LITERACY COACH:
A SELF-STUDY OF THE COMPLEXITIES OF
COACHING FROM A DISCURSIVE, INTERACTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

by

Laura Schon Schiller

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Educational Studies)
in The University of Michigan
2011

Doctoral Committee:

    Professor Lesley A. Rex, Chair
    Professor Deborah Keller-Cohen
    Professor Annemarie S. Palincsar
    Professor Mary J. Schleppegrell
    Associate Professor Donald Freeman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iv

LIST OF TABLES

LIST of APPENDICES

CHAPTER I
RE-VISIONING LITERACY COACHING

INTRODUCTION

We know very little about the content, purpose, or focus of the coach; in large-scale studies that investigate coaching, there is little in-depth explanation of the foci of coach conversations, observations, or modeling (Bean, Draper, Hall, Vandermolen, & Zigmond, 2010, p. 90).

Literacy coaching is an under researched, widespread, recent phenomenon that leaves coaches and researchers with many unanswered questions. This study attempts to address questions that may be of use to both groups by investigating coaching as a complex social, discursive, and situated phenomena. It does so by conducting micro-analyses of discursive interactions between a literacy coach and two teachers. Though tightly focused, this investigation is situated within broader, influential societal discourses and is designed to contribute to current conversations among researchers and practitioners. In this chapter, I will explain why literacy coaching is worthy of investigation, highlighting those elements from research and practice that implicate my choice of study design. I will portray the issues surrounding teacher/coach interaction in three ways. First, I will situate literacy coaching as a global policy situation unique to this time in American educational history. Second, I will address literacy coaching as a personal, professional problem that I experienced when moving from the position of teacher to the position of literacy coach. Third, I will foreshadow the research on literacy coaching found in the Literature Review in Chapter II to illustrate the problems addressed

in the coaching research and to identify those problems relevant to this study in need of further research.

The National Policy Context

To understand why I chose to investigate literacy coaching, it is useful to consider the national policy context that dramatically impacted the rise of job-embedded professional teacher learning, particularly literacy coaching. In 2001, in an effort to ameliorate the problems faced by public schools, particularly low-income, urban, minority-majority schools, the federal government reauthorized funding for elementary and secondary education. Known as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the school funding reauthorization created an unprecedented role for the federal government. For the first time, the federal government's reach in education extended directly into the classroom. Through competitive funding grants, the government stipulated what would be taught in early elementary classrooms, with what materials, for how long, and in what ways. To improve the quality of classroom teaching, literacy coaching was funded through Reading First grants awarded to some of the nation's most challenged schools. The result was the rapid spread of literacy coaching across the country.

Before research could catch up to the growing coaching phenomena, coaching K-12 became a preferred professional development approach to improving instruction and ultimately student achievement as measured by test scores. The pressure for raising test scores is both national and global as the United States seeks to enhance its competitive edge in the world. Driven by this context of global competition, forty-three states have officially adopted new Common Core State Standards designed to address the achievement gap from high school to college. Simultaneously, the federal government

has awarded hundreds of millions of dollars for the development, implementation, and research of national tests in math and English language arts. Meanwhile, increasing numbers of failing schools continue to face drastic sanctions including reconstitution or closure and school districts around the country are faced with fiscal uncertainty, the result of a prolonged recession and political decisions related to funding for education.

These are difficult times for educators trying to figure out the most cost effective ways to raise test scores and teacher competence, seen as the key to higher student achievement. It is in this context of state standards for global competitiveness, issues of educational equity, and teacher learning through professional development, that I situate my self-study of literacy coaching. Is literacy coaching a viable approach to improving student achievement? Is it possible to improve the effectiveness of literacy coaching? In the field, answers to these questions and others about literacy coaching are couched in a sense of urgency to meet the demands of higher standards and new tests.

Problematizing Literacy Coaching from a Personal, Professional Perspective

Beyond situating literacy coaching in national and global contexts, another way to approach issues surrounding coaching is to interrogate my own historical experiences with coaching, first as a teacher, then as a teacher mentor and co-learner, and finally, as a district literacy coach. The personal narrative that follows provides a landscape of problems related to literacy coaching from a practitioner's point of view. Over a period of years, my work role gradually shifted from that of classroom teacher to literacy coach. With changes in my job description came changes in my perspective on coaching as well. These changes were shaped by seminal events in my professional experience as well as

formal role changes. I share them here to ground my inquiry into literacy coaching in real world experiences and to lay the foundation for questions that informed my study.

As a classroom teacher, I was influenced by the National Writing Project. Common classroom practices included building a community of learners, immersing students in quality literature as models for both reading and writing, providing students with authentic reasons to write and publish for an audience beyond the teacher, and maintaining a classroom library where students could choose trade books to read. Student choice of topics and texts within parameters increased motivation and the amount that students read. I viewed myself as a teacher researcher, someone who documents her practice in order to share with others. Whole class publications were one way I collected evidence of student and teacher growth over time. Over successive years, the literary quality of the whole class publications improved demonstrably and encouraged me to become increasingly conscious of my intentional growth as a teacher. The more I learned, the more my students could accomplish. Strategically, I documented student learning and teacher learning to share with a wider audience.

Therefore, when I removed the reading textbooks from my classroom and replaced them with young adult novels, classic and contemporary, I was visibly upset when my principal berated my decision. He argued that all the other teachers were teaching with anthologies and parents would not understand if I taught differently from my colleagues. Tears and negotiation led to a compromise. If I would agree to teach my colleagues how to instruct from trade books and if they would adopt the practices I found so successful, then I could continue to follow the best practices I learned through the National Writing Project.

The problem was that I knew how to be an effective teacher but I did not know

how to sway colleagues to my way of approaching teaching and learning. At the time, I

taught sixth grade students. My seventh and eighth grade colleagues assumed that my

literacy practices applied only to younger children. There seemed to be an unofficial

hierarchy in the school based on the grade one taught. Information and expectations

filtered down from the higher grades, not up from the lower grades. How could I

influence my upper grades colleagues?

Another dilemma I confronted when trying to influence my colleagues to adopt

more authentic literacy practices was that I could describe the actions I was taking in my

classroom but not the principles behind those actions. At that time, I had not read enough

or written enough to be able to articulate the theory behind my literacy decisions. Based

on student achievement and parent approval something effective was occurring in my

classroom, but I found it challenging to explain why I was doing what I was doing so

another teacher could adapt the practices to her style of teaching, her students, or her

interpretation of effective instruction. My classroom decisions could not transfer whole

cloth to another teacher and I did not know how to explain my learning. Further, I had

difficulty understanding why, given the successful teaching of so many National Writing

Project teachers, my colleagues were reluctant to re-imagine their practice? Why couldn't

I get more teachers to realize the benefits of current literacy practices?

As a classroom teacher I had no authority to tell teachers what to do. Some

teachers chose to remain distant and closed their doors to me. Others were interested in

learning more and together we formed volunteer study groups. We read professional

books and shared artifacts of practice. However, when the district curriculum director

asked how to approach teacher learning systemically throughout the district, we were at a loss for answers. The teachers who wanted to learn improved their practice but the majority of teachers were not involved with our study groups and the district did not embrace a culture of learning. How does a school or district create a climate conducive to professional improvement? What should be done for those teachers who express disinterest in learning with colleagues?

Dissatisfied with current district professional learning opportunities, I chose to leave the classroom and become a district literacy coach, hoping that I could have greater influence on teacher practice resulting from a formal role shift. I had been a successful teacher who had coaching-like experiences. I assumed I was prepared for the role. However, nothing in my previous classroom or volunteer mentoring or collegial learning experiences could have prepared me for the reactions of principals and staff when it came to building a common district language for literacy practices or creating professional learning opportunities for teachers. I was unprepared for so many disparate views on what constituted effective teaching and learning. I was also unprepared for the vitriol directed at me personally that accompanied views of practice that seemed outdated to me. Why were so many teachers skeptical of research? Why did teachers and administrators hold on to practices that appeared to limit student learning? Why was I trusted by some teachers and distrusted by others? It was one thing to coach teachers when their participation was voluntary and I was one among equals. It was quite another experience to coach from a district position where my words and actions seemed to threaten the teachers I most wanted to reach.

Adding to the complications of literacy coaching were differences across race, culture, and class. At the time, the district was proactively hiring African American teachers to relate to and reflect the increasing numbers of African American students entering the schools. Stories of inadequate schooling in the South, racism, and urban inequities surfaced. Could a white teacher teach African American students? Could a white district literacy coach be trusted to represent the diverse views of a changing student and teacher population? What did I as literacy coach need to understand in order to collaborate with teachers whose backgrounds, beliefs, and world views appeared so different from my own? We could relate to one another as teachers working with similar students in the same district, but our views of what constituted teaching and learning were diverse. It was as though we were out of sync with one another with little hope of ever seeing things eye to eye.

Despite the challenges, there were successes. I facilitated teacher research groups across the district and built relationships with teachers K-12. I modeled in some classrooms and there were teachers who changed their practice as a result of my coaching. But I was challenged to find ways to reach more teachers and to bridge what seemed to be insurmountable differences. Faced with the difficulties of coaching adult learners, particularly those who did not agree with my views of literacy practice, I celebrated my successes and puzzled over the problems.

Research on Literacy Coaching

As literacy coaching has proliferated across the country, research has gradually increased. In September, 2010, the Elementary School Journal devoted an issue to research on coaching. In the introduction to that volume, Misty Sailors and Nancy

Shanklin laid out their rationale. They linked the imperative for academic achievement with social equity, then argued that the way to ensure learning is through effective teachers who are in short supply in high needs schools. To improve the quality of teaching, they turned to research on the effectiveness of professional development (PD) and coaching as one way to provide professional development promoted in pending federal legislation and competitive funding grants, i.e., Race-to-the-Top. They concluded, "While…the role of coaches…regarding student data analysis and improved teacher instruction have yet to be determined, the studies in this issue clarify that coaching is a viable and effective form of professional development for teachers, and…warrants further study (Sailors & Shanklin, 2010, p. 6).

Answers to my questions of coaching practice are just beginning to be addressed in the research literature. However, most studies have adopted a bird's eye view of literacy coaching by asking questions such as: Who are coaches? What do they do? Is there a link between student achievement test scores and coaching? As the literature remains scant, only a few studies addressed the kinds of issues raised in my experiences as a literacy coach. How does a coach work with teachers whose views of teaching and learning differ from those of the coach? What happens during teacher/coach interactions that result in successful coaching encounters? What do coaches need to know when they talk with teachers? How can a coach prepare for the difficulties s/he is likely to face when working with a wide range of teachers? A few studies have begun to investigate teacher/coach interactions. One found that peer coaches were unaware of their use of negative language during coaching (Perkins, 1998). Another found that coaches who adopted a "telling" style of discourse limited teacher participation and learning (Nowak,

2003). A third study investigated the use of power between teachers and coaches and argued that all coaching is situated and co-constructed through language (Rainville, 2007). While these studies begin to address some of the issues that confronted me as a literacy coach, all three researchers agreed that further study is needed in order to better understand the nature of teacher/coach interactions.

LITERACY COACHING

Literacy coaching has emerged as a key component of school reform, albeit an under-researched component, (Dole, 2004; Walpole & Blamey, 2008) and an important asset for improving student achievement (Coggins, Stoddard, & Cutler, 2003; McKenna & Walpole, 2008; Symonds, 2003; Toll, 2007; Wayne, Yoon, Zhu, Cronen, & Garet, 2008). Referred to as, "a cottage industry," (Hall, 2004, p. 3) literacy coaching has recently been adopted by schools and districts in a variety of ways, all intended to improve teaching and learning through sustained, job embedded, staff development. While definitions of literacy coaches are often determined by local context, one constant in these school improvement efforts is the need to work side by side with teachers in and out of the classroom for the purpose of improving teaching and learning. No matter the geographical location or magnitude, those who describe, evaluate or attempt to improve coaching so as to improve teaching practice and student achievement invariably look to what occurs between coaches and teachers. Implicit in this focus is the assumption that coaching is definable as the interaction between the coach and the coachee. Also implied is the central role of the talk in these interactions, and of the importance of understanding the role played by social factors in this discursive, interpersonal relationship. Beyond studies from a cognitive perspective that focus on coaching and learning as individual

states of improvement are calls for studies that examine coaching and learning as a dynamic interplay of social relationship, cultural norms and personal investment.

Research in response to these calls, though emergent, has applied a variety of perspectives and methods for analyzing salient coaching discourse. Under the heading of discourse analysis approaches, the relative newness and uniqueness of these applications raises the question of their usefulness in contributing to worthwhile understandings of coaching—for the coach as well as the researcher. Is there benefit to discursively analyzing interactions between coaches and teachers? If so, which theories and methods might produce trustworthy research that also contributes to practice? This seminal question begs several fundamental questions: What is the work of a literacy coach and what does a literacy coach need to know and do to perform the job?

What is the Work of Coaching?

The rapid rise of literacy coaching has been attributed to the accountability measures of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) as well as the pressure schools feel to raise student achievement (Toll, 2007). Coaching was built into the NCLB act itself. The federal stamp of approval backed by funds brought literacy coaching to states across the U.S. in an effort to improve student learning. Raising student achievement is repeatedly linked to teacher knowledge and research on staff development widely recognizes the need for ongoing teacher learning, particularly when that learning is job embedded (Darling-Hammond, Wei Chung, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009; Wayne, et al., 2008). Embedding teacher learning in the context of practice supports teachers as they apply new learning to the particularities of their classrooms (Croft, Coggshall, Dolan, Powers, & Killion, 2010). Knowledge about the benefits of sustained teacher learning,

particularly when it is directly connected to teacher practice, together with the boost

given to coaching by the federal government, have led to a plethora of literacy coaching

instantiations.

In a recent International Reading Association (IRA) survey, titles for school

coaching positions ranged from "reading coach" or "literacy coach" to "collaborative

professional development teacher." Other titles of educators fulfilling coaching roles

included, "specialist, facilitator, coordinator, teacher consultant, implementer, and leader"

(Roller, 2006). In an effort to clarify the role, the International Reading Association

published the following definition.

> **A reading coach or a literacy coach** is a reading specialist who
> focuses on providing professional development for teachers by providing
> them with the additional support needed to implement various
> instructional programs and practices. They provide essential leadership for
> the school's entire literacy program by helping create and supervise a
> long-term staff development process that supports both the development
> and implementation of the literacy program over months and years
> (International Reading Association, 2007).

Despite the IRA's definition of a literacy coach, intended to clarify the profusion

of roles, responsibilities, and titles that abound, the notion of a literacy coach is still so

new to schools, local context often determines how and to whom the label, literacy coach,

is applied. What to call those who deliver, facilitate, teach, or coach staff development is

hard to pin down, as is naming the work of a literacy coach. What a literacy coach does is

dependent on a variety of factors, including how the role is defined given the local

context, the often invisible or unacknowledged ideologies underlying a particular

instantiation of literacy coaching, and the model or type of coaching adopted.

The Work of Literacy Coaching Varies

Coaching is described in numerous ways. But overarching all the descriptions is the notion that coaching is directly linked to classroom practice. David Allen, Patrice Nichols et al.(2004) distinguish between traditional forms of coaching, such as mentoring or training, and conceptions of coaching as inquiry, where coaching is "collaborative, sustained, connected to and derived from teachers' work with their students, and tied explicitly to improving practice" (Neufeld & Roper, 2003, p. 3).[1] In this model, coaches are "collegial supports rather than direct instructors" (p.3). According to the NSDC[2] report on professional development (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2009) coaches should be accomplished colleagues able to model in classrooms and provide specific observations and critique over time. In some contexts, schools are interested in using literacy coaches to foster particular pedagogies (Poglinco et al., 2003) around reading or writing. Others view literacy coaching as a form of job embedded professional development where coaches "serve as change agents to make a school wide impact on the literacy program by being a resource to teachers, modeling lessons, and conducting professional development" (Shaw, 2007). Some describe literacy coaches as more than reading teachers, whose work might focus on demonstrating specific skills or strategies for teachers to implement. In their view, the work of a literacy coach is seen as, "work[ing] with a teacher to shift understandings" (Buly, Coskie, Robinson, & Egawa, 2006). Shifting understandings occurs through structured conversations where a coach helps "the

---

[1] Neufeld and Roper (2003) note that coaching does not replace other models of professional development. I agree that there is a place for a variety of approaches to teacher learning depending on the situation. Summer institutes, coursework, workshops, large group meetings, study groups, and action research among other forms of professional development, are also valuable sites for teacher learning.
[2] National Staff Development Council

teacher think critically about his or her instructional practice. When this reflective dialogue is free of judgment, teachers are more likely to make real and lasting changes in their practice, which should ultimately benefit their students," (2006, p. 25). These descriptions are important because how the role of a coach is viewed influences the nature of the work.

To complicate matters further, different descriptions and enactments of coaching reflect different ideologies, with implications for how the work of coaching is carried out (Toll, 2007). Whether the coach is perceived as an instrument of district policies, enforcing mandated reforms, or whether a coach is perceived as a colleague who is present as a resource and a support for effective teaching has import for the interactions that ensue between a teacher and a coach. If a coach is seen as a colleague able to assist a peer's learning, then the admonition that coaches need to be able to build and sustain trust and affirm teacher strengths while nudging teachers to improve instruction (Dole, 2004; Tatum, 2004) follows logically. However, building trust and encouraging instructional growth may be less of a needed skill set if a coach has been hired to enforce an accountability measure. In each case, how the coach interacts with the teacher will vary, dependent in part, on the ideology behind the job description.

Despite the multiplicity of coaching descriptions, pinning down what most literacy coaches actually do may be illustrated by comparing two divergent examples from researchers who have experience working with coaches. The work of Cathy Toll (2007) will be contrasted with the work on literacy coaching from Michael McKenna and Sharon Walpole (2008). By examining their similarities across differences, the core work of a literacy coach as it relates to the present study, will gain clarity.

According to Toll (2007) the work of a literacy coach is predicated on three functions: intervening, leading, and partnering. Both intervening and partnering are relevant to this study as they involve working with teachers to improve practice. The leading role, as Toll describes it, involves administrative collaboration. When intervening, a literacy coach will remediate a teacher's instruction by observing, analyzing the observation, communicating with those involved, learning about approaches to remediate the problems, modeling in classrooms, and monitoring over time. Partnering differs from intervening because in partnering, the teacher sets the goals. The literacy coach becomes a careful listener who co-plans, demonstrates, and provides ongoing support toward teacher determined goals.

In contrast, two other experts on literacy coaching, Michael McKenna and Sharon Walpole (2008) take a different approach when examining the work of a literacy coach. They recognize the multiplicity of coaching models and argue that there are two kinds of coaches: change coaches and content coaches. Change coaches work with administrators on school reform issues that build capacity for addressing site-based needs. Content coaches work with teachers and address issues of instruction that will improve student learning. McKenna and Walpole differentiate among types of coaching: mentoring new teachers, cognitive coaching, peer coaching, subject-specific coaching, program specific coaching, and reform oriented coaching. Each type of coaching specifies the kind of work a literacy coach would undertake. Depending on the coaching type, the work can range from observing and reflecting on instruction to demonstrating strategies in the classroom to curriculum development to implementation and fidelity to an adopted reform program.

While these two examples imply diverse, challenging job descriptions for the work

of a literacy coach, there are similarities. Most literacy coaching models include building

teacher knowledge and selecting instructional approaches. Most include observation and

reflection. Above all, the constant across all models and coaching approaches is the need

to interact with teachers over time. The work of coaching is regarded as simple and as

complicated as extensive observing and talking with teachers about their practice.

What is Useful for a Coach to Know?

> Literacy coaches must begin with the characteristics of excellent classroom reading teachers. They must have taught in a classroom informed by deep knowledge of literacy development, assessment, instruction, and materials. That classroom-based excellence is not enough, though. Literacy coaches must have additional understanding of the needs of struggling students—the more focused skills of reading specialists. These reading specialists must be able to apply this knowledge to support classroom teachers and to assume instructional leadership roles. Finally, reading coaches (IRA, 2004) add an additional area of specialization to those encompassed by reading specialists; they understand how to work with adults, enacting the National Staff Development Council (NSDC, 2001) Standards for Staff Development (McKenna & Walpole, 2008, p. 3).

While this description of what a literacy coach must know and be able to do sets a

high bar for competence, it is incomplete if one considers the additional skill sets a coach

must have to work at the secondary level. A report on *Standards for Middle and High*

School Literacy Coaches (International Reading Association, 2006) sets up an ideal

description of what a secondary coach should know and be able to do. Literacy coaches at

the secondary level must be able to "assist content area teachers in addressing the reading

comprehension, writing, and communication skills that are particular to their

disciplines…promote instructional reform, improve staff's capacity to use data, as well

as…supporting content area teachers…with one-on-one demonstrations, observations,

debriefings and classroom follow-ups, and small-group learning of new content and

pedagogy" (p. 7). The detailed report sums up the skills a highly qualified candidate for literacy coach would have. "Given the many demands of the role, the best candidates are those who are skilled listeners, good questioners, accomplished problem solvers, and professionals who embody strong reflective capabilities and are able to develop trusting relationships with a variety of people" (p. 8).

Tucked into these lengthy competency descriptions is the caveat that working with adults is not the same as working with children. Most literacy coaches have exemplary classroom backgrounds. They may be able to model lessons for colleagues. They are also likely to know a great deal about literacy approaches. But in many instances, their prior experiences that qualify them for a coaching position may not include an understanding of adult learning theory or much experience working with adult learners. Teaching children is not the same as teaching adults, particularly teaching adults who are one's colleagues.

The development of a theory of adult learning is generally credited to Malcolm Knowles. He referred to adult learning as andragogy as opposed to pedagogy. The major difference is the independence of the learner with children being more dependent on their teacher and the adult, less teacher dependent and seeking choice in what and how s/he learns. Experiential knowledge and independence are two keys to adult learning. Throughout Knowles' work (Knowles, Holton III, & Swanson, 1998), some basic but flexible assumptions are said to be specific to adult learners given that learners are individuals and situations may influence how these principles display.

1) Adult learners need to know the "how, what, and why of learning" (p. 135). In practice, co-planning with an adult learner is often a result of this need. How ready an

adult is to learn is influenced by the need to know. Also at stake is adult motivation, learning outcomes, and the likelihood of applying the learning (p. 151).

2) Adult learners can be self-directed learners, meaning that they can teach themselves and that they can take ownership for their own learning goals.

3) Adult learners have the freedom to choose their learning.

4) "Adults' experience plays a major role in shaping their learning" (p. 139). Relying on experience is both good and bad for learning because prior experiences can bias learners or help them learn (1998)[3]. If we assume that teaching adults is different from teaching children, then we are faced with even more knowledge and skill that a coach must have in order to successfully work with teachers, which leads to the purpose of this study.

Given that coaching is such a complex and demanding role, what might increase the likelihood that coaches will be successful in their interactions with adults? Given that interaction is at the core of coaching, how do coaches construct dialogues that help teachers become smarter at what they want to do? If building trust and relationships are recognized essentials for coaches, how might that happen through teacher-coach interactions? It is one thing to admonish coaches to build trust and establish relationships. It is another to show them how. The tenor of these questions led me to discourse analysis as a lens through which to view coaching conversations and as an approach that literacy coaches can learn to use to strengthen their work with colleagues.

---

[3] A 2005 6th edition of Knowles' work addresses these core principles as well. I have decided to use the 5th edition, 1998. The 2005 edition does not add new material significant for the purposes of this study.

While I had been integrating discourse analysis approaches into my professional coaching for many years, in 2009 I deliberately set out to examine my own practice as a site for formal research. The remaining chapters provide an account of what that investigation produced.

THE STUDY

Rationale for Design: Why a Self-study?

I designed my study to understand the problems particular to coaching so as to suggest what to do about them. My focus on discerning resolutions for the unproductive complications and pitfalls of coaching began with two questions: How do teachers and coaches interact in ways that support their learning? How do coaches interact effectively with teachers who hold different views of learning? These questions reflect central issues in the coaching literature as well as my own key concerns from my experiences as a coach.

My choice of what to pinpoint as the phenomenon to research and the means for bringing it into focus emerged from my classroom teaching and staff development with teachers and study of discourse analysis and related ethnographic concepts. Primary concepts from these fields of study such as: language-in-use, frame clash and participant observation from the insider's perspective came together in my thinking to define the unit of analysis for this study: interactions between a literacy coach and teachers. In addition to pointing me toward what to study and how, these approaches aligned with the need to better understand through the lens of interaction the coach's role and actions when working with a teacher who would benefit from coaching. As few studies currently exist that address teacher/coach interactions, the "how" of coaching remains a mystery.

I concluded that a study of my own coaching offered unique benefits to resolve that mystery, which a study of someone else's coaching might not afford. I had already been introduced into self-study through teacher research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Fleischer, 1995; Hubbard & Power, 1999) and publishing about my own classroom (Schiller, 1993, 1996, 1997, 2001). I was already predisposed and socialized into being a teacher researcher. Why not be a coach researcher? While the convenience of this argument was tempting, other more powerful reasons led me to do a self-study. There is an interesting tension between being a coach and being a researcher. One of my research purposes was to understand what discourse analysis from a research perspective offers that discourse analysis from a coaching perspective may not. That is an understanding I could not access in the same way if I studied another coach. There is value-added to a study in which reflexivity makes it possible to account for actions that fall within a coach's domain and are informed by research and coaching actions that fall within a researcher's domain and are informed by coaching.

Another of my aims was to understand what a literacy coach with knowledge of discourse analysis can understand and accomplish during coaching. What discourse analytic understandings and methods does the coach apply and how are they taken up? What is practical and possible given the press of action, the immediacy of daily demands that mark school-based coaching? Because of my years of coaching, I have a sense of what is doable, what is possible to utilize in that context. Because of my years of study as a researcher, I understand the differences between the conceptual and methodological expectations in research and practice. I viewed this as an opportunity to be a boundary spanner, bridging the world of practice and research. What can a researcher lend to a

19

literacy coach and what can a literacy coach lend to a researcher about understanding the complications of a coach's work?

Rationale: Why These Two Teachers? Why This Setting?

In order to investigate the discursive interactions of a literacy coach and classroom teachers, I identified a school district willing to support the extended periods of time in the schools I required in order to gain an understanding of classroom practices. I selected two classroom teachers to provide a comparison and because the micro-analysis scale of the design made it impractical to study more than two teachers. In the future, there would be benefit to additional interactional studies in a range of contexts and with a variety of coaches and teachers.

The schools and teachers came from a struggling majority African-American district whose superintendent I knew would be supportive of this research. He selected the teachers, both of whom he deemed exemplary with students. However, much more was involved in my selection of site. My personal history includes years of living and teaching in a minority-majority school district. I experienced the demographic shift in culture from Caucasian to African American, both in the classroom, in the teaching staff, and at the administrative level. Overt and covert racism was a daily part of that context. I live in one of the most racially segregated areas of the country. The inequities of urban versus suburban schools are striking. My awareness of racial disparities in our educational system led me to conduct research in a district that was underserved, where teachers were less likely to have had numerous opportunities to grow professionally. My successful history as a consultant made me confident that discursive interactional theories and methodology would resonate for teachers in affluent districts where access to high

quality professional development was the norm. I was less confident that those same

discursive approaches would have benefit for teachers whose practice was not informed

by years of cutting edge professional development. In choosing these teachers I was

putting my coaching skill and the usefulness of discourse analysis to a rigorous test. I

reasoned that if interactional approaches made sense for underserved teachers, it was

likely to have relevance for many other teachers as well.

The Study Methodology

Traditionally, a literacy coach would observe a teacher, confer with the teacher

based on the observations, and then determine next steps or follow up to the coaching

conference. Based on this model, I theorized a coaching conference as comprised of three

stages: preparation for the coaching conference, the actual conference, and the post-

conference analysis. These stages formed the chronology of the study, which began with

an ethnographic approach to observing two teachers' summer school classrooms. For five

weeks, I videotaped and wrote field notes during their classes. This data initially led me

to determine the issues I would address in my coaching meetings with each teacher and

the video clips we would review together. The data also became part of the data I

analyzed for the study to explore my first set of questions: *How did I prepare for the*

coaching interaction? Why did I explore some classroom discourse episodes and not

others with a given teacher? How did I make such decisions? How did I determine which

discourse analysis approaches to share with teachers?

To answer these questions, I first conducted a thematic analysis of the field notes

followed by a content analysis of the field notes and the videotape data corpus. My axial

collapsing of these themes and topics led to a number of insights about preparing for

coaching that take into account potential miscommunication. At this stage, I am most concerned with analyzing how and why I decided which issues in their classroom practice to take to the teachers.

The recorded coaching conversations that followed provided the data for fine-grained discourse analysis of our interactions. I wanted to understand whether and, if so, *how the teachers' and I interacted to build understandings of their classroom practices.* I also wanted to understand whether and, if so, *how the teachers' and I utilized understandings of discourse analysis to study their classroom practice.* I followed the logic of dominance to select robust interactions from among the thousands available in the data. I selected interactions in which frame clashes were evident between myself and the teachers and utilized discourse analytic concepts such as positioning, politeness, status and alignment, with related methods, to analyze them.

In the last stage of data analysis, I reviewed my analyses of the coaching conference transcripts and additional interactions to gain insight into my effectiveness as a coach. *What discourse analytