field of literacy and assuming administrative responsibilities were two other leadership duties that LCs reported doing. All LCs expressed a need to stay up to date on the literature. Both new LCs agreed that they needed to know a great deal more about literacy and so spent a considerable portion of their time reading the literature. Because LCs also acted as information resources for teachers, they expended more time finding helpful or requested articles.

Staying current in the field of literacy also included attending professional workshops or conferences, which all LCs did and valued. Both new LCs attended four additional weeks of Second Chance training throughout the year which required that they be absent from their classrooms for a week at a time. While they were generally appreciative of the additional training, both commented on the difficulty of leaving their classes for such an extended length of time. Claire, one of the new LCs, also attended additional conferences related to building teacher morale. All LCs found staying current a necessary component of what they did. Because of this belief, LCs invested substantial time in building their personal base of literacy knowledge as well as providing teachers with information that would support them in their teaching efforts.

Administrative tasks, both literacy related and otherwise, fell under leadership. Middle school LCs, Ann and Britta, and Eve, the LC at the smaller alternative high school, reported less involvement with any kind of administrative task than did the LCs at the two large high schools. However, all LCs were frustrated at the amount of time administrative duties took away from work they would rather be doing. Ann commented,

> It might be effective to have an administrative LC and a teaching LC. You know, someone whose job was to do the administrative time stuff: the testing, the

> paperwork and the files and forms and those kinds of things. And then someone whose job it was to do the guided meetings and coaching.

Because the LCs were involved in and responsible for so many tasks, there simply was not enough time to attend to everything. This made administrative-type tasks burdensome and distracting. This was specifically the case with testing. Though district-wide testing was discussed in the earlier section, "Diagnosis and assessment" and belongs there, LCs considered testing an administrative task. They did not enjoy being responsible for it, nor did they see it as a task that was pertinent to their job as LC. Other administrative duties falling to LCs were e.g., attending school committee meetings, setting up and informing teachers about departmental meetings or events like writing contests, deciding which students would attend which reading classes, and showing secretaries how to enter test data.

Out of the total number of tasks carried out in the leadership role, LC self-report logs indicated that Ann, Claire, and Debra reported that 42–46% of those tasks had to do with some type of administrative duty. Ann and Claire reported that those administrative tasks were split fairly evenly between those related specifically to literacy and those tied to other school issues. As new LCs, Ann and Claire were just beginning to sort through the multitude of tasks directed their way and negotiate what tasks were logical for them to assume. Debra, on the other hand, indicated that the vast majority of her administrative tasks were directly related to literacy. After five years, Debra had positioned herself so that she assumed mainly those tasks directly related to her literacy goals. Britta and Eve reported that only 4-13% of the tasks they carried out during the logging periods had to do with any kind of administration.

All LCs were expected to carry out several roles and expressed frustration over the number of responsibilities for which they were in charge. Thinking through the responsibilities and scope of each role (student instruction, diagnosis and assessment, and leadership), planning for its development and implementation, and then carrying out all the corresponding tasks was often times overwhelming. One LC put it like this, "It's frustrating because I get so divided because I'm the literacy coordinator and I'm the ESL coordinator as well … and sometimes I [even] end up as the bilingual secretary because someone in the office doesn't speak Spanish… and I'm teaching my classes. It's a lot to divide my time." Most frustrated by this situation were the two new LCs, Ann and Claire. This frustration diminished somewhat as over the course of the semester, they more or less decided where they would focus their energies. These decisions were based on what they felt was most needed in their school and what they could realistically accomplish.

Finally, LC comments regarding leadership indicated that they regarded it as the most important work they did in the schools. They resented other testing and administrative responsibilities that took them away from it, but four out of the five LCs also identified it as being the most stressful responsibility of their job. It also appeared that the Second Chance Program content covered in the professional development meetings was problematic for the LCs when content-area teachers failed or refused to see its relevance to their teaching. LCs also considered peer coaching or observation of prime importance in what they did and desired that content-area teachers become more willing and participatory in it. For this to happen, LCs believed it was essential that principals hold their faculty members accountable.

At the conclusion of the study, LCs were asked if they would like to have a more defined job description to delineate their roles and responsibilities. Both large high school LCs, Claire and Debra, said they would not. Debra, after five years as LC, had crafted the job to reflect what she thought most important. She was comfortable with her job. Claire, though new to the position, had been given a great deal of leeway in determining what she would do and had also been relieved of testing responsibilities. Ann and Britta, middle school LCs, and Eve, at the smaller alternative high school, indicated they would prefer a more defined job description. These three LCs had less determination over what they were to do.

Summary of Comparison and Contrast of LC Responsibilities in the District

In conclusion, LCs agreed on the instruction and diagnosis and assessment roles in their positions. Instruction of students simply was not part of their job. Rather, they reached students by working in leadership roles with teachers. Diagnosis and assessment roles were assumed by four of the five LCs and basically focused on administration of district-wide reading and writing tests. LCs found this role burdensome and not beneficial to helping teachers develop professionally. Though two LCs did mention that teachers should know students' test scores, they questioned whether the information ever reached the teachers.

Leadership was the area in which LCs did the most work. They generally focused on developing and planning faculty inservice, observing/peer coaching, and researching or staying up to date on the field. There were additional supervisory tasks that each LC carried out, and these tasks were considered irrelevant to the main role of helping teachers increase in literacy instruction proficiency.

In addition to fulfilling their literacy responsibilities, LCs were also responsible for teaching four classes daily plus assuming two to three other major responsibilities such as coordinating the ESL or gifted and talented programs, chairing the English department, sitting on school improvement committees, and mentoring new or ESL sheltered teachers. LCs also performed other miscellaneous tasks e.g., ordering books for the library or placing students in the reading classes or acting as a Spanish translator in the office or being in charge of any kind of literacy competition, as well as attending monthly meetings at the district office or relevant conferences.

With the exception of Eve, at the alternative high school, all LCs also reported that dealing with teacher resistance to faculty meetings or peer coaching and observing was draining. This was the reason Britta and Debra, both five-year experienced LCs, were giving up the LC job at the end of the year. When the LCs were asked if they enjoyed the LC position, Debra indicated that she did not, Claire and Eve were not sure, while Ann and Britta both stated that they did.

All LCs stated that no job description for the LC position existed. As a result, LCs found themselves doing a variety of jobs that did not always feel congruent with the literacy emphasis of the position. Additionally, Ann and Claire, the two new LCs, and Eve, the alternative high school LC, indicated that their job responsibilities were increasing. Britta and Debra, the LCs leaving the position at the end of the school year, reported that their responsibilities were not increasing. However, when questioned if they would like a more formal job description that defined roles and responsibilities, Claire and Debra said they would not, while the other three LCs indicated that they would.

Finally, with one exception, all LCs would have been unwilling to give up their half-time teaching to become a full-time LC if asked. The enjoyment of being a being a teacher came from the students. It was this commitment to helping students that led to LCs to agree to accept the job.

Differences in Perceptions Among LCs, Teachers, and Principals

Research Question Two states: Is the role of the secondary level literacy coordinator perceived in a significantly different manner by any of the following groups: literacy coordinators, faculty members, and school administrators in each of the five secondary schools located within the district, and more specifically, (a) Do faculty members from different content-area backgrounds, i.e. arts, English, math, PE, science, etc. perceive the role of the secondary literacy coordinator in significantly different ways? (b) Do faculty members with literacy endorsements and/or District literacy inservice perceive the role of the secondary literacy coordinator in a significantly different way from those faculty members with no such literacy endorsements or inservice? (c) Do faculty members in middle schools perceive the role of the secondary literacy coordinator in a significantly different way than those faculty members in the high schools?

In order to assess differences in perception among literacy coordinators, faculty members, and principals about the role of the LC, several sources of data were used. The main source of information was a survey, but LC and principal interviews, teacher focus groups, LC self report logs, and field observations were also used to illuminate and explain differences in perceptions.

The survey was designed and sent out to each of the three groups: LCs, teachers, and principals. Thirty statements focused specifically on the role perceptions of the LC. Respondents indicated on a five-point Likert scale the degree to which they "strongly disagreed" (1), "disagree" (2), "no opinion" (3), "agreed" (4), or "strongly agreed" (5) with the statement. An analysis of variance was calculated on the three groups' responses to the statements. Five of these statements resulted in significant differences. Table 10 presents the mean score, the standard deviation (SD), the *F* score, and the statistical significance for each statement. Because the analysis of variance only indicated the main effect and did not reveal where the significant difference lay, pairwise comparisons were then run and the significant comparisons included in the table. (Note that it is possible to obtain a significant difference between mean scores that vary only slightly from one another.)

Statements (30) "A literacy coordinator works with students in content classes with teachers' collaboration" and (31) "A literacy coordinator works with students in a pullout program" dealt with the populations with whom the LC worked. On Statement (30), the main effect indicated that both principals (mean 3.60, *SD 0.89*) and teachers (mean 3.74, *SD 0.82)* differed significantly from the LCs (mean 2.40, *SD 0.89*).

Principals' and teachers' means approached "agree" (4) on the Likert scale, while the LCs' mean approached disagree (2). However, pairwise comparisons revealed that the significant difference existed solely between the LCs and the teachers. The main effect of Statement (31) indicated again that both principals (mean 3.20, *SD 1.10*) and teachers (mean 3.29, *SD 0.*96) differed significantly from the LCs (mean 1.80, *SD 0.45*).

Table 10

Analysis of Variance for Perceptional Differences among LCs, Principals, and Teachers

Statement	Literacy Coordinator (N=5) Mean *(SD)*	Principals (N=5) Mean *(SD)*	Teachers (N=195) Mean *(SD)*	*F*	Significant Pairwise Comparison Only
A literacy coordinator works with:					
30. students in content classes with teachers' collaboration	2.40 *(0.89)*	3.60 *(0.89)*	3.74 *(0.82)*	6.41**	LC<T***
31. students in a pullout programs	1.80 *(0.45)*	3.20 *(1.10)*	3.29 *(0.96)*	5.93**	LC<T***
A literacy coordinator:					
33. teaches only literacy related skills	1.60 *(0.55)*	2.00 *(0.00)*	2.71 *(0.90)*	5.29**	LC<T*** P<T*
44. fulfills administration responsibilities tied to school issues not dealing with literacy	3.60 *(0.89)*	1.40 *(0.55)*	2.59 *(1.04)*	5.79**	T<LC* P<T** P<LC**
46. plans and collaborates with faculty and staff to implement a school-wide quality reading program	2.40 *(0.89)*	3.60 *(0.89)*	3.72 *(0.78)*	7.02***	LC<T***

Note. (SD) = standard deviation.
A list of the complete survey statements can be found in Appendix B.
* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$

Principals' and teachers' means hovered slightly above "no opinion" (3) though teachers were somewhat closer to "agree" (4) than were principals. The LCs' mean fell slightly below "disagree" (2) but moving toward "strongly disagree" (1). Pairwise comparisons indicated that the significant difference lay only between the LCs and the teachers.

Significant differences lay solely between the teachers and the LCs. Teachers leaned towards agreeing that LCs worked with students in content classes and in pullout programs. LCs disagreed with this. Interviews with LCs, LC self-report logs, and observations all confirmed that LCs did not work with students in any capacity. Only one teacher in the teacher focus group interviews mentioned the value of LCs instructing students. He said that the LC was an effective teacher and by not having the LC teach, many students' learning would be limited. Principals never mentioned the LCs instructing students. They all focused on the LCs' role as a peer coach.

The remaining three statements (33), (44), and (46) that revealed significant difference had to do with the duties the LC performed. Statement (33) stated: "An LC teaches only literacy-related skills." The LCs' mean (mean 1.60, *SD 0.55*) fell almost halfway between "disagree" (2) and "strongly disagree" (1), while principals' response (mean 2.00, *SD 0.00*) centered squarely on "disagree" (2). Teachers' response (mean 2.71, *SD 0.90*) moved away from "disagree" (2) towards "no opinion" (3). Pairwise comparisons showed that significant difference lay between the LCs and the teachers, and between the teachers and the principals. Statement (44) stated: "An LC fulfills administration responsibilities tied to school issues not dealing with literacy (subbing, discipline, extracurricular activities, etc.)." The LCs' response (mean 3.60, *SD 0.89*) approached "agree" (4) while teacher response (mean 2.59, *SD 1.04*) hovered almost in the middle of "no opinion (3) and "disagree" (2). Principals' response (mean 1.40, *SD 0.55*) fell below "disagree" (2) and began to approach "strongly disagree" (1). Pairwise comparisons indicated that significant difference lay between all comparisons: the teachers and the principals, the principals and the LCs , and the teachers and the LCs.

Principals were the most adamant that LCs were not fulfilling administrative duties unrelated to literacy issues. However, comments from teacher focus groups reflected that they did not agree with the principals. One such conversation among the teachers from Dover illustrates the conflict teachers had with the LC administering or controlling all of the professional development in their school:

> Math Teacher: Why is she like the head faculty person? That's what I don't get.
> Science Teacher: I don't know.
> Civics Teacher: Professional development team. I don't know why she's on that.
> Science Teacher: I mean, I can understand being on the professional development team but that being in charge of…
> Math Teacher: Why is that her job as literacy coordinator? To be in charge of professional development for the whole school?
> Science Teacher: I don't know. I don't understand that.
> Math Teacher: That's not what professional development, in my opinion, is everything we do about literacy? Is that the only focus of our professional development? Is it nothing but literacy? I hope not.

Though this conversation reflects teachers' dissatisfaction about the situation, LC self-report logs show that all LCs marked that they were fulfilling administrative tasks unrelated to literacy at least periodically. For the two new LCs, Ann and Claire, frequency counts were 23% and 22% respectively, of all the tasks they carried out in the leadership area. The other LCs indicated that their administrative responsibilities unrelated to literacy were much lower: 1%, 4%, and 11%. This may reflect that LCs were carrying out administrative tasks unrelated to literacy or it may reflect disagreement among the three groups about what tasks were considered to be unrelated to literacy.

The final statement, Statement (46), read: "The LC plans and collaborates with faculty and staff to implement a school-wide quality reading program." Both principals' (mean 3.60, *SD 0.*89) and teachers' (mean 3.72, *SD 0.78*) responses approached "agree" (4) though teacher response was closer. However, the LCs' mean (mean 2.40, *SD 0.*89)

approached “disagree” (2). Pairwise comparison showed that the significant difference lay completely between the LCs and the teachers. This finding may reveal something about how the LCs and teachers perceive what a reading program is. Teachers may have the tendency to view Second Chance as a reading program, a negative one at that, as a teacher at Blaine commented,

> When we first started [Second Chance], it was everybody has to do it and they have to do it this way…It was that pushing…forcing us to do things that weren’t fitting into our content area. We felt like it was a hoop,

while LCs saw Second Chance as strategies. Strategies that could help teachers capitalize on their students’ reading and writing so that learning took place, no matter the discipline. A former LC at Arbor said,

> We’re trying to teach reading across the curriculum so that when they get into history class, they can read that history book, that science book…But the point I think for the teacher is pick something that’s really important and have them use these literacy strategies to learn that info and so you’re teaching deep, one concept, that’s really important that maybe they would use over and over rather than trying to fit [it] into everything for math.

Of the five statements indicating significant difference, all five resulted in significant difference existing between the LCs and the teachers. In three of these five, the significant difference existed solely between the LCs and the teachers. In the remaining two statements, significant difference was also evident between the LCs and the principals and the principals and the teachers.

Research Question Two – Sub question (a)

The survey also addressed three sub questions of Research Question Two. The first sub question read: (a) Do faculty members from different content-area backgrounds, (e.g. math, humanities, arts, physical education) perceive the role of the reading specialist in significantly different ways?

In considering meaningful ways in which the data could be analyzed, I chose to forego a group comparison including all content-areas. Because of the large number of content-areas and the unequal Ns in each of those groups, analysis would most likely have produced such a random main effect that even with pairwise comparisons, determining outcomes would have proved impossible. Rather, I chose to first group content-areas into two divisions: core classes (English/language arts, history/social studies, math, sciences) and non-core classes (applied technology, art/performing arts, business technology, counseling/guidance, ESL, foreign languages, music, ROTC, special ed). This decision was based on the rationale that core classes are generally more dependent on literacy skills and core class teachers might, therefore, have a different perception of the role of the LC than teachers in non-core classes. Multiple t-tests were run on the survey responses grouped core classes and non-core classes. No significant differences were found on any of the responses.

I then chose to analyze how English/language arts teachers' responses compared to all other content-area teachers' responses. The rationale behind this grouping came from the general alignment of literacy coordinators with English departments throughout the history of the reading specialist position. Additionally, in the five-year history of LCs in the district, all but one LC had come from an English/language department. Therefore, two categories: (a) English teachers, and (b) All other teachers were created and multiple t-tests run. This resulted in five statements showing a significant difference. Those five statements are listed in Table11.

Table 11

English Teachers vs. All Other Teachers

Statement	English Teachers (N=32) Mean *(SD)*	All Other Teachers (N=163) Mean *(SD)*	t-score
A literacy coordinator:			
37. works with small groups of teachers (grade level, team unit, department, etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction.	4.13 *(0.79)*	3.70 *(0.79)*	2.79**
39. initiates casual or spontaneous conversations related to literacy issues with the faculty.	3.94 *(0.72)*	3.52 *(0.81)*	3.01**
51. assists teachers in learning how to administer and/or interpreting assessment.	3.81 *(0.87)*	3.44 *(0.86)*	2.18*
53. fulfills other district or state assessment responsibilities.	3.63 *(0.79)*	3.33 *(0.74)*	1.94*
55. analyzes test data.	3.84 *(0.82)*	3.39 *(0.81)*	2.90**

Note. (SD) = standard deviation.
A list of the complete survey statements can be found in Appendix B.
* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

The first statement, Statement (37), "A literacy coordinator works with small groups of teachers (grade level, team unit, department etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction," revealed that English/language arts faculty members' response (mean 4.13, *SD 0.*79) fell slightly above "agree" (4) while other content-area faculty members' response fell slightly below "agree" (4). Similarly, Statement (39), "An LC initiates

casual or spontaneous conversations related to literacy issues with the faculty," showed that members of the English/language arts departments' response (mean 3.94, *SD 0.72*) closely approached "agree" (4) and that all other content-area departments' response (mean 3.52, *SD 0.81*) fell almost exactly between "agree" (4) and "no opinion" (3).

Statements (51) "An LC assists teachers in learning how to administer and/or interpret assessment," (53) "An LC fulfills other district or state assessment responsibilities," and (55) "An LC analyzes data, all have to do with assessment issues," all had to do with assessment. The English/language arts teachers' responses all approached "agree" (4) while all other teacher response fell closer to "no opinion" (3). Assessment, specifically the district-wide reading and writing testing that took place twice a year, was something that all teachers were familiar with as they were involved in the evaluation of student writing. However, it appears that the English/language arts teachers were somewhat more aware of the responsibilities tied to assessment. This seems reasonable as four of the five LCs were affiliated with the English departments at their schools, and in such a situation, very likely to discuss assessment and its concurrent responsibilities with their colleagues. The sole exception was Claire at Claybourne High. She was not a member of the English department nor was not responsible for any testing.

Focus group teachers and principals, in general, did not have a great deal to say about assessment, other than to acknowledge that they had monthly writing assignments to carry out with their classes. They also mentioned the district testing but just as something that happened at certain times. The LCs had a bit more to say about assessment and working with teachers. Debra commented on her interaction with teachers in general, regarding their awareness and involvement with testing,

> So the writing assessment was started…the main purpose was to get teachers from all different content areas to talk about writing and to be thinking about writing in their classes….The whole district does the same writing prompt, and it's a persuasive writing prompt. And until this year, we did that in the fall and the spring. They all do the writing prompt and then, there's a day when the faculty gets together and scores all the essays the students wrote. We'll have like two classrooms with teachers grading the ninth grade ones, and two with the tenth grade. We use the Six Traits, and so we had to teach the teachers the Six Traits. I did that.

Ann from Arbor also indicated the involvement of her faculty members and mentioned the specific responsibility English teachers had in the process,

> The district's writing assessment is persuasive writing at this point, and the district gave us a rubric, but we've modified [it] for our school. And again, the entire school takes that test. The faculty as a whole grades it using a rubric and then all of the English teachers input those scores. So that's part of what I get to do is oversee that. The [district reading test] we do twice a year and the writing assessment we do twice a year and I get to oversee that.

Finally, LC self-report logs indicated that anywhere between 17% and 33% of the tasks LCs carried out during the three recording periods were related to diagnosis and assessment.

Research Question Two – Sub question (b)

The second sub question of Research Question Two read: Do faculty members with literacy endorsements and/or District literacy inservice perceive the role of the reading specialist in a significantly different way from those faculty members with no such literacy endorsements or inservice? Teacher responses were grouped according to whether or not teachers indicated they had any literacy endorsements and/or inservice, then multiple t-tests were run on the two groups. This comparison generated the greatest number of statements (12) with significant differences. Those statements and results are listed in Table 12.

Table 12

Teachers with any Literacy Certification/Inservice vs. Teachers without any Literacy Certification/Inservice

Statement	Teachers with Literacy Certification/ Inservice (N=136) Mean *(SD)*	Teachers without Literacy Certification/ Inservice (N=59) Mean *(SD)*	t-score
A literacy coordinator:			
34. teaches only content-area subject/s in which literacy instruction is integrated	4.27 *(0.65)*	3.55 *(0.83)*	5.57**
35. works with individual teachers (plan, model, follow up, etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction	4.33 *(0.49)*	3.73 *(0.85)*	5.57*
36. works with 1st / 2nd year teachers to strengthen their literacy instruction	4.33 *(0.49)*	3.80 *(0.86)*	4.85*
37. Works with small groups of teachers (grade level, team unit, department, etc,) to strengthen their literacy instruction	4.33 (0.49)	3.74 *(0.81)*	5.58*
40. finds and provides materials for teachers	4.25 *(0.62)*	3.74 *(0.80)*	4.08*
43. fulfills administration responsibilities regarding literacy	4.17 *(0.58)*	3.66 *(0.80)*	4.25*
46. plans and collaborates with faculty and staff to implement a school-wide quality reading program	4.33 *(0.49)*	3.68 *(0.78)*	6.19**

Table 12 (continued)

Statement	Teachers with Literacy Certification/ Inservice (N=136) Mean *(SD)*	Teachers without Literacy Certification/ Inservice (N=59) Mean *(SD)*	t-score
A literacy coordinator:			
47. researches ways to improve literacy within the school	4.33 *(0.49)*	3.91 *(0.68)*	4.21*
50. collaborates with teachers to develop assessments	4.0 *(0.74)*	3.43 *(0.92)*	3.84*
51. assists teachers in learning how to administer and/or interpret assessments	4.25 *(0.62)*	3.45 *(0.86)*	6.24**
52. works to coordinate school assessment with district or state standards	4.33 *(0.65)*	3.58 *(0.81)*	5.77**
54. administers standardized tests	3.67 *(0.78)*	3.13 *(0.91)*	3.52*

Note. (SD) = standard deviation.
A list of the complete survey statements can be found in Appendix B.
* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$

Statement (34) read "An LC teaches only content-area subject/s in which literacy instruction is integrated." This kind of instruction includes literacy strategies that deal with comprehension before, during, and after reading content-area material. Attention is also focused on vocabulary building and developing the writing skills needed in that particular content-area. With this kind of instruction, as much attention is paid to the

development of thinking, speaking, reading, and writing skills as vehicles to access meaning from the text as to the acquisition of the content information itself. Teachers with literacy certification response (mean 4.27, *SD 0.65*) fell just above "agree" (4) while teachers with no certification response (mean 3.55, *SD 0.83*) fell almost exactly in the middle of "no opinion" (3) and "agree" (4).

Statements (35), (36), and (37) all dealt with the groups of teachers LCs worked with to strengthen literacy instruction. They were respectively: Statement (35) "individual teachers", Statement (36) "1st/2nd year teachers", and Statement (37) "small groups of teachers" (grade level, team unit, department, etc). For all three groups, faculty with literacy certification response was the same (mean 4.33, *SD 0.49),* falling slightly above "agree" (4) on the Likert scale. Responses from faculty without certification on the same statements varied somewhat (Statement (35) mean 3.73, *SD 0.85*; Statement (36) mean 3.80, *SD 0.86*; and Statement (37) mean 3.74, *SD 0.*81)), but all means fell slightly below "agree" (4).

Statements (40), (43), (46), and (47) all had to do with the responsibilities LCs had within the school. Respectively, the tasks were as follows: Statement (40) "finds and provides materials for teachers", Statement (43) "fulfills administration responsibilities regarding literacy", Statement (46) "plans and collaborates with faculty and staff to implement a school-wide quality reading program", and Statement (47) "researches ways to improve literacy within the school". In all cases, the teachers with literacy certification responses' ranged from "agree" (4) to slightly higher: Statement (40) mean 4.25, *SD 0.62*; Statement (43) mean 4.17, *SD 0.58*; Statement (46) mean 4.33 *SD 0.49*; and Statement (47) mean 4.33, *SD 0.49*. Faculty without literacy certification responses

ranged somewhat below “agree” (4): Statement (40) mean 3.74, *SD 0.80*; Statement (43) mean 3.66, *SD 0.80*; Statement (46) mean 3.68 *SD 0.78*; and Statement (47) mean 3.91, *SD 0.68*.

Finally, the last four statements, (50), (51), (52), and (54) all dealt with assessment. Again, on all occasions, the teachers with literacy certification agreed more with the statements than did teachers without literacy certification. The statements read as follows: Statement (50) “An LC collaborates with teachers to develop assessments”, Statement (51) “An LC assists teachers in learning how to administer and/or interpret assessments”, Statement (52) “An LC works to coordinate school assessment with district or state standards”, and Statement (54) “An LC administers standardized tests”. Teachers with literacy certification responses’ ranged from slightly below to slightly above “agree” (4): Statement (50) mean 4.0, *SD 0.74*; Statement (51) mean 4.25, *SD 0.62*; Statement (52) mean 4.33 *SD 0.65*; and Statement (54) mean 3.67, *SD 0.78*. Faculty without literacy certification responses approached the mid point between “no opinion” (3) and “agree” (4): Statement (50) mean 3.43, *SD 0.92*; Statement (51) mean 3.45, *SD 0.86*; Statement (52) mean 3.58 *SD 0.81*; and Statement (54) mean 3.13, *SD 0.91*. In all 12 instances where significant difference existed, teachers with literacy certification agreed more with the statement than those teachers without it.

These findings were encouraging as they presented healthy teacher knowledge of the value and current roles of a literacy coordinator. It appeared that those teachers with literacy endorsements or inservice had a more informed view of what an LC could do. Results related to this sub question were reinforced by teachers’ comments about the value of their literacy training. These teachers reported on how literacy training had

helped them to develop professionally. A teacher from Dover High provided an insight into the pros and cons of literacy inservice for her:

> I've learned enough over the last three years that I am consciously incompetent is what Jeff Wilhelm calls it. I know I could do a thousand things better…So now I have all this knowledge about literacy and what would be effective, but I don't have anybody to work with me to try to implement it or develop it.

A middle school teacher from Blaine commented on the ongoing value and of learning literacy strategies:

> Our focus was training that then we had flexibility to fit into our content areas. I'll speak for myself. I have reading and writing, as far as that part of literacy components [go], that I have included in my class. I still do [them] because they're best practices. They're good things for the kids. So I picked up some of those three or four years ago, but I still do them because I know that they are of value. I can help my kids make connections.

Finally, a middle school PE teacher from Arbor enthused about her students' improvement after she implemented literacy strategies:

> …I was scared at first [to adjust my teaching style] and I didn't really see at first how this was going to help me. And now, I'm like, "Wow!" My curriculum hasn't changed, I still teach the same things but I really think that my kids are getting it more because of these extra things that I'm doing with literacy and I've seen. I've been teaching for nine years and I've been using literacy for probably three years of really putting it in my classroom and I've really seen such a difference. My kids are remembering the cues that I'm teaching them, they're performing the skills better, and I really attribute it to the literacy program.

Research Question Two – Sub question (c)

The third and last sub-question of Research Question Two read: Do faculty members in middle schools perceive the role of the secondary literacy coordinator in a significantly different way than those faculty members in the high schools? After running multiple t-tests on faculty survey responses grouped according to middle school or high school designation, ten statements were found to vary to a significant degree (See Table 13).

Table 13

Middle School Teachers vs. High School Teachers

Statement	Middle School Teachers (N=71) Mean *(SD)*	High School Teachers (N=124) Mean *(SD)*	t-score
A literacy coordinator works with:			
26. native English speaking struggling readers	4.09 *(0.85)*	3.67 *(0.80)*	2.57**
27. ELLs to build literacy skills	4.12 *(0.72)*	3.69 *(0.78)*	3.06***
28. on-level readers	3.93 *(0.86)*	3.65 *(0.77)*	1.74*
29. honor or gifted readers	3.88 *(0.99)*	3.43 *(0.84)*	2.43**
30. students in content classes with the teacher's collaboration	3.93 *(0.90)*	3.63 *(0.76)*	1.75*
A literacy coordinator:			
35. works with individual teachers (plan, model, follow up, etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction	3.97 *(0.77)*	3.65 *(0.87)*	2.14*
36. works with 1st and 2nd year teachers to strengthen their literacy instruction	4.03 *(0.82)*	3.72 *(0.85)*	1.94*

Table 13 (continued)

Statement	Middle School Teachers (N=71) Mean *(SD)*	High School Teachers (N=124) Mean *(SD)*	t-score
A literacy coordinator:			
39. initiates casual or spontaneous conversations related to literacy with faculty	3.75 *(0.76)*	3.49 *(0.82)*	1.76*
48. tests/diagnoses student abilities	3.75 *(0.81)*	3.27 *(0.82)*	3.12***
49. provides teachers with student assessment results and discusses implications for instruction	3.72 *(0.91)*	3.42 *(0.89)*	1.76*

Note. (SD) = standard deviation.
A list of the complete survey statements can be found in Appendix B.
* p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01. ***p ≤ .001.

Statements (26) – (30) all concerned ability groupings of students with whom the LC was perceived to work. In all instances, the middle school teachers' agreed more than did the high school teachers that the role of the LC was to work with each ability group of students. While significance existed for all ability groupings of students, Statement (28) "on-level readers" and Statement (30) "students in content classes with the teacher's collaboration" were significant at the .05 level. Statement (26) "native English-speaking struggling readers" and Statement (29) "honor/gifted students" were significant at the .01 level. Statement (27) "English language learners" was significant at the .001 level.

Statements (35) and (36) focused on the teachers with whom the LCs worked. Again, middle school teachers agreed more than did high school teachers that the role of

the LC was to work with (35) “individual teachers (to plan, model, follow up etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction” and with (36) “first- and second-year teachers to strengthen literacy instruction”. The next statement, Statement (39) “The LC initiates casual or spontaneous conversation related to literacy with faculty” also resulted in middle school teachers agreeing more strongly with it than high school teachers. The last two statements to show significant difference had to do with assessment.

Statement (48), “The LC tests/diagnoses student abilities,” and Statement (49), “The LC provides teachers with student assessment results and discusses implications for instruction,” indicated once again that middle school teachers agreed more with the statements that this was a role of the LC than did high school teachers. In all situations, middle school teachers agreed more with the statement than did high school teachers. There is little from teacher focus, principal, or LC interviews that spoke to these outcomes. All LCs reported that they occasionally diagnosed individual students for placement purposes or if students missed school-wide testing. However, Britta was the only LC to mention that she would like to do more with assessment. She thought students should know their scores on the district reading and writing tests and be able to attach significance to them. This information was readily available but no one accessed it. She also advocated teachers learning and using assessments like informal reading inventories on a regular basis to be more informed about their students’ specific reading abilities.

Summary of Differences in LC Perceptions Among LCs, Teachers, and Principals

In summary, it appeared that there were not many significant differences between the perceptions of literacy coordinators, faculty members, and principals as to what the LC’s responsibilities were with two major exceptions (see Table 10). The first difference

had to do with whom the LCs worked. When the results of all teachers were considered in the analysis among LCs, teachers, and principals, teachers seemed to think that LCs should be working with students while LCs indicated they did not. This was significant as it reflected two different approaches to improving student literacy proficiency. Teachers' perceptions related to a previous focus that is no longer being emphasized by reading experts and the IRA: direct instruction of students. However, LCs' perceptions reflected congruence with the current emphasis of IRA (2004): reading specialists work with teachers to improve their literacy instruction.

When subgroups of teachers were compared to each other, different survey statements were considered significant. English teachers were compared to all other content-area teachers and teacher response revealed that English teachers were more in line with what LCs considered important (see Table 11). They indicated to a significant difference that the LCs worked with small groups of teachers to develop literacy instruction. When teachers with any kind of literacy inservice/certification were compared to those without any, teachers with literacy inservice/certification indicated more agreement with the LCs' emphasis on working with teachers (see Table 12). Their responses implied that LCs worked with individual teachers, first- and second-year teachers, and small groups of teachers to develop literacy instruction. They also thought that LCs found and provided materials for teachers. When the final grouping of teachers, middle school vs. high school, was compared, middle school teachers indicated that LCs worked in conjunction with all student groups and with individual and first- and second-year teachers (see Table 13).

The second difference had to do with the scope of the LCs' role. Teachers saw the LC's role as somewhat more narrow – dealing only with literacy instruction, while LCs did not confine it thus and in fact, indicated that they assumed additional administrative tasks unrelated to literacy. Principals disagreed more strongly than teachers that LCs assumed administrative tasks not connected to literacy. This was the only item on which there was significant difference for principals.

Teacher and Principal Attitudes

In addition to the statements focused specifically on Research Question Two and its subsections, several statements probing teachers' and principals' attitudes were included on the survey with the hope that they would further reveal and explain the perceptions existing among the LCs, principals, and teachers. Of those statements, the ones that revealed significant differences were included here, and were used to help develop a richer and fuller picture of the perceptions of the participants. The results of the analysis of variance on these statements, plus the pairwise comparisons run thereafter can be found in Table 14.

Statements (13), (14), (15), and (17) had to do with teacher attitudes. Statement (13) stated "As a teacher, I implement literacy techniques in my teaching." Teacher response fell just above "agreed" (4) on the Likert scale with this statement (mean 4.08, *SD 0.80*), followed by principal response approaching "no opinion" (3) (mean 3.20, *SD 1.10*), and LC response slightly lower (mean 3.00, *SD 1.00*). Pairwise comparisons indicated that significant difference lay between teachers and LCs and also between teachers and principals. Statement (14) read, "As a teacher, I feel that literacy issues are not my responsibility." This statement was cross worded and therefore, the desirable

Table 14

Analysis of Variance for Perceptional Differences among LCs, Principals, and Teachers on Teacher Attitude and the Role of the Principal

Statement	Literacy Coordinator (N=5) Mean *(SD)*	Principals (N=5) Mean *(SD)*	Teachers (N=195) Mean *(SD)*	*F*	Significant Pairwise Comparison Only
As a teacher, I:					
13. implement literacy techniques in my teaching	3.00 *(1.00)*	3.20 *(1.10)*	4.08 *(0.80)*	6.89***	LC<T*** P<T*
14. feel that literacy issues are not my responsibility	3.80 *(0.84)*	2.40 *(0.89)*	1.85 *(0.94)*	11.19***	T<LC*** P<LC*
15. am under a great deal of pressure to meet curriculum demands at my school	4.60 *(0.55)*	4.40 *(0.55)*	3.44 *(1.10)*	4.54*	T<LC* T<P*
17. would do more with literacy instruction if I felt better prepared to teach it	3.80 *(0.45)*	4.00 *(0.00)*	2.79 *(1.12)*	4.91**	T<LC* T<P*
My principal:					
23. has a literacy plan and is working towards implementing it	2.60 *(0.55)*	5.00 *(0.00)*	4.03 *(0.72)*	13.59***	LC<T*** LC<P*
24. actively discusses literacy and encourages attendance at professional conferences, institutes, etc. with faculty members	3.00 *(1.22)*	4.80 *(0.45)*	4.05 *(0.79)*	6.54**	LC<T** T<P* LC<P*

Table 14 (continued)

25. plays an important role in improving student literacy	3.00 *(1.50)*	4.60 *(0.30)*	3.77 *(0.76)*	4.18*	LC<T* T<P* LC<P*

Note. (SD) = standard deviation.
A list of the complete survey statements can be found in Appendix B.
* p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01. ***p ≤ .001

answer was a lower rather than a higher score as it was in all the other statements. Teacher response (mean 1.85, *SD 0.94*) fell slightly below "disagree" (2), indicating that they did think that literacy was a responsibility of theirs. However, principals and LCs commenting on whether the teachers in their schools felt that literacy issues were not their responsibility, responded differently.

Principal response (mean 2.40, *SD 0.89*) was almost exactly in the middle of "disagree" (2) and "no opinion" (3). Principals were less inclined to agree that teachers accepted literacy as one of their responsibilities. Finally, LC response (mean 3.80, *SD 0.84*) approached "agree" (4). LCs were least inclined to agree that teachers accepted literacy as one of their responsibilities. Pairwise comparisons revealed that significant difference lay between the teachers and the LCs and also lay between the LCs and the principals.

Statement (15) read, "As a teacher, I am under a great deal of pressure to meet curriculum demands at my school." LC response (mean, 4.60, *SD .055*) fell above "agree" (4) and approached "strongly agree" (5). LCs most agreed with this statement about teachers. Principal response (mean 4.40, *SD 0.55*) was just slightly below that of the LCs. Finally, teacher response (mean 3.44, *SD 1.10*) fell almost exactly between "no opinion" (3) and "agree" (4). Pairwise comparisons showed that significant difference lay between the teachers and the principals, and between the teachers and the LCs. The final

statement focusing on teacher attitude was (17) “As a teacher, I would do more with literacy if I felt better prepared to teach it.” Principal response (mean, 4.00, *SD .00*) was “agree” (4). LC response (mean, 3.80, *SD .045*) fell slightly below “agree” (4). Teacher response (mean, 2.79, *SD .055*) fell slightly below “no opinion” (3). When examining the pairwise comparisons, significant difference was found between the teachers and the principals and also between the teachers and LCs.

The last three statements found to have significant difference dealt with the role of the principal. In all three statements, principals agreed more with the statement, followed by teachers, and finally, by LCs in least agreement. Again, agreement with the statement was indicated by response to a five point Likert scale with “strongly disagree” at (1), “disagree” at (2), “no opinion” at (3), “agree” at (4) and “strongly agree” at (5). The statements were as follows: Statement (23) “My principal has a literacy plan and is working towards implementing it.” Pairwise comparisons revealed that significant difference lay between the LCs (mean 2.60, *SD 0.55*) and teachers (mean 4.03, *SD 0.72*) and between the LCs (mean 2.60, *SD 0.55*) and the principal (mean 5.00, *SD 0.00*); Statement (24) “My principal actively discusses literacy and encourages attendance at professional conferences, institutes, etc. with faculty members.” Pairwise comparisons indicated that significant difference lay between the LCs (mean 3.00, *SD 1.22*) and the teachers (mean 4.05, *SD 0.79*) but significant difference also existed between the teachers (mean 4.05, *SD 0.79*) and principals (mean 4.80, *SD 0.45*) and between the LCs (mean 3.00, *SD 1.22*) and principals (mean 4.80, *SD 0.45*); and Statement (25) “My principal plays an important role in improving student literacy.” Pairwise comparisons showed that significant difference lay among all groupings: LCs (mean 3.00, *SD 1.50*) and teachers

(mean 3.77, *SD 0.76*), teachers (mean 3.77, *SD 0.76*) and principals (mean 4.60, *SD 0.30*), and LCs (mean 3.00, *SD 1.50*) and principals (mean 4.60, *SD 0.30*).

The responses to these statements indicated that teachers did feel that literacy issues were their responsibility and even more importantly, they indicated that teachers were implementing literacy techniques to address such issues. It appeared the teachers felt like they were addressing literacy and as a consequence, their response to Statement (17) "As a teacher, I would do more to with literacy instruction if I felt better prepared to teach it," was unsurprising. They disagreed. Teachers responded as if they were aware of literacy and addressing it. However, LC and principal response to these statements presented quite a different view of teachers. LCs and principals were more of the opinion that teachers did not seem to view literacy as their responsibility nor implement many literacy techniques. They also thought that if teachers felt better prepared to teach literacy, they would do more with it.

Principals agreed more strongly than either teachers or LDs about the role they played in supporting literacy. They felt they had a viable literacy plan in place, were consistently raising issues related to literacy, and encouraging faculty members to become more involved with literacy. They also saw themselves playing an important role in improving student literacy. For whatever reason, the LCs were less convinced that principals had literacy plans they were implementing. Additionally, neither the LCs nor the teachers exhibited agreement about the role of the principal in furthering literacy awareness among the faculty or playing an important role in improving student literacy.

Additional Teacher Perceptions

Teacher focus groups and principal interviews revealed additional perceptions about the work of the LC. In these interviews, some reoccurring topics surfaced. One such topic raised in teacher focus groups had to do with what literacy looked like within the content-area classroom. There was no one description. In fact, this was the teachers' point – literacy looked different within each discipline. Therefore, teachers often preferred a broad definition of literacy though all groups specifically mentioned reading and writing and wanted flexibility to modify literacy instruction to fit their particular situation.

However, when the district elected to adopt the Second Chance program, flexibility was not an option. Second Chance was not a curricular program, but rather a methodological approach, and the initial LCs (all English teachers) were given the task of implementing that approach school-wide. Some LCs were quite insistent that all teachers implement the strategies in one particular manner. One teacher from Arbor said in response to a question about the general attitude in the school toward the LC, "It has been negative. New things cause resentment. The groundwork laid by the first person victimized the [current] LC. It's a matter of implementation, how it's done." A similar viewpoint was also expressed by a teacher from Blaine, "I think we've gotten better at that in our school. When we first started, it was everybody has to do it [implement Second Chance strategies] and they have to do it this way."

Additionally, in implementing the Second Chance protocol, LCs were also responsible to go into teacher classrooms to observe and coach teachers in carrying out the strategies. This resulted in some teachers mistrusting the motives behind the visit of

the LCs and expressing resistance. Reasons behind teacher resistance ranged from feeling inept and vulnerable to resenting evaluation by a peer to worrying that a negative report about their teaching might reach the principal and be used as evidence for censure. Some teachers felt they had been forced to allow an LC into their classroom to observe, and this had engendered negative feelings. A teacher from Claybourne expressed this view in response to what the role of the LC was in the school at large:

> Unfortunately, most see the LC as doing part of [the principal's] job. Internal conflict still exists here from previous years and many see her as part of his eyes and ears. However, she has made a positive difference in how faculty meetings go.

A teacher at Blaine Middle who had transferred from the middle school which closed the previous summer, said,

> In my previous school, I felt like there was a lot of resistance, more so [than here]. And it was kind of like insisting that she be in your classroom. And she would come and you know, you were a little bit more defensive because you had to sign up and she had to come, and it was just every class.

Both of these approaches to teacher accountability resulted in significant teacher resistance, some of which still existed in the schools.

Another topic engendering emphatic comments and frustration concerned the effectiveness of the literacy instruction presented by LCs with English backgrounds. In particular, the focus groups at Blaine Middle and Dover High were quite outspoken in their criticism of all LCs being English teachers and not in touch with what would work in their content-area classrooms. A music teacher from Blaine made a distinction between what he viewed as successful literacy instruction and what usually happened when literacy instruction was presented:

> One of the successful things we did a few years ago that Britta helped do, is that she had content teachers [because] we feel like, "There go the English teachers

> again." One of the things is that she had a math teacher get up and share a strategy…and that told the math teachers, that said more to the math teachers than anything an English teacher could ever have said. And a science teacher showed a practical way, an effective way, to use text editing in a science textbook. That said more to science teachers than anything an English teacher could have said. And my advice is that if you want a literacy coordinator to work effectively with content teachers, make sure he or she is not an English teacher.

This sentiment was echoed by a math teacher from Blaine, who spoke positively about a workshop in his content-area that had integrated literacy skills:

> One of the greatest things I went to was… a math writing, reading workshop…that was taught by math people through the State Office of Education, and they gave us a folder this big…it was how to use all these ideas with math, and they had pulled books, activities, they had pulled all this stuff so that we actually had the stuff… Then we went through and actually practiced with each other. We taught lessons to each other… and it was the first time that I as a math teacher went "Oh!" instead of looking at an English proposal and groaning…I wish everyone had a chance to go to a class for their curriculum like I had, because that was key. That was the best thing…We could say, "OK, here's a unit. Here's some stuff with fractions. We can use this book." I have the book in my hands. I don't have to go find it somewhere or search it out, I have it.

A teacher from Dover retorted:

> You start doing [literacy strategies] for the sake of doing it instead of doing it in the service of trying to teach something. Until you come up with an activity that [includes literacy strategies] and is well-designed, then what is the point of having [the LC] come watch? If she can't tell me whether or not it really is teaching kids how to do trig or how to do … what's the point? If I'm not going to help them figure out that when two secants cross inside a circle, how do you find the measure of the arcs? What difference does it make if [the LC] doesn't get the whole concept? Do you understand what I mean? ... I would never invite Debra into my classroom. She's not going to understand really what I'm doing. So I don't really feel inclined to ever consider it… I think that's where we fall short with the training is it's always been by English teachers with English and history examples and until you get a hook for the faculty that's disenfranchised, you're not going to move any further forward.

The focus group from Claybourne High did not address this topic with the same level of intensity; however, their frustration over the content of the literacy instruction

was still apparent. The focus group from Arbor Middle addressed the issue but more in passing while East High's teachers had nothing to say on this topic.

There was no outright personal criticism of the LC but rather repeated requests to have content-area experts with literacy skills come in for professional development to show them how literacy could be woven into their teaching. All teachers in the focus groups were very aware of the need to integrate literacy and supported it, hence their involvement. However, having to do it on their own and without content-area resources was extremely frustrating and time-consuming, and time was the commodity of which they had least. They also broached the idea that perhaps the professional development training taking place in faculty meetings could be given by department instead of the one-size-fits-all training they found ineffective.

These focus group teachers, usually four or five from departments other than English, were the teachers that LCs indicated most supported literacy in the schools and who were working in tandem with the LCs. These teachers' responsibility was to work with their departments and find ways to help other content-area faculty members integrate literacy strategies into their teaching. Yet in a couple of schools, they often seemed borderline explosive as a result of frustration about what they were being asked to do. A member of the focus group from Blaine said,

> For me, time is the only resistance. I have no problem in changing or learning or anything. Time becomes valuable. I have six kids. I have all kinds of stuff going on in my life and it really is frustrating to me when someone tells me, "You have to go to this for free," This is my job, this is not my calling… But the expectation, and I think it's more so in this area than in a lot of areas, teaching is a calling and to be a good teacher, you just give of your time and everything's, 'But don't you want to be a better teacher?' Yeah, I do. Don't you want to pay me? I mean, that sounds selfish but this is my job. And I watch my family members and if they do anything for their job, they get paid for it. And here you have to be squeaky about that if you want that. And it makes you look like you're a money

> monger and you're not. It's just the expectation is I'd love to do it. Do you want to give me some time to do it?

A member of the focus group from Dover expressed a similar frustration by saying,

> I know that I could do a thousand things better, but frankly, pay me to do it. I'm not going to spend every waking minute of my off time to rewrite a curriculum that's terrible. And if the district isn't going to put the money into buying me a new curriculum that's already written for me, then I'm just going to have to do a chunk at a time when I can. I'm not going to rewrite the whole textbook…well, honestly, the stuff that they were talking about last week [in the literacy professional development meeting] I mean, you got up and did a skim and scan and H …a participation guide and P… a simulation before she talked about something. You can do all those things in math, and I get it. I totally understand that that can be done in math, but when are you going to give me the time to sit down and write it?

These focus group teachers were not complaining about incorporating literacy into their curriculum. They could see its value. Rather, they seemed overwhelmed and frustrated about how they were going to do it when everything had to be rethought and modified to fit their content-area. Math teachers, in particular, seemed more dissatisfied than did teachers from other content-areas. All lacked time and resources. Additionally, they resented somewhat the expectation that they were to find a way to make it all work, usually by themselves, and without compensation.

The strong sentiment expressed by these focus group teachers did not seem to be shared by teachers district-wide as no significant difference was reflected in the analysis of variance on survey Statement (18) "As a teacher, I think that the literacy coordinator lacks content-area expertise which restricts the effectiveness of her suggestions" (see Appendix B). There was no significant difference in perception among LCs, teachers, or principals. In fact, teachers were the group to disagree most with the statement. Their mean response of 2.1 corresponded with "disagree" (2) on the Likert scale. Principal

response was slightly higher at 2.4, while LC response (3.4) fell between “no opinion” (3) and “agree” (4).

This outcome, along with the four statements discussed previously (13, 14, 15, and 17) regarding teacher attitude, indicated teachers generally appeared to have a positive attitude towards literacy. They had access to an LC, thought literacy was important, saw a relation between it and their content-area, felt responsible for literacy and believed they were implementing strategies. They also indicated that knowing more about literacy instruction would not change the way they taught. Basically, they seemed to see themselves attending to literacy in their content-area classes.

Moreover, to give the impression here that focus group teachers were angry and hostile about working with the LC would be a mistake. All focus groups indicated that teacher resistance did exist, some thought quite strongly, but this resentment was usually not localized at the school LC. Many positive comments were made about the LC being a mentor, facilitator, coordinator, researcher, and cheerleader. A teacher from Blaine said, “I think one reason [for having an LC] is back to [name of teacher]’s point about the role as the cheerleader or the one that is advocating for us to do this kind of stuff and helping us,” while a PE teacher from Arbor commented,

> And M [a previous LC] was my mentor and she helped me tremendously in getting comfortable and actually implementing [literacy instruction] and showing me how to think outside the box and how can you use these strategies to help your students learn physical education and learn the skills I need to teach. So it was really beneficial to me when I was first learning. And now I think our LC, because I know the strategies, I think it’s more the feedback they can give when they come and observe you. I think it’s the encouragement, I think some teachers really need encouragement.

Another teacher from East High said,

> She's really helped me with math as well in that I struggle with, “Well, I don't want you to read the math book because it's confusing [even] to me," but to make it a requirement that they take notes at the beginning of our class, and how to organize those notes, that's been a way again that she's directed me in kind of the same way. This is still helping them to learn to read and write and to communicate. And also from the perspective of the first year teacher, it’s helped me to know kind of how to teach literacy. Just in the WSGs, [monthly writing assignments all teachers do with their classes] because I wasn't that great of an English student, so[the writing and instruction from the LC] been a good resource for me.

Finally, a second teacher from East High added,

> She’ll actually bring us articles. I know twice she’ll be reading stuff for her own classes but she’ll see an article about science and so she’ll copy it and bring it to me. I don't know if you can use this, but here's something about science. She's willing to like help us find resources.

Members of the focus group from East High were particularly positive in their assessment of the LC. To them, she was someone they could go to for help with their classes or if they needed some sort of resource. They talked about their school being small and lacking departments, only the English department had more than one teacher and was functioning as a department. They talked about being interdependent and regularly communicating on some level with almost all the faculty. However, they were also a young faculty with few teachers having more than five years teaching experience and fewer teachers who had more than 3-4 years experience at that particular school. Additionally, six of their 21 faculty members were new to the school that year and were either first or second year teachers or held an alternative credential. These teachers were much more receptive to direction and guidance.

The focus group at Arbor Middle was also more positive. One teacher was a former LC and the other three content-area teachers had all found a place for literacy in

their content-areas of PE, computer technology, and art. They indicated that there was teacher resistance but three out of the four felt like progress was being made. The fourth was not so sure. She felt like the LC was doing some great things but didn't see her peer coaching and observing as had been done in the past and which she felt was an essential and critical part of the literacy emphasis.

Among all the focus groups, the two teachers who spoke most favorably of the influence of the LC and literacy were Arbor's PE and computer technology teachers. They had both found a place in their curriculum for literacy and had many good things to say about the influence of the literacy instruction on their students, yet were not responsible for trying to get other teachers on board with literacy. The computer technology teacher did think that the most effective strategy to bring resistant faculty members around was to show them how successful literacy implementation could make a difference in student engagement and proficiency. Both of these teachers, now positive about literacy, spoke of the initial difficulty in changing their way of thinking and approaching their subject matter. They also indicated their delight in increased student achievement and involvement, which they attributed to their change of instruction. These two teachers, while aware of the conflict over literacy, simply proceeded to teach with the literacy strategies that worked for them.

In spite of the positive comments made by the focus groups, the most telling outcome of all the focus groups was the almost complete agreement that if literacy were not mandated, they would not be incorporating it in their teaching. They did not have the time. Even those at East High, the most positive group towards literacy, thought a literacy emphasis would not be necessary. They indicated that as a small faculty, they would

continue to interact with English teachers and could thereby get the information and direction they needed. Additionally, no one in the focus groups wanted to be an LC.

In summary, focus groups varied in their responses concerning the role of the LCs in presenting effective literacy instruction related to various content-areas. With the exception of East High, all dealt with substantial amounts of frustration in implementing literacy strategies. This seemed to be a result of constraints in what they had been asked to do rather than how they viewed literacy and its importance. However, focus group teachers also commented on the value of the LC as a mentor and facilitator. Moreover, survey results indicated that teachers in general had a fairly positive orientation towards literacy, saw its relevance to their teaching, and were using it in their classrooms. Ironically, almost all focus group teachers agreed that literacy efforts on the part of teachers would disappear if literacy ceased to be an emphasis. Each was adamant about not wanting to have the job of the LC.

Additional Principal Perceptions

In talking with principals, it was clear that they all saw the importance of increasing student literacy proficiency and were supportive of their LCs' efforts to help teachers integrate more literacy instruction into their teaching. Dover's principal went so far as to say,

> Ninety-nine point nine percent of the discipline problems we deal with are with kids who are misbehaving because they're frustrated because they cannot function [in school]. And if you trace back, it goes right back to their ability to read and to write and to understand.

Principals generally participated in all the professional development meetings that the LCs gave to the faculty members and emphasized that all teachers were to be involved in peer coaching. All principals indicated different ways of supporting the LC e.g., through

providing resources or including them in school planning committees or listening to and following suggestions based on the LCs' advice. Each principal tended to think most highly of his or her own teachers. Principals from Arbor, Claybourne, Dover, and East, all indicated that the teachers in their schools supported the literacy emphasis and requirements better than did the faculties in other schools.

Overall, principals reported that they were very satisfied with the LCs' performance and that the LCs' efforts were making a positive difference. Only Blaine's principal seemed somewhat hesitant about how well that was happening in her school. At the time of this study, her LC was not involved in the professional development meetings as she had been in previous years, and the school's main focus had shifted to an additional emphasis the district was promoting.

When principals were asked which of the three categories of responsibilities defined by the IRA (2000) (i.e., student instruction, leadership, and diagnosis and assessment) seemed most important for the LCs to fulfill, Arbor's and East's principals indicated that all three were necessary and expressed satisfaction that their LCs were doing something in each of the categories. However, principals from Blaine, Claybourne, and Dover all responded without hesitation that leadership or professional development was the most critical area for them, although they did not dismiss the other two areas. Regarding leadership, all principals reported that the peer coaching piece was in place and happening to a greater extent than did LCs. East's principal said, "She [the LC] just does [the peer coaching] and I know it's happening…I know it's happening because I know I'm paying people to observe and be observed."

Principals were more optimistic than either the LCs or teachers about faculty members' responses to principal directive to implement and participate in literacy activities. Principals indicated there was little teacher resistance to peer coaching and implementing literacy instruction and generally regarded it as much less of an issue than did the LCs. This was evidenced by the principal from Arbor, "Well, again, most of the resistance was in the beginning and that was five years ago." Principals also related positive anecdotal stories about teachers who had utilized a literacy strategy or been peer observed and had had positive experiences.

This is not to say that principals were oblivious to the challenges that LCs faced in dealing with teacher resistance and how it affected them. The principal at Dover High School captured a great deal of the principals' sentiment when he said,

> Even though I've tried to relieve the pressure and divert the focus [of teacher resistance], it's there. Self-implied because she's [the LC] so conscientious. Most of them are. And so they feel bad. And there are teachers who are angry and they strike out at somebody and they're not going to strike out at me. So they, even though we try not to, they put the focus on her and maybe they send her a rude email or they razz her or you know, they just make here feel miserable and she feels the pressure because of the need to improve literacy. She feels like that the burden for that falls largely on her shoulders. And no matter what you do to try and alleviate that burden, conscientious people just accept that. They take it on themselves.

Principals, therefore, saw the LCs bearing the brunt of teacher resistance no matter what they did to change or modify teacher attitude and facilitate their jobs.

Principals all felt they had a teacher accountability piece set up within their schools. They all talked about monthly writing assignments each teacher was to carry out with their classes to prepare student for the district-wide writing test. While teachers did conduct monthly writing assignments, evaluation of the assignments differed. At East, the student writing was gathered and scored by the teacher and the scores given to the LC,

while at Claybourne, the writing assignments were never collected or examined and teachers only self-reported what they had done.

All principals also indicated that they, not the LCs, were accountable for teacher compliance to peer coaching. However, only the principal from Arbor talked about personally observing teachers as they implemented literacy instruction. He stated that teachers reported to him on their peer coaching activities in year-end interviews. Principals from Blaine and Dover also mentioned that teachers reported on peer coaching through department heads or year-end interviews. However, two LCs indicated that year-end interviews were ineffective in motivating teachers to participate in peer coaching.

In holding teachers accountable, principals all remarked about the necessity of approaching teachers from a positive standpoint. The principal at Blaine said,

> There are lots of ways you can address resistance. You can call them in and call them on the carpet, I don't think that's useful or productive. I think you try and be positive with people. I think you try to find, catch them doing things that are working and encourage that to happen around the building.

The principals could emphasize and encourage participation, highlight success, and reward participation with some type of recognition, but in the end, teachers decided if they would participate or not. Principal interviews revealed the complexity of having to work with LCs and teachers. They had to negotiate a fine balance by supporting LCs through requiring teachers to participate in peer coaching and implementing literacy strategies, but not overwhelm, frustrate, or anger teachers in the process.

Given that teacher resistance to literacy instruction and peer coaching existed, principals were asked what made an effective LC. Principals' responses varied: having people and communication skills; being teachable, flexible, committed to literacy, comfortable in a leadership position, a great teacher; and having a broad knowledge, a

vision. However, the one quality identified by all principals was being respected by their peers. Blaine's principal said,

> See, I've looked around the district and I think the key to any successful literacy program in any school is the person. And in my observation, we've had some schools that have had very strong, powerful LCs and other schools have had teachers who have not been completely accepted or respected by their faculties and so it's the degree [to which] they're respected and accepted by the faculty.

Briefly summarized, principals were supportive of the LCs and generally satisfied with their performance. They reported that the LCs had made a positive difference within their schools. Principals generally believed that the most important responsibility of the LC was that of leadership, indicated that the peer coaching strand was working, and reported having a means of holding teachers accountable for their literacy involvement.

Current LC Duties and Perceptions of LC Duties

The final research question, Research Question Three read: How do the duties currently being undertaken by secondary literacy coordinators correspond to surveyed perceptions of the role of the reading specialist? In both interviews and survey, possible LC duties were categorized into three main categories that the IRA (2000) had stipulated in their position statement on reading specialists. Those categories were instruction, leadership, and diagnosis and assessment. Though there was no formal job description for the LC, all LCs were basically in agreement regarding the first two categories. LC self-report logs, observations, and interviews supported these findings. The first had to do with student instruction whether it was one on one, small group, or whole class and whether it happened in a pull out situation or when working in conjunction with another classroom teacher.

When functioning as an LC, not one of the LCs ever directly taught students in any capacity. LCs also agreed that the second area of leadership was the area in which they spent the majority of their time, and in which they were primarily focused on professional development. All LCs were in charge of developing and planning faculty inservice, observing/peer coaching, and researching or staying up to date on the field. Additionally, each LC had some supervisory tasks that they considered irrelevant to the main role of increasing instructional literacy proficiency. While in the third area of diagnosis and assessment LCs were not in complete agreement, this was solely because one LC had been totally relieved of any testing responsibility. The remaining LCs, however, were all responsible for the district wide reading and writing tests that took place biannually in their respective schools. This was born out in interviews with LCs, principals, and teachers as well as through observations and teacher logs.

Teachers and principals were asked in a survey to identify what they perceived were the LCs' duties and responsibilities. Their responses differed from the duties the LCs actually carried out. The greatest difference had to do with student instruction. Teachers perceived to a significant difference that LCs were to work with students in pullout programs or in classrooms with teacher collaboration. However, LCs never worked directly with students on any kind of basis. Teachers also perceived that an LC only taught literacy related skills, did not fulfill administrative responsibilities tied to school issues other than literacy, and planned and collaborated with faculty and staff to implement a school-wide reading program. LCs on the other hand, indicated that they taught more than just literacy skills, fulfilled some administrative responsibilities tied to school issues not related to literacy, and disagreed with the idea that they planned and

collaborated with school personnel to implement a school-wide reading program. When the perceptions of principals were compared to the duties of the LCs, there was only one significant difference. Principals agreed with the statement that LCs did not fulfill administrative responsibilities tied to school issues outside of literacy while LCs disagreed with this statement.

Chapter Summary

LCs in the district fulfilled many duties. The one they considered most important was working with teachers to improve their literacy instruction. This effort was often met by teacher resistance. In spite of that fact, LCs resented other tasks such as assessing and diagnosing or any type of administrative job that took them away from it. Additionally, LCs were in step with IRA's (2004) current emphasis on working with teachers. As a result, no LC directly instructed any students in any capacity. Besides these major responsibilities, LCs were also responsible for a myriad of other tasks such as ordering library books or acting as a translator etc.

In addition to their LC responsibilities, LCs also assumed two or three other major responsibilities such as ESL director or mentoring all new teachers etc. as well as taught half time. Teaching required a substantial amount of time and preparation but four out of the five LCs were not willing to give up teaching students in order to become a full time LC. All in all, there simply were too many tasks for LCs to complete. As a result, they were forced to pick and choose the tasks they felt were most important. There was no formal job description and this flexibility to meet site needs seemed to work best for the majority of schools.

LCs, teachers, and principals varied in their perceptions of the LC in two main ways: with whom they worked and the overall scope of the LC job. First, teachers as a whole thought that LCs should be working with students. However LCs disagreed on this point. When teachers were divided into smaller groups, responses varied. English teachers agreed that LCs should work with small groups of teachers to improve their literacy instruction while non English teachers did not. Teachers with any kind of literacy certification or inservice agreed that LCs should work with more kinds of teachers: individual teachers, first- or second-year teachers, as well as small groups of teachers. Teachers without any kind of literacy certification or inservice disagreed with this. Finally, middle school teachers agreed that LCs should work with students of all ability levels as well as individual and first- and second-year teachers.

The second main difference in perception had to do with the scope of the LC job. Teachers perceived the job as being more narrow, focused mainly on teaching literacy related skills. However, LCs considered the job to be broader and to encompass additional administrative jobs not related to literacy. Principals disagreed most with this last statement. It was the only item for which principals indicated a significant difference in perception.

In addition to the survey responses, interviews revealed additional teacher and principal perspectives. As a whole teachers generally reported a positive attitude toward literacy, its importance, and their use of it. Focus group teachers also had positive comments regarding the work of the LCs; however, they also repeatedly raised the issue of the effectiveness of the professional development that the LCs presented to the faculty members. They struggled to find ways to make what was presented fit into their

disciplines and wanted a content-area expert to design and present literacy strategies that would drop neatly into their curriculums. All focus group teachers agreed that literacy efforts on the part of teachers would disappear if literacy ceased to be an emphasis.

Principals were generally supportive of and satisfied with the job of the LC. They agreed that the LCs were making a difference and along with the LCs, considered leadership to be their most important role. They also tended to view the LCs in a more influential light, specifically regarding the peer coaching/observation strand, than did the LCs themselves and felt that LCs were not asked to assume non literacy administrative responsibilities while the LCs disagreed with this.

The concluding point of this study revealed that there was a mismatch between what LCs are perceived to do and what they actually do. The most significant had to do with whom they worked. Teachers thought LCs worked with students. In reality, LCs never did this. Teacher also thought that LCs' job was limited to teaching literacy related skills and working towards implementing a school-wide quality reading program. LCs reported that they taught more than literacy skills, had non literacy administrative responsibilities and were not working towards establishing a school-wide quality reading program.

Chapter Five

Conclusions

This study investigated what roles and responsibilities secondary literacy coordinators assumed, if perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of the LC varied according to LC, teacher, or administrator group; and how the current roles and responsibilities of the LCs corresponded to those perceptions.

Roles and Responsibilities of the LC

Results indicated that the roles and responsibilities LCs undertook were many and complex. They also varied in type as well as in relation to place of work. LCs assumed a myriad of responsibilities but also continued to teach half-time and carry out other major responsibilities in the school. Results also showed that LCs were in step with current literacy emphases as designated by IRA (2004): they worked with teachers and never directly instructed students. LCs primarily assumed leadership roles that supported and helped teachers improve their personal literacy instruction, e.g., preparing professional development meetings, acting as a resource, peer coaching. They resented responsibilities such as school-wide testing and administrative tasks that impeded that effort. Because of the number and complexity of responsibilities that LCs assumed, they were often faced with a number of untenable situations. Three such situations are detailed in the following sections: (a) LC Responsibilities and Restrictions vs. Adequate Resources and Compensation, (b) No LC job Description and Flexibility vs. Formal LC Description and Manageable Role, and (c) Conflicting Nature of the LC Duties – the Ideal vs. Reality. At the conclusion of each of the aforementioned sections, recommendations are made regarding each situation.

The next issue addressed in this chapter has to do with the varying perceptions of the role of the LC. LCs, teachers, and principals all exhibited some discrepancy of belief over the duties for which the LC was responsible. These discrepancies are addressed in the section titled "Differing Perceptions of the Role of the LC". Moreover, content-area teachers were specifically not in agreement about the effectiveness of the LCs' literacy instruction. This conflict is discussed in the section titled "Conflicting Teacher Perceptions about the LCs' Current Responsibilities". Finally, this chapter concludes with the limitations of the study and recommendations for further research.

LC Responsibilities and Restrictions vs. Adequate Resources and Compensation

LCs' duties could have easily consumed an entire day; however, the district only provided funding for part-time LCs. This meant that LCs were also half-time teachers and taught four class periods a day, which left the three remaining class periods free for literacy responsibilities. Unfortunately, the LCs' preparation period had been subsumed into that literacy time. Ironically, that while some focus group teachers questioned the need for the LCs to have so much released time, LCs simply had too many tasks for which they were responsible. They could not complete them all adequately and were forced to pick and choose those they considered most important. This finding has remained constant since the position of the reading specialist was first formally studied in the 1950s (Bean, 1979; Crain, 2003; Darwin, 2002; Henwood, 1999/2000; Quadroche, Bean, & Hamilton, 2001; Robinson, 1967, 1958; Mosby 1982).

However, when LCs were asked if they would be willing to give up teaching to become a full-time LC, four out of the five LCs said they would not. Working with students was where the LCs found enjoyment and reward. In addition, continuing to teach

offered the LCs the advantages of remaining in contact with students and their struggles as well as having a working class in which they could improve their own literacy instruction and invite other teachers to observe.

In accepting the LC postion, LCs assumed the responsibility for instructing and working with all faculty members as well as carrying out teaching duties and other major responsibilities. In return, they lost their preparation period as principals and teachers alike commented that LCs had three periods in which to fulfill literacy responsibilities. This perspective appeared to influence the quantity of tasks LCs were asked to assume. In reality, LCs only had two periods for literacy, but this did not appear to be taken into consideration. Additionally, any teacher willing to give up their preparation period in order to teach another content-area class received an additional one-sixth of their salary. LCs received $1200 more a year for accepting, in essence, the same situation. It is debatable whether the LCs received an equitable return on their investment of time and effort.

None of the LCs was overly concerned about the financial remuneration of the position. However, they were concerned about the number of tasks they were to fulfill in the allotted time. Both tasks and time should be proportioned equitably so that the role stays manageable and so that LCs who have gained experience and expertise in the role will desire to remain in it. By doing so, both the school and district benefit. In addition, LCs should be fairly compensated for their additional time and effort.

No LC Job Description and Flexibility vs. LC Job Description and Manageable Role

Literacy coordinators accepted the LC position without having an accurate picture of what they would be asked to do as LCs because there was no formal written job

description of the position. However, there were district and principal expectations that LCs would conduct professional development meetings addressing literacy instruction, oversee peer coaching, and administer the district school-wide reading and writing testing. Although two LCs and all of the principals preferred this arrangement because of the flexibility it offered to respond to on-site issues as needed, the distinct disadvantage of this was that no one really knew what the job entailed. As it turned out, the LC role was so large and unwieldy that a job description could probably not have described the many facets of the job.

A review of the literature revealed that difficulties arising over vague job descriptions is not uncommon as the role has been constantly changing since the 1920s (Bean, 1979, 2004a; Bean & Eichelberger, 1985; Henwood, 1999/2000; Hutson, McDonell, & Fortune, 1982; Jaeger, 1996; Quadroche, Bean, & Hamilton, 2001; Robinson, 1967). Moreover, even the IRA (2000) position statement on reading specialists reads, "Reading specialists can assume multiple roles…" (pg. 1) and goes on to list several. In addition, the IRA's (2004) position statement on reading coaches does not delineate specific job responsibilities either. This ambiguity has most likely existed because there is a multitude of literacy needs within a school and therefore, a variety of approaches that may be taken.

When the district was considered in that light, it was possible to see that different schools had different needs and therefore, different goals. This was evident in Claire's approach with faculty members who were divided and had low morale. Claire focused on collaboration, not at all related to Second Chance, as her first literacy focus. However, to introduce it, she spent a significant amount of time establishing connections between why

the teachers were educators and how they helped learning take place. She had to meet teachers where they were in order to help move them to a new perspective.

This approach was entirely unnecessary at East High. Eve worked with a small group of integrated and communicative faculty members whose needs were easy to assess. As a result, her professional development focused on presenting literacy from different content-area stances. However, she focused most of her observational time on helping the six new teachers in the school deal with class and behavior management with some literacy instruction added occasionally. Each approach differed substantially from the other, yet each was appropriate for the situation and both included literacy. These examples illustrate the need for there to be flexibility in the roles the LC assumes. However, flexibility also complicates the question of what is expected of the LCs.

Flexibility by its very nature defies an exact description. However, if the answer to the question of what the literacy coordinator is to do is to be left to the discretion of the LCs and administrators at individual sites because it is in the best interest of the schools, then it is also in the best interest of the schools that limitations be set on how many tasks the LCs will assume. This is necessary because setting limitations requires LCs and administrators to prioritize and set specific goals, delineate how those goals will be met, and keep expectations realistic for the LCs'. By doing these things, it is also much more likely that LCs will experience less frustration and more desire to remain in the position. However, setting goals and limitations can be extremely difficult to do when principals and/or LCs may not see the intricacy or complexity of one major responsibility until the LCs have been working at it for a time.

It is, therefore, recommended that consistent ongoing dialog between the principals and LCs take place to determine whether adding or removing responsibilities is appropriate. It is also essential to have some sort of delineated agenda to use to work through the process of selecting appropriate goals, determining how the goals will be assessed, and gathering feedback from the faculty, etc. This is a time consuming process but if discretion is to be left to the sites to choose which of all the responsibilities the LCs will assume, they must develop a plan of action and assessment so choices and directions are made wisely and with justification.

In addition, LCs must be reflective about their practice, forthright in what they have to say, and able to articulate the reasoning behind their statements and suggestions. Principals on the other hand, need to be cognizant that LCs are much more attuned to how the faculty is responding to the literacy emphasis, be prepared to question LCs carefully about teacher response and the LCs' course of action and rationale, be willing to defer to LCs' judgments and suggestions based on the validity of that rationale, and find effective ways of motivating teachers to respond to the LCs' requests.

In regard to communication between LCs and principals, with one exception, both groups indicated that positive communication was taking place between them. However, principals seemed to be much more satisfied with the dialog than were most of the LCs. Principals also seemed to have a general overview of what the LCs were doing but not a great deal of understanding of what was required to accomplish any given task. This was not surprising given the number of areas and responsibilities a principal oversaw: Time was always at a premium. This resulted in dialog taking place sporadically and somewhat

hurriedly. While regular meetings had taken place in the past for all LCs, the current situation had changed. Only one LC reported meeting regularly with her principal.

Site initiative and freedom to respond to local issues as school administration sees fit is an essential component of any successful institution and should always be so. However, LCs and administrators also need some kind of guide to delineate the duties of the LC in order to keep the job manageable and expectations realistic. If this does not happen, the LC simply becomes spread so thin that it is difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish anything as completely or as well as desired. Such was the case in the schools of this district.

Conflicting Nature of the LC Duties - the Ideal vs. Reality

Working with teachers was a task that was paradoxical in nature for the LCs. Teachers could be, and often were, abrasive in their interaction with the LCs. A few teachers would simply not respond to LC requests to work with them personally. In contrast, when LCs saw teachers experiencing success because of some form of literacy implementation or modification, they were delighted and encouraged to continue on in what was at times an unrewarding endeavor.

Also paradoxical in nature was the fact that LCs were given the injunction to train teachers to implement certain literacy elements, but then had no power to assess whether their efforts were making a difference or whether they needed to modify their training in forthcoming faculty presentations. No LC wanted the power to force teachers to let them in to observe. LCs thought and the principals concurred, that that was the role of the principals. Principals, on the other hand, stated that they couldn’t force teachers to do anything. They indicated that they tried to hold teachers accountable for literacy

implementation in year-end interviews, but LCs reported that interviews were ineffective in influencing teacher behavior during the course of the year.

That principals did not or would not try to force teachers to do anything was probably the best option, and in this era of hyper-accountability, most likely the right response. However, this left the LCs in a figurative no man's land. It set them up for failure when they were given the responsibility to change or modify teacher instruction but no ability to follow through on that injunction. This situation also pointed out the supervisory nature of the peer observation task. It shifted LCs into a leadership role with which they had to be comfortable, but for which they had received little, if any, training and no corresponding authority. Readance, Baldwin, and Dishner (1980) also found this to be true and noted that if LCs were to make progress in the secondary schools, they needed to have status as well as responsibility.

Assuming this leadership role may have also put LCs at odds with some of their fellow teachers who feared or resented being observed by a colleague even though the emphasis was on coaching, not evaluating teachers. If the LCs were evaluating anything, it was their own instructional effectiveness. It was also this assessment of effectiveness that facilitated the LCs in modifying and improving their faculty presentations.

As things stood, principals had the responsibility to hold teachers accountable for this strand of the LCs' work. However, not having some kind of ongoing teacher observation or assessment in place jeopardized progress toward literacy goals. In fact, teacher observation was the only element in place that could be examined to determine if the efforts of the LCs were making inroads in the school. This is the case because to date, no studies have been conducted that prove or indicate a correlation between the use of a

reading specialist and improved literacy scores. Test scores in schools with reading specialists may rise but it has not been established that one is tied to the other. Therefore, one measurable way to determine if LCs make a difference within a school is to observe teachers and note the extent and effectiveness of the literacy instruction in their teaching.

Educators more than any other group, should understand the purpose and importance of goals and assessment in gauging effectiveness. That teachers were unwilling to participate and administrators limited in efforts to motivate them to do so, spoke directly to one of the questions lying at the heart of the literacy matter: What is it that we want LCs to be responsible for and what will we empower them to be able to do?

If peer coaching is to be emphasized as a significant element in improving literacy instruction and thereby, student literacy proficiency, then it also requires that some sort of evaluative piece support it. LCs must have some sort of additional supervisory status regarding observation or principals need to determine how evaluation will take place. This does not suggest that evaluation be punitive, only that some method of follow up support it. It seems reasonable that administrators not only include literacy instruction as one of the elements they look for in their yearly observations of teacher instruction, but that they also question teachers about their peer coaching involvement when they discuss the teacher observation. It also seems reasonable for principals to ask departmental chairs to help encourage and follow up on peer coaching experiences within their departments. Moreover, LCs when emphasizing peer coaching, may be able to encourage greater teacher interest by presenting it in terms of developing greater professional expertise and collegiality than in solely emphasizing it as an element of literacy instruction.

Differing Perceptions of the Role of the LC

Perceptions of the LCs and their role, not surprisingly, varied from LCs to teachers to principals. Blumer (1969), Charon (1989), and Stryker (1980) address varying perceptions in context of symbolic interactionism and explain that people's actions are based on what they perceive. To the extent that people find value or meaning in symbols or interactions, determines their receptivity to and use of that thing. It appeared that LCs, teachers and principals all held different issues to be important within the context of the LC role and literacy. As a result, different groups valued different things and perceptions of the LC varied from group to group.

Teachers, as a whole, saw the LCs as those who worked with students in either pullout situations or in the classroom in collaboration with the classroom teacher. This harkened back to an earlier role of the LC – directly instructing students in order to improve their reading proficiency (Bean, 2004a; Robinson, 1958, 1967). However, the LCs did neither of these tasks. Rather, they worked with the teachers to improve their literacy instruction. Individual teacher groups differed from teachers, as a whole, in that they saw LCs working with differing combinations of students and teachers.

That teachers, in general, had this perception of the role of the LC after five years of the LC working with teachers within the school was somewhat surprising. This perception might reflect that teachers and principals valued a former, more traditional, role of the LC than the one currently defined by the IRA (2004) and emphasized by their school district or it might simply reflect what teachers thought LCs could do. In any event, the LCs were in congruence with current literacy trends while teachers seemed to not yet value this emphasis.

Another difference in perception concerning the role of LC had to do with the level of optimism concerning LC effectiveness. Principals were generally more optimistic about how well the LCs were functioning and their influence on the faculty than were the LCs or the teacher focus groups. This could be the case because principals relied more heavily on seeing an element in place, such as LCs presenting well-thought out and organized professional development, than on knowing specifically which teachers were actively trying to develop their literacy instruction through peer observation.

In spite of the differences, all groups indicated that they thought the LCs were making progress or had made progress since the LCs had first been positioned in the school. Principals were positive about having LCs and shared experiences where the LC had made a difference. Evaluations were subjective and based on anecdotal experiences: One principal even said she would die without her LC. Principals referred to the district testing scores and indicated they were rising but whether or not it was attributable to the influence of the LC was impossible to indicate.

It was encouraging that teachers and principals both reported that the LC were making positive impressions at their schools. However, conflicting perceptions about the role of the LC may indicate a greater depth of disagreement or misinformation about the LC position than was easily observed. For their part, LCs were consciously aware of those faculty members who perceived them as annoyances, nuisances, or threats and did not value what they had to offer. LCs tended to avoid these kinds of teachers and instead, focused on those teachers who were receptive to what they had to offer. Both experienced and inexperienced LC talked about the futility of working with resistant teachers and the need to work with those who were open to new ideas and information.

One LC identified three types of teachers in her school: resistant, receptive, and unconvinced. She emphasized that she had given up on the resistant teachers. For the most part, she categorized those teachers as very tenured teachers on the verge of retirement and opposed to almost anything new. Instead, she focused her efforts on those teachers, at all levels of experience, who were receptive to learning about new methods that might help them facilitate student learning. She remarked that by working with receptive teachers and coaching them to success, those who were unconvinced would see that success and come along of their own volition.

Most LCs had come to this same conclusion very quickly and were focusing their efforts on those teachers whom they considered most open to their encouragement and support. This seemed to be the best, and at times, only recourse, open to LCs as principals reported limitations in motivating teachers towards positive involvement in literacy, often because teacher perceptions did not seem malleable. In addition, principals often seemed inundated with too many responsibilities of their own to be able to put a great deal of time and effort into any one thing. However, all principals indicated they supported the literacy emphasis and efforts of their LCs. With the exception of one LC, all LCs concurred with this. LCs were in agreement that the element most likely to change neutral or slightly disinterested teachers' perceptions was for them to see and hear about successful experiences from the receptive teachers.

Conflicting Teacher Perceptions about LCs' Literacy Instruction

The most interesting finding from this study had to do with teacher perceptions concerning the literacy instruction that LCs presented in professional development meetings. Survey results indicated that teachers as a whole, felt satisfied about their

literacy instruction in their content areas, and thought that the LCs' content-area background did not limit their effectiveness in presenting to teachers from all content-area backgrounds. However, this perception was contradicted by one or two focus group teachers in each of four schools. These teachers were very outspoken about having a content-area expert present literacy instruction and said, without hesitation, that knowledge of the content area was essential for literacy instruction to be effective. Math teachers, in particular, were more vocal about this than other content-area teachers.

Perhaps some of the answer in the conflicting perspective of the teachers was explained in the bridging position in which the focus group teachers found themselves. Focus group teachers were the teachers most receptive or supportive of the literacy focus and to who the LCs looked for support. Particularly at the high school level, these teachers were representative of many content-areas and were the teachers the LCs and principals depended on to help the teachers in other departments become better informed and more supportive of literacy. Their job was to help teachers in their departments integrate the literacy strategies into their content-area instruction.

These focus group teachers expressed intense frustration about the difficulty of making the LCs' literacy instruction relevant to their content areas. Even though all LCs, teacher focus groups, and principals talked about literacy in similar terms, how those ideas transferred into instruction differed. Focus group teachers complained about the time and effort it took to make the LCs' literacy strategies relevant to their content areas. The LCs' presentations had no credibility for them and they wanted to collaborate with someone from a similar content-area background. They reasoned, as well as spoke from experience, that content-area specialists who presented literacy strategies had already

designed the strategies to drop neatly into their content-area curriculum. They suggested that faculty literacy inservice be conducted by department and by someone with expertise in that area.

These comments bring us back to the theoretical framework of this study, symbolic interactionism. These focus group teachers, responsible for making literacy strategies applicable to their departmental colleagues, did not see the relevance of literacy strategies as presented by LCs with English backgrounds, to what and how they taught. Therefore, they dismissed them as irrelevant and looked to others proficient in their own content-area for instructional credibility.

While these focus group teachers did not personally disparage the LCs, they were adamant about the necessity of having a content-area literacy instructor. They firmly believed that only when someone understood their content area, could they discern whether the strategies actually helped students comprehend better. Whether or not this was accurate, the perception was pervasive. This perception was reinforced by those focus group teachers who had attended literacy training conducted by experts in their field. They were enthusiastic and profuse in their praise about how helpful the workshops had been and about how relevant the materials and information that had been given to them were.

What these teacher focus groups revealed was a need to include content-area teachers in the discussion about literacy and literacy instruction. It indicated that at the least, content-area teachers perceived literacy presented by LCs with English backgrounds to be less relevant and applicable to them than that presented by someone in

their own fields. However, even more interesting a proposition, and one that needs exploring, is that literacy, does in fact, look different in different fields.

Limitations

In any study, be it qualitative or quantitative in nature, there are limitations. While findings from a qualitative study cannot be generalized to a larger population, they supply rich detail and insight into a specific situation. Such was the case with this study as interviews, self-report logs, and observations revealed the complexities of the LC role as well as others' perceptions of it. Additionally, the study examined only five secondary schools within one school district. No attempt should be made to generalize findings from this study to other secondary LCs or schools.

Regarding the quantitative nature of the survey, the sample sizes of the participant groups were unequal. There were five LCs and five principals but 193 teachers. It was unclear whether the participants responded to survey statements based on what they saw the LCs doing within their schools or on what they thought the LCs should be doing. Moreover, significant difference in response could be reached if the group mean fell slightly to one side or the other of the same number on the Likert scale. This is to say that a significant difference sometimes resulted when the mean of participants in one group was only slightly higher or lower than the mean in another group. The length of time covered by the study was the first semester of the 2005-2006 school year. While this was deemed a long enough time for routines and patterns regarding literacy instruction and involvement to develop, a longer period of time might have revealed additional developments, specifically for those LCs new to the position.

Finally, though I recorded and transcribed interviews verbatim, my own fallibility as a human being may also have contributed to oversights or errors made while interpreting that data as well as the quantitative data.

Recommendations for Further Research

Studies examining LCs at the secondary level are few in number. This is most likely the case as LCs working at the secondary level are also dramatically fewer in number. While substantially more studies have been conducted concerning elementary school LCs, it has only been in the last ten to fifteen years that LCs have begun to make inroads at the secondary level. Attitudes, teaching methods, and resources at the secondary level differ dramatically and the function of the LC in these circumstances needs more attention. This study has added one more sliver of insight into the roles of the LCs but additional studies are needed to provide even greater understanding of how LCs function and interact at the secondary level.

Although LCs, teachers, and principals basically talked about literacy using the same terms, teacher focus groups all commented that literacy looked different in different disciplines. What literacy looks like in different content areas was not a specific focus in this study. It is, however, squarely in the middle of the issue. Assuming that literacy coordinators have knowledge of literacy that can work in tandem with what content-area teachers do to improve student proficiency, then it is imperative that the two collaborate. Presently, this is not happening. Discussions need to focus on what literacy means in each discipline. This may require some effort as it is not clear if, or to what extent, content-area teachers have common language with which to discuss the subject. On one hand, content-area teachers may struggle articulating what it is they want and need to say about

literacy while conversely, literacy coordinators may not have sufficient subject knowledge to understand other content-area teachers' viewpoints. Studies bringing teachers from all content areas together to discuss what literacy is in their content area would help to establish common understanding that would facilitate LCs effectiveness when working with all content areas.

It also appears that there may be a mismatch between how content-area teachers and LCs traditionally from English backgrounds approach literacy in the classroom. In the five years that the district has had LCs in the secondary schools, almost all of the LCs came from English departments. However, teacher focus groups from four schools consistently voiced the desire to have a content-area teacher help them integrate literacy into their curriculum. This finding leads to perhaps the most compelling areas for further research: 1) Determining what acts of literacy look like in different content areas and how they mirror or differ from what LCs traditionally from English backgrounds present. It may well be that literacy strategies that work well for disciplines such as English and history, may not be nearly so effective for disciplines such as science and math. 2) Evaluating outcomes and responses to content-area LCs presenting literacy instruction fashioned specifically for their discipline. This addresses the question sometimes raised by teachers and LCs alike, "If something is working the way we're doing it, why do we have to change?" The question seems to indicate that teachers consider their instruction effective or they have not yet been convinced that changing or modifying their approach will make any difference in the achievement of their students. In either case, teachers may be more receptive to content-area LCs because they may be perceived as having more credibility and therefore, more applicable suggestions.

In conclusion, the voices of secondary content-area teachers regarding literacy, be they literacy coordinators or teachers from within or without English departments, have not been heard much (Crain, 2003; Sarno-Tedeschi, 1991). Studies dealing with literacy coordinators at the secondary level are few, and fewer still are those in which LCs have been able to share their experiences and resulting successes and failures. Almost non-existent are studies in which secondary content-area teachers have been included in conversations about literacy and their discipline, and studies looking at secondary content-area experts functioning as the LC are non-existent. It may be that such LCs do not yet exist.

Moreover, it appears that the role of the LC is and always has been ambiguous and may well remain that way as literacy needs within a school vary widely. LCs should have the flexibility to meet them in a way most fitting for that situation. However, greater efforts must be made to limit how much responsibility the LC will assume. It also appears that perceptions of the LC role may continue to vary from LCs to teachers to principals as each group values different aspects of the LC role. Finally, coming to understand and capitalize on the role of the secondary literacy coordinator requires that both LCs and content-area teachers be included in discussions about literacy, what it is, what it looks like, and how literacy instruction can be improved in order to benefit students.

References

Applebee, A.N., Langer, J.A., Mullis, I.V.S., Latham, A.S., & Gentile, C.A. (1994). *NAEP 1992 writing report card* (Report No. 23-W01). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, Education Information Branch, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wardsworth Publishing Co.

Baker, K., & Allington, R. L. (2003). Best practices in literacy instruction for children with special needs. In L. B. Gambrell, L. M. Morrow, S. B. Neuman, & M. Pressley (EDs.), *Best practices in literacy instruction* (pp. 292-310). New York: Guilford Press.

Barclay, K. D., & Thistlewaite, L. (1992). Reading specialists of the 90's: What do they want? *Reading, Research and Instruction, 32,* 87-96.

Barry, A. (1994). The staffing of high school remedial reading programs in the United States since 1920. *Journal of Reading, 38,*14-22.

Barry, A. (1997). High school reading programs revisited. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 40,* 524-531.

Bean, R. M. (1979). Role of the reading specialist: A multifaceted dilemma. *Reading teacher, 32,* 409-413.

Bean, R. M. (2004a). *The reading specialist: Leadership for the classroom, school and community*. New York: Guilford Press.

Bean, R. M. (2004b). Promoting effective literacy instruction: The challenge for literacy coaches. *CR, 37,* 58-63

Bean, R. M., Cassidy, J., Grumet, J. E., Shelton, D. S., & Wallis, S. R. (2002). What do reading specialists do? Results from a national survey. *Reading Teacher, 55,* 736-745.

Bean, R. M., Cooley, W. W., Eichelberger, R. T., Lazar, M. K., & Zigmond, N. (1991). Inclass or pullout: Effects of setting on the remedial reading program. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 23,* 445-464.

Bean, R. M. & Eichelberger, R. T. (1985). Changing the role of the reading specialists: From pull-out to in-class programs. *Reading Teacher, 38,*648-653.

Bean, R. M., Knaub, R., & Swan, A. L. (2000). *Reading specialists in exemplary schools.* Paper presented at the 45th International Reading Association convention, Indianapolis, IN.

Bean, R. M., Swan, A. L., & Knaub, R. (2003). Reading specialists in schools with exemplary reading programs: Functional, versatile, and prepared. *Reading Teacher, 56,* 446-456.

Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. E. (2004). *Reading next – A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of NewYork.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Blackford, L. (2002). Secondary school reading. *School Administrator*, *59*, 12-14.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bond, G. L., & Dykstra, R. (1967). The cooperative research program in first grade-reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 2*, 1-142.

Brownell, M. T., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2000). An interview with Dr. Michael Pressley, *Intervention in school & clinic, 36*,105-108.

Buly, M. R., Coskie, T., Robinson, L., & Egawa, K. (2004). What is a literacy coach? *Voices in the Middle,1*, 60-61.

Carvell, R., & Kerr, M. (1980). A self-appraisal survey of reading specialists: Education in the least restrictive environment. *Journal of Educational Research, 74,* 120-124.

Chall, J. (1967). *Learning to read: The great debate.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Coaches, consensus, and controversy. (2004). *Reading Today, 21*, 18.

Charon, J. M. (1989). *Symbolic Interactionism.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Crain, A. B. (2003). *Role of the reading specialist: Perspectives of content area teachers and reading specialists*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* London: Sage Publications.

Darwin, M. J. (2002*). Delving into the role of the high school reading specialist*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Mason University.

Davis, F. B. (1944). Fundamental factors of comprehension in reading. *Psychometrika,* 185-197.

Davis, W. N. (1976). *A study of the role perceptions and occupation behaviors of elementary and secondary reading teachers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The American University.

Dietrich, D. M. (1967). Standards and qualifications for reading specialists. *The Reading Teacher, 20,* 483-489.

Dilley, L. (1944). Every teacher and reading. *The School Review, 52,* 597-605.

Dole, J. A. (2004). The changing role of the reading specialist in school reform. *Reading teacher, 57,* 462-471.

Draper, R. J., Smith, L. K., Hall, K., & Siebert, D. (2005). What's more important – literacy or content? Confronting the literacy-content dualism. *Teacher in Action Education, 27, 12-21.*

Duke, N. K. (2000). 3.6 minutes per day: The scarcity of informational texts in first grade. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35, no. 2, 202-224.

Durkin, E. (1972). *Teaching Young Children to Read.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Eisenhart, M. A., Cuthbert, A. M., Shrum, J. L., & Harding, J. R. (1988). Teacher beliefs about their work activities: Policy implications. *Theory into Practice, 27,* 137-144.

Foundation for Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning, (2006). Retrieved 5/15/2006 from http://www.cell-exll.com/secondchance.htm.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Herder and Herder.

Garry, V. V. (1973-74). Competencies that count among reading specialists. *Journal of Reading, 17,* 608-613.

Gates, A. I. (1937). The necessary mental age for beginning readers. *Education Digest,* 42-43.

Gates, A. I. (1958). Improvements in reading possible in the near future. *Reading Teacher, 12,* 83-88.

Geertz, C. (1975). *Interpretation of cultures*. London: Hutchinson.

Georgia State Department of Education (1977). *Parent advisory council information handbook for title 1 in GA.* Atlanta, GA: Title One Unit, Office of Instructional Services.

Gibson, J. B. (1937). A novice remedies junior high reading. *California Journal of Secondary Education, 12,* 421-423.

Goodman, K. S. (1986). *What's Whole in Whole Language?* Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Haab, M. d. (2001). *The emergent nature of the role of a reading specialist: A study of the sociopolitical forces that shape the role of a reading specialist.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Hall, B. (2004). Literacy coaches: An evolving role. *Carnegie Reporter, 3,* 1-5.

Hammersly, M. (1992). *What's wrong with ethnography?* London: Routledge

Henwood, G. F. (1999/2000). A new role for the reading specialist: Contributing toward a high school collaborative educational culture. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 43,* 316-325.

Hutson, B. A., McDonell, & Fortune, J. C. (1982, December). *A multifaceted view of the roles of the reading specialist.* Paper presented at National Reading Conference,Clearwater, Florida.

International Reading Association. (1968). *Reading specialists: Roles, responsibilities, and qualifications.* Newark, DE: Author.

International Reading Association. (1978). *Guidelines for the professional preparation of reading teachers.* Newark, DE: Author.

International Reading Association. (1985). *Guidelines for the specialized preparation of reading professionals.* Newark, DE: Author.

International Reading Association. (1998). *Standards for reading professionals.* Newark, DE: Author.

International Reading Association. (2000). *Teaching all children to read: The roles of the reading specialist. A position statement of the International Reading Association.* Newark, DE: Author.

International Reading Association. (2003). *Standards for reading professionals - Revised 2003.* Neward, DE: Author.

International Reading Association. (2004). *The role and qualifications of the reading coach in the United States. A position statement of the International Reading Association.* Newark, DE: Author.

International Reading Association. (2006). *Standards for Middle and High School Literacy Coaches.* Newark, DE: Author.

International Reading Association Evaluation Committee. (1979). What's in a name: Reading specialist? *Journal of Reading, 20,* pp. 623-28.

Isenberg, J. P. (1990). Teachers' thinking and beliefs and classroom practice. *Childhood Education, 66,* 322-327.

Ivey, G., & Fisher, D., (2005). Learning from what doesn't work. *Educational Leadership, 63,* 8-14.

Jaeger, E. (1996). The reading specialist as collaborative consultant. *The Reading Teacher, 49,* 622-630.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2000). *Educational research.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Kulesza, D. (2001). *The role of reading specialists: A descriptive study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nevada at Las Vegas.

Lapp, D., Fisher, D., Flood, J., & Frey, N. (2003). Dual role of the urban reading specialist. *Journal of Staff Development, 24,* 33-6.

Maleki, R. B., & Heerman, C. E. (1994). What do rural middle-secondary teachers expect of reading programs and reading specialists? *Reading Improvement, 31,* 101-106.

Mason, G. E., & Palmatier, R. A. (1973). A preparation for professionals in reading. *Journal of Reading, 16,* 637-640.

Moburg, L. G. (1967). A new consultant gets started. *Reading Teacher, 20,* 520-524.

Morphett, M. V., & Washburn, C. (1931). When should children begin to read? *Elementary School Journal,* 496-503.

Morris, D., & Slavin, R. E. (2003). *Every Child Reading.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Mosby, E. M. (1982). *An analysis of job descriptions for reading specialists in selected school districts in the United States.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M.

Mullis, I.V. S., & Jenkins, L. (1990). *The reading report card, 1971-1988: Trends from the nation's report card*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Nation's Report Card, (2003). Retrieved February 14, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/results2003/natachieve-g.8asp.

National Reading Panel. (2000a). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction.* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Curriculum Studies, 19,* 317-328.

Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2003). *Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity – promises and practicalities.* Washington D.C.: The Aspen Institute Program on Education/ Providence, Rhode Island: The Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

O'Brien, D. G., Stewart, R. A., & Moje, E. B., (1995). Why content literacy is difficult to infuse into the secondary school: Complexities of curriculum, pedagogy, and school culture. *Reading Research Quarterly,30,* 442-463.

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pipes, G. (2004). *What are they really doing?: A mixed methodology inquiry into the multi-faceted role of the elementary reading specialist.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama.

Pressley, M. (2002). Metacognition and self-regulated comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup and S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction.* (pp. 291-309). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Quatroche, D. J., Bean, R. M., & Hamilton, R. L. (2001). The role of the reading specialist: A review of research. *Reading Teacher, 55,*282-294.

Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (1997). *Designing and conduction survey research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Readence, J. E., Baldwin, R. S., & Dishner, E. K. (1980). Establishing content reading programs in secondary schools. *The Reading Teacher,* 523-527.

Robinson, H. A. (1958). The secondary school reading specialist. *Reading Teacher, 12,* 103-106.

Robinson, H. A. (1967). The reading consultant of the past, present, and possible future. *Reading Teacher, 20,* 475-482.

Robinson, R. D., & Pettit, N. T. (1978). The role of the reading teacher: Where do you fit in? *Reading Teacher, 31*, 923-927.

Ruddell, M. R. (1993). *Teaching content reading and writing*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Rupley, W. H., Mason, G., & Logan, J. W. (1985). Past, present, and future job responsibilities of public school reading specialists. *Reading World*, 48-60.

Sarno-Tedeschi, J. M. (1991). *The roles of the reading specialists in the culture of high school: A tapestry of perceptions, politics, possibilities.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Columbia University.

Schrekman, L. J. (1981). *Attitudes of secondary content area teachers toward the disabled reader, teaching reading and inservice workshops.* Unpublished masters thesis. Kean College of New Jersey.

Serafini, F. S. (2005, May). *The evolving role of the reading (literacy) specialist.* Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, Texas.

Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

South Carolina Department of Education, Division of Teacher Quality, *Title II no child left behind*. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from http://www.scteachers.org/TitleII/index.cfm

Stake, R. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (EDs.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236-247). Eds., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stauffer, R. G. (1967). Change, but- *Reading Teacher, 20,* 474 and 499.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research.* London: Sage Publications.

Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionsim: A social structural version.* Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings Publishing.

Sturtevant, E. G. (2003). The Literacy Coach: A Key to Improving Teaching and Learning in Secondary Schools. *Alliance for Excellent Education, Carnegie Corporation of New York.* Retrieved January 25, 2005 from http://www.all4ed.org/publications/LiteracyCoach.pdf

Tatum, A. W. (2004). A road map for reading specialists entering schools without exemplary reading programs: Seven quick lessons. *Reading Teacher, 58,* 28-39.

Thomas, E. L. (1967). A reading consultant at the secondary level. *The Reading Teacher, 20,* 509-514, 519.

Thorndike, E. L. (1917). Reading as reasoning: A study of mistakes in paragraph reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 8,* 323-332.

Thompson, R. (1979, October). *Teachers' perceptions of how reading consultants can be of best use*. Paper presented at the Florida State Reading Conference, Daytona Beach, Florida.

Tucker, J. (1970). Setting up and operating public school and reading clinics. In D. L. Shepherd (Ed.), *Current emphasis in reading. Proceedings of Hofstra University Reading Conferences Six, Seven, and Eight*, 3, 63-67. New York: Hofstra University.

U.S. Census Bureau (2005a). Retrieved February 2, 2007 from http://www.census.gov/popest/cities/tables/SUBEST2005-04-49.xls

U.S. Census Bureau (2005b). American fact finder. Retrieved February 2, 2007 from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTable?_bm=y&geo_id=16000US4962470&ds_name=ACS_2005_EST_G00_&redoLog=false&mt_name=ACS_2005_EST_G2000_B02001

U.S. Census Bureau (2005c) Retrieved February 2, 2007 from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/49/4962470.html

Usova, G. M. (1973). *A comparison of attitudes toward reading instruction among secondary principals, secondary reading specialists, and secondary content-area teachers in Pennsylvania and West Virginia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Pittsburgh.

Vacca, R. T.,(1998). Let's not marginalize adolescent literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 41,* 604-609.

Vacca, J. L., & Padak, N. D. (1990). Reading consultants as classroom collaborators: An emerging role. *Journal of educational and psychological consultation, 1,* 99-107.

Vaughan, J. L., & Estes, T. H. (1986). *Reading and Reasoning Beyond the Primary Grades.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Walsh, P. (1986). *Tales out of school.* New York: Viking Penguin.

Worthen, B. R., White, K. R., Fan, X., & Sudweeks, R. R. (1999). *Measurement and assessment in schools.* New York: Longman.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Letters of Consent

Brigham Young University
Consent to Act as a Research Subject
(Administrator and Faculty Form)

A multiple case study of the secondary literacy coordinators in Foothill School District

Purpose of the Study: You are being asked to participate in a research study investigating the responsibilities and roles literacy coordinators assume in middle and senior high schools and how the faculties of those schools perceive those roles. Linda Frost, a doctoral candidate in the Department of Teacher Education, is conducting this study. Dr. Roni Jo Draper, associate professor, supervises her work. Eligibility is based on willingness to participate.

Procedures: If you participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

1. Participate in a 30-45 minute interview about literacy coordinators in which you will be audio taped. Follow up contacts may also be made if questions arise concerning the content of the interview.
2. Complete a survey.

Risks or Discomforts:
You may have concerns about being audio taped. However, the data on the audio tapes will only be used by the researcher to produce transcripts for analysis. When referring to this information in the report, a pseudonym will be used.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this study. However, it is likely that information from this study will help secondary schools and Foothill School District utilize literacy coordinators in a more effective way so as to encourage and increase student literacy achievement.

Confidentiality: Strict confidentiality will be maintained when reporting findings from this study. No individual identifying information will disclosed. Where possible, all identifying references will be removed and replaced by pseudonyms. All data collected in this research study will be stored in a secure area, and access will only be given to personnel associated with this study. Interview tapes and surveys will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

Voluntary Nature of Participation: Participation in this study is voluntary. You have the right to refuse to participate and the right to withdraw later without any adverse effect. If you choose not to participate in this study, you will not be contacted further.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study, please ask them now. If you have any questions later, you may contact Linda Frost at 373-2900 or 422-3091. If you have questions regarding your rights as a human subject and participant in this study, you may contact Dr. Renea Beckstrand, Chair of the Institutional Review Board, 422 SWKT, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; phone (801) 422-3873; email: renae_beckstrand@byu.edu

Agreement: Your signature below indicates that you have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of your own free will and volition to participate in this research and accept the benefits and risks related to the study. Your signature also indicates that you have been told that you may change your mind and withdraw your consent to participate at any time.

_____ _____

Research Subject Date

Brigham Young University
Consent to Act as a Research Subject
(Literacy Coordinator Form)

A multiple case study of the secondary literacy coordinators in Foothill School District

Purpose of the Study: You are being asked to participate in a research study investigating the responsibilities and roles literacy coordinators assume in middle and senior high schools and how the faculties of those schools perceive those roles. Linda Frost, a doctoral candidate in the Department of Teacher Education, is conducting this study. Dr. Roni Jo Draper, associate professor, supervises her work. Eligibility is based on willingness to participate.

Procedures: If you participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

1. Keep two week's of daily logs at three different time periods (at the beginning, middle and end of the semester) of the tasks you carry out as a literacy coordinator.
2. At the conclusion of every week of the study, briefly describe in a log one experience that went well and one you were not satisfied with.
3. Participate in four 30-40 minute interviews about your role as a literacy coordinator in which you will be audio taped.
4. Complete a survey.

Risks or Discomforts:
You may have concerns about recording your activities in the log, being audio taped and observed. However, your logs will be returned to you if you desire and the data from the audio tapes will only be used by the researcher to produce transcripts for analysis. Observation notes will be similarly analyzed and when reference to any of this data is made in the report, a pseudonym will be used.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this study. However, it is likely that as you reflect on your practice and record experiences in your log, you will gain insights into your role and responsibilities. Also, information from this study may help secondary schools and Foothill School District utilize literacy coordinators in a more effective way so as to encourage and increase student literacy achievement.

Confidentiality: Strict confidentiality will be maintained when reporting findings from this study. No individual identifying information will disclosed. Where possible, all identifying references will be removed and replaced by pseudonyms. All data collected in this research study will be stored in a secure area, and access will only be given to personnel associated with this study. At the conclusion of the study, logs will be returned to the literacy coordinator and interview tapes will be destroyed.

Voluntary Nature of Participation: Participation in this study is voluntary. You have the right to refuse to participate and the right to withdraw later without any adverse effect. If you choose not to participate in this study, you will not be contacted further.

Compensation: Literacy coordinators will receive $25.00 at the mid point of this study and $25.00 at its conclusion.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study, please ask them now. If you have any questions later, you may contact Linda Frost at 373-2900 or 422-3091. If you have questions regarding your rights as a human subject and participant in this study, you may contact

Dr. Renea Beckstrand, Chair of the Institutional Review Board, 422 SWKT, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; phone (801) 422-3873; email: renae_beckstrand@byu.edu

Agreement: Your signature below indicates that you have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of your own free will and volition to participate in this research and accept the benefits and risks related to the study. Your signature also indicates that you have been told that you may change your mind and withdraw your consent to participate at any time.

_____ _____

Research Subject Date

Appendix B

Surveys

Literacy Coordinator Survey

Please answer each item as completely as you can. This information will assist the researcher in preparing as thorough a case study as possible on the literacy coordinators in the Foothill School District.

Circle the appropriate answer:

1. Gender: Male Female

2. Ethnicity:

American Indian or Alaska Native
Asian
Black or African American
Hispanic/Latino
Pacific Islander
White
Other

3. In which type of school do you work? Middle Senior High

4. With which grade or grades do you work? 7 8 9 10 11 12

5. Of which department are you a member?

English/Language Arts
Social studies
Science
Math
Art/Music
PE
Technology
Special Ed
Guidance
Other (please specify)

6. For how many years before specializing in reading were you a classroom teacher?

0 1-2 3-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21+

7. For how many years have you been a literacy coordinator?

At elementary school level _____ At secondary school level _____

Please specify other types and years of experience in the public schools not mentioned above.

Please complete:

8. What degrees do you hold?

	Field/Specialization	Year Earned	Institution
BA	_____	_____	_____
BS	_____	_____	_____
MA	_____	_____	_____
MS	_____	_____	_____
M.Ed	_____	_____	_____
EdD	_____	_____	_____
PhD	_____	_____	_____

Other (please specify)

9. In addition to a degree in literacy or other content area, what literacy training have you had?

	When Taken	Sponsoring Institution
Reading certificate	_____	_____
Reading endorsement	_____	_____
District training	_____	_____
Wilheim Cohort	_____	_____
School inservice	_____	_____
Summer institute	_____	_____
College courses (approx. how many?)	Undergraduate _____	Graduate _____
Other (please specify)		

10. How many times in the last 2 years have you:

	in your content area	on literacy issues
Taken a university course	_____	_____
Attended a		
state/national/international	_____	_____
conference	_____	_____
professional workshop	_____	_____
Attended a district or school		
endorsement class	_____	_____
professional workshop	_____	_____
institute	_____	_____
conference	_____	_____
Read journals/professional material	_____	_____
Other (please specify):	_____	_____

11. Circle how you obtained your present position.
    a. Direct application
    b. Asked to accept job; pay raise
    c. Asked to accept job; no pay raise
    d. Other (please specify):

12. Please indicate about what percentage of your time is spent in:

Teaching/instructing student roles	_____
Leadership (working with faculty, community, etc.) roles	_____
Assessment roles	_____
Other (please specify):	_____

Short answer questions

13. What are your needs as a literacy coordinator?

14. Would you like more literacy expertise?
    If so, in what areas?

15. Other comments:

Please circle the number on the scale that most closely reflects your opinion.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
16. I have a job description	1	2	3	4	5
17. I would like to have a more defined job description	1	2	3	4	5
18. I would like to have a less restrictive job description	1	2	3	4	5
19. My job responsibilities as a literacy coordinator are increasing	1	2	3	4	5
20. I would like to collaborate more with other literacy coordinators	1	2	3	4	5
21. I enjoy being a literacy specialist	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
My principal:					
22. believes a school wide reading program is beneficial	1	2	3	4	5
23. has a literacy plan and is working towards implementing it	1	2	3	4	5
24. plays an important role in improving student literacy	1	2	3	4	5
25. observes my work and provides feedback	1	2	3	4	5
26. gives me autonomy to make decisions about how I use my time	1	2	3	4	5
27. provides the resources I need (materials, time, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
28. doesn't request that I participate in extracurricular activities	1	2	3	4	5
29. actively discusses literacy and encourages attendance at professional conferences, institutes, etc. with faculty members	1	2	3	4	5
30. has me present literacy inservice to faculty	1	2	3	4	5
31. refers to me for information about current literacy research	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
The teachers in my school:					
32. know of my presence and expertise	1	2	3	4	5
33. come to me with questions, concerns, requests, etc. about literacy	1	2	3	4	5
34. are willing to learn about literacy	1	2	3	4	5
35. are willing to implement literacy techniques into their lessons	1	2	3	4	5
36. feel that literacy issues are not their responsibility	1	2	3	4	5
37. are under a great deal of pressure to meet curriculum demands	1	2	3	4	5
38. see no relation between literacy issues and their content-area subjects	1	2	3	4	5
39. would do more with literacy issues if they felt better prepared to do so	1	2	3	4	5
40. feel that I lack content-area expertise which restricts the effectiveness of my recommendations	1	2	3	4	5
The district:					
41. emphasizes literacy development	1	2	3	4	5
42. has a variety of resources to help with literacy issues	1	2	3	4	5
As a literacy coordinator, I work with:					
43. native English speaking struggling readers to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
44. English language learners to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
45. on level readers to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
46. honor/gifted students to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
47. students in content classes with teachers' collaboration	1	2	3	4	5
48. students in a pullout program	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
As a literacy coordinator, I:					
49. teach only literacy related skills	1	2	3	4	5
50. teach content area subject/s in which literacy instruction is integrated	1	2	3	4	5
51. work with individual teachers (plan, model, follow up, etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction	1	2	3	4	5
52. work with 1st/2nd year teachers to strengthen their literacy instruction	1	2	3	4	5
53. work with small groups of teachers (grade level, team unit, department etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction	1	2	3	4	5
54. conduct professional development for faculty	1	2	3	4	5
55. initiate casual or spontaneous conversations related to literacy issues with faculty	1	2	3	4	5
56. find and provide materials for teachers	1	2	3	4	5
57. develop curriculum	1	2	3	4	5
58. build good home school community connections (answer questions, speak to groups, facilitate effective parent teacher relationships etc)	1	2	3	4	5
59. fulfill administration responsibilities regarding literacy	1	2	3	4	5
60. fulfill administration responsibilities tied to school issues not dealing with literacy (subbing, discipline, extracurricular activities, etc)	1	2	3	4	5
61. provide instructional guidance to aides, peer tutors, paraprofessionals who work in the classroom to help teachers meet student needs	1	2	3	4	5
62. plan and collaborate with faculty and staff to implement a school-wide quality reading program	1	2	3	4	5
63. research ways to improve literacy within the school	1	2	3	4	5
64. test/diagnose student abilities	1	2	3	4	5
65. provide teachers with student assessment results and discuss implications for instruction	1	2	3	4	5
66. collaborate with teachers to develop assessments	1	2	3	4	5
67. assist teachers in learning how to administer and/or interpret assessments	1	2	3	4	5
68. work to coordinate school assessment with district or state standards	1	2	3	4	5
69. fulfill other district or state assessment responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
70. administer standardized tests	1	2	3	4	5
71. analyze test data	1	2	3	4	5

72. Approximately how many times a month do you work with faculty from the following departments?

English/Language Arts	Technology/Home Economics (TLC)
Social studies	Special ED
Science	Guidance
Math	PE
Art/Music	Other: (please specify

Administrator Survey

Please complete each item as completely as you can. This information will assist the researcher in preparing as thorough a case study as possible on the role of the literacy coordinators in the Foothill School District.

Circle the appropriate answer:

1. Gender: Male Female

2. Ethnicity:

American Indian or Alaska Native Pacific Islander
Asian White
Black or African American Other
Hispanic/Latino

3. In which type of school do you work? Middle Senior High

4. How many years have you worked as a principal?

1-2 3-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21+

5. Did you teach before becoming a principal and if so, for how many years?

No 1-2 3-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21+
In what grade?

6. Have you been a literacy coordinator? If so, for how many years? At what level?

No 1-2 3-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21+

At elementary school level _____
At secondary school level _____

Please complete:

7. What degrees do you hold?

	Field/Specialization	Year Earned	Institution
BA	_____	_____	_____
BS	_____	_____	_____
MA	_____	_____	_____
MS	_____	_____	_____
M.Ed	_____	_____	_____
EdD	_____	_____	_____
PhD	_____	_____	_____

Other (please specify)

8. In addition to a degree in literacy or other content area, what literacy training have you had?

	When Taken	Sponsoring Institution
Reading certificate	_____	_____
Reading endorsement	_____	_____
District training	_____	_____
Wilheim Cohort	_____	_____
School inservice	_____	_____
Summer institute	_____	_____
College courses (approx. how many?)		
Undergraduate _____	Graduate _____	
Other (please specify)		

9. How many times in the last 2 years have you:

	in your content area (administration)	on literacy issue
Taken a university course	_____	_____
Attended a state/national/international		
conference or workshop	_____	_____
Attended a district or school		
endorsement class	_____	_____
professional workshop/inservice	_____	_____
institute	_____	_____
conference	_____	_____
Read journals/professional material	_____	_____
Other (please specify):	_____	_____

Please circle the number that describes your position regarding each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
As a principal, I:					
10. believe a school-wide reading program is beneficial	1	2	3	4	5
11. have a literacy plan and am working towards implementing it	1	2	3	4	5
12. play an important role in improving student literacy	1	2	3	4	5
13. observe the literacy coordinator at work and provide feedback	1	2	3	4	5
14. give the literacy coordinator autonomy to make decisions about how to use time	1	2	3	4	5
15. provide the resources the literacy coordinator requests (money, materials, time, opportunity, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
16. do not request that the literacy coordinator participate in extracurricular activities	1	2	3	4	5
17. actively discuss literacy issues and encourage attendance at professional conferences, institutes, etc. with faculty members	1	2	3	4	5
18. have the literacy coordinator present literacy inservice to the faculty	1	2	3	4	5
19. refer to the literacy coordinator for information about current literacy research	1	2	3	4	5
20. think the literacy coordinator has a well-defined and enacted program	1	2	3	4	5
21. think the literacy coordinator interacts well with all kinds of faculty	1	2	3	4	5
22. believe the literacy coordinator lacks content-area expertise which restricts the effectiveness of her/his recommendations	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
The teachers in my school:					
23. know of the availability and expertise of the literacy coordinator	1	2	3	4	5
24. go to the literacy coordinator with questions and concerns about literacy	1	2	3	4	5
25. are willing to learn about literacy	1	2	3	4	5
26. are willing to implement literacy techniques into their lessons	1	2	3	4	5
27. feel that literacy issues are not their responsibility	1	2	3	4	5
28. are under a great deal of pressure to meet curriculum demands	1	2	3	4	5
29. see no relation between literacy issues and their content-area subjects	1	2	3	4	5
30. would do more with literacy issues if they felt better prepared to do so	1	2	3	4	5
31. feel that a literacy coordinator lacks content-area expertise which restricts the effectiveness of their recommendations	1	2	3	4	5
The district:					
32. emphasizes literacy development	1	2	3	4	5
33. has a variety of resources to help with literacy issues	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
A literacy coordinator works with:					
34. native English speaking struggling readers to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
35. English language learners to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
36. on level readers to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
37. honor/gifted students to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
38. students in content classes with teachers' collaboration	1	2	3	4	5
39. students in a pullout program	1	2	3	4	5
A literacy coordinator:					
40. is a valuable resource at the secondary school level	1	2	3	4	5
41. teaches only literacy related skills	1	2	3	4	5
42. teaches content area subject/s in which literacy instruction is integrated	1	2	3	4	5
43. works with individual teachers (plan, model, follow up, etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction	1	2	3	4	5
44. works with $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ year teachers to strengthen their literacy instruction	1	2	3	4	5
45. works with small groups of teachers (grade level, team unit, department etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction	1	2	3	4	5
46. conducts professional development for faculty	1	2	3	4	5
47. initiates casual or spontaneous conversations related to literacy issues with faculty	1	2	3	4	5
48. finds and provides materials for teachers	1	2	3	4	5
49. develops curriculum	1	2	3	4	5
50. builds good home school community connections (answer questions, speak to groups, facilitate effective parent teacher relationships etc)	1	2	3	4	5
51. fulfills administration responsibilities regarding literacy	1	2	3	4	5
52. fulfills administration responsibilities tied to school issues not dealing with literacy (subbing, discipline, extracurricular activities, etc)	1	2	3	4	5
53. provides instructional guidance to aides, peer tutors, paraprofessionals who work in the classroom to help teachers meet student needs	1	2	3	4	5
54. plans and collaborates with faculty and staff to implement a school-wide quality reading program	1	2	3	4	5
55. researches ways to improve literacy within the school	1	2	3	4	5
56. tests/diagnoses student abilities	1	2	3	4	5
57. provides teachers with student assessment results and discusses implications for instruction	1	2	3	4	5
58. collaborates with teachers to develop assessments	1	2	3	4	5
59. assists teachers in learning how to administer and/or interpret assessments	1	2	3	4	5
60. works to coordinate school assessment with district or state standards	1	2	3	4	5
61. fulfills other district or state assessment responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
62. administers standardized tests	1	2	3	4	5
63. analyzes test data	1	2	3	4	5

Please use the reverse side of this sheet to make any suggestions/comments you have about the perceptions and/or roles of the literacy coordinator in your school. Thank you very much for your participation.

Faculty Member Survey

Please answer each item as completely as you can. This information will assist the researcher in preparing as thorough a case study as possible on the role of the literacy coordinators in the Foothill School District.

Circle the appropriate answer:

1. Gender: Male Female

2. Ethnicity:

American Indian or Alaska Native
Asian
Black or African American
Hispanic/Latino
Pacific Islander
White
Other

3. In which type of school do you work? Middle Senior

4. With what grade or grade ranges do you work? 7 8 9 10 11 12

5. Of which department are you a member?

English/Language Arts
Social studies
Science
Math
Art/Music
PE
Technology
Special Ed
Guidance
Other (please specify)

6. a. How many years have you been a classroom teacher?

1-2 3-5 6-10 11 – 15 16-20 21+

b. How many years have you been a counselor?

1-2 3-5 6-10 11 – 15 16-20 21+

c. Other types of experience and years in public schools not listed above?

Please complete:

7. What degrees do you hold?

	Field/Specialization	Year Earned	Institution
BA	_____	_____	_____
BS	_____	_____	_____
MA	_____	_____	_____
MS	_____	_____	_____
M.Ed	_____	_____	_____
EdD	_____	_____	_____
PhD	_____	_____	_____

Other (please specify)

8. In addition to a degree in literacy or other content area, what literacy training have you had?

	When Taken	Sponsoring Institution
Reading certificate	_____	_____
Reading endorsement	_____	_____
District training	_____	_____
Wilheim Cohort	_____	_____
School inservice	_____	_____
Summer institute	_____	_____

College courses (approx. how many?)

Undergraduate _____ Graduate _____

Other (please specify)

9. How many times in the last 2 years have you:

	in your content area	on literacy issues
Taken a university course	_____	_____
Attended a		
state/national/international	_____	_____
conference	_____	_____
professional workshop	_____	_____
Attended a district or school		
endorsement class	_____	_____
professional workshop	_____	_____
institute	_____	_____
conference	_____	_____
Read journals/professional material	_____	_____
Other (please specify):	_____	_____

10. List what you consider to be the three most important responsibilities of a secondary literacy specialist . (One being the most important.)

Please circle the number that indicates your position regarding each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
As a teacher, I:					
11. have access to a literacy coordinator in my school	1	2	3	4	5
12. am interested in learning about literacy	1	2	3	4	5
13. implement literacy techniques in my teaching	1	2	3	4	5
14. feel that literacy issues are not my responsibility	1	2	3	4	5
15. am under a great deal of pressure to meet curriculum demands at my school	1	2	3	4	5
16. see little or no relation between literacy issues and my content-area teaching	1	2	3	4	5
17. would do more with literacy instruction if I felt better prepared to teach it	1	2	3	4	5
18. think that the literacy coordinator lacks content area expertise which restricts the effectiveness of her suggestions	1	2	3	4	5
19. think a school wide program to increase literacy would be beneficial	1	2	3	4	5
20. am satisfied with the reading abilities of my students	1	2	3	4	5
21. am satisfied with the writing abilities of my students	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
My principal:					
22. believes a school wide reading program is beneficial	1	2	3	4	5
23. has a literacy plan and is working towards implementing it	1	2	3	4	5
24. actively discusses literacy and encourages attendance at professional conferences, institutes, etc. with faculty members	1	2	3	4	5
25. plays an important role in improving student literacy	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
A literacy coordinator works with:					
26. native English speaking struggling readers to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
27. English language learners to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
28. on level readers to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
29. honor/gifted students to build literacy skills	1	2	3	4	5
30. students in content classes with teachers' collaboration	1	2	3	4	5
31. students in a pullout program	1	2	3	4	5
A literacy coordinator:					
32. is a valuable resource at the secondary school level	1	2	3	4	5
33. teaches only literacy related skills	1	2	3	4	5
34. teaches content area subject/s in which literacy instruction is integrated	1	2	3	4	5
35. works with individual teachers (plan, model, follow up, etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction	1	2	3	4	5
36. works with 1st/2nd year teachers to strengthen their literacy instruction	1	2	3	4	5
37. works with small groups of teachers (grade level, team unit, department etc.) to strengthen literacy instruction	1	2	3	4	5
38. conducts professional development for faculty	1	2	3	4	5
39. initiates casual or spontaneous conversations related to literacy issues with faculty	1	2	3	4	5
40. finds and provides materials for teachers	1	2	3	4	5
41. develops curriculum	1	2	3	4	5
42. builds good home school community connections (answer questions, speak to groups, facilitate effective parent teacher relationships etc)	1	2	3	4	5
43. fulfills administration responsibilities regarding literacy	1	2	3	4	5
44. fulfills administration responsibilities tied to school issues not dealing with literacy (subbing, discipline, extracurricular activities, etc)	1	2	3	4	5
45. provides instructional guidance to aides, peer tutors, paraprofessionals who work in the classroom to help teachers meet student needs	1	2	3	4	5
46. plans and collaborates with faculty and staff to implement a school-wide quality reading program	1	2	3	4	5
47. researches ways to improve literacy within the school	1	2	3	4	5
48. tests/diagnoses student abilities	1	2	3	4	5
49. provides teachers with student assessment results and discusses implications for instruction	1	2	3	4	5
50. collaborates with teachers to develop assessments	1	2	3	4	5
51. assists teachers in learning how to administer and/or interpret assessments	1	2	3	4	5
52. works to coordinate school assessment with district or state standards	1	2	3	4	5
53. fulfills other district or state assessment responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
54. administers standardized tests	1	2	3	4	5
55. analyzes test data	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C

Principal Cover Letter

Dear Faculty,
My name is Linda Frost and I'm a doctoral student at BYU. I'm currently working in conjunction with Foothill School District to research the role of the literacy coordinator (LC) in each of the five secondary schools in the district. The district administration intends to use this information to help them examine the effective use of school personnel in fostering greater student literacy in the district's secondary schools.

In order to get your particular perspective on the role and responsibilities of the LC, I'm requesting that you please respond to an electronic survey. You can reach it by clicking on the provided link: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=463521803031

The survey is no more than 15-20 minutes long and you will be providing unique and essential information. Your individual identity and responses will be kept confidential. Only I will have access to the surveys and once the results are compiled and written up in a holistic form, the surveys will be destroyed. I would appreciate your completing the survey by Friday, March 3.

If you should have any questions or want more information, please email me at frostlinda@yahoo.com or call **422-4974**. Also, please be sure and contact me should you encounter some problem taking the survey.

I know teacher time is always at a premium and greatly appreciate your willingness to share your opinions with me. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Linda Frost

Appendix D

Daily and Weekly Task Logs

Daily Task Log

Please check all tasks below that you carry out during the course of your day as a literacy coordinator. If you perform the same task more than once in a day, please check it the corresponding number of times. If you perform a task that is not on the list, please write it in under "Other" and check it as often as performed.

Instruction

_____ work with native English speaking struggling readers to build literacy skills
_____ work with English language learners to build reading skills
_____ work with on level readers to build literacy skills
_____ work with honor/gifted students to build literacy skills
_____ work with students in a content-area classroom with that teacher's collaboration
_____ work with students in a pullout program
_____ teach only literacy related skills
_____ teach content area subject/s in which literacy instruction is integrated
_____ plan and/or prepare for instruction

Leadership

_____ work with individual teachers (plan, model, follow up, etc.) to strengthen their literacy instruction
_____ work with 1st/2nd year teachers (plan, model, follow up, etc.) to strengthen their literacy instruction
_____ work with small groups of teachers (grade level, team unit, department etc.) to strengthen their literacy instruction
_____ conduct professional literacy development for faculty
_____ initiate casual or spontaneous conversations related to literacy issues with faculty
_____ find and provide materials for teachers
_____ develop curriculum
_____ build good home school community connections (answer questions, speak to groups, facilitate effective parent teacher relationships etc)
_____ fulfill administration responsibilities regarding literacy
_____ fulfill administration responsibilities tied to school issues not dealing with literacy (subbing, discipline, extracurricular activities, etc)
_____ provide instructional guidance to aides, peer tutors, paraprofessionals who work in the classroom to help teachers meet student needs
_____ plan/collaborate with faculty and staff to implement a quality school-wide reading prog.
_____ research ways to improve literacy within the school

Diagnosis/Assessment

_____ test/diagnose student abilities
_____ provide teachers with result of student assessments and discuss implications for instructions
_____ collaborate with teachers in developing assessment tools
_____ assist teachers in learning how to administer or interpret assessment results
_____ work to coordinate school assessment with district or state standards
_____ fulfill other district or state responsibilities regarding assessment
_____ administer standardized tests
_____ analyze test data

Other:

Weekly Reflective Log

Please write briefly about one experience or activity you had this week carrying out your duties as a literacy coordinator that you were not satisfied with, why, and what you discovered. Also, briefly describe an experience that you felt went well, why, and what you discovered.

Appendix E

Interview Questions

Possible Interview Questions

(Others may be generated after considering raw data)

Literacy Coordinator

Interview #1

1. Do you have a job description? If so, what is it?
2. Does your job description match your personal definition of the role of the literacy coordinator? How so?
3. What do you view as being most important in your job? What are your three most important roles you have?
4. What specific preparation have you been given for this job?
5. What's your plan of attack as a literacy coordinator? What do you plan to do first? Next?
6. What are your greatest concerns?
7. What are your strengths as a literacy coordinator?
8. Why did you become a literacy coordinator?
9. How did you come to know how to be a literacy coordinator?

Interview #2

1. The International Reading Association (IRA) defines three role descriptions for the literacy coordinator: leadership, instruction, diagnosis and assessment. Which of these three takes most of your time? Which of the three is most needed in your school? Why?
2. Who do you work with? How do you decide whom you'll work with?
3. What facilitates your role? Hinders your role?
4. Are there any discrepancies between what you do and what you would like to do? If so, what?
5. What recommendations would you make to the principal concerning your job/

Interview #3

1. What kinds of tasks do you mainly do?
2. What tasks, if any, do you assume that take you away from literacy issues?
3. What kind of response are you getting from teachers? What are they most interested in?
4. What kind of support do you get from the administration?
5. What are your biggest challenges? Rewards?

Interview #4

1. How do you feel the first semester went as a literacy coordinator?
2. What kind of additional professional development, if any, would you like to have had or have?
3. How have your ideas/beliefs about being a literacy coordinator changed over the semester?
4. If you could make changes so that you could be more effective, what changes would you make?
5. What have you most enjoyed in your role this semester?

Faculty Member Focus Group

1. What connections, if any, do you see between literacy and your content area?
2. With whom do literacy coordinators primarily work? Why?
3. How do you view the role of the literacy coordinator?
4. Why do you approach or not approach the literacy coordinator regarding the literacy needs of your students?
5. How do you regard literacy inservice? Have you had any? What kind? Was it or was it not beneficial? Why?

Administrators

1. How is the literacy coordinator funded? Why only part time?
2. What percentage of students is reading on or above level?
3. What is your school's greatest literacy issue?
4. What kind of districts support or emphasis is there on literacy?
5. Are there any policies or legislation that effect decisions you make regarding literacy issues?
6. What is your view of literacy and how do you tie it to the school? What are your literacy goals? How do you encourage teachers to work towards literacy?
7. How do teachers respond to literacy opportunities, i.e., inservice, conferences, etc.
8. What is the role of the literacy coordinator in the school?
9. Are there faculty members who actively work to integrate literacy techniques into their teaching? Who? Do they influence others? How?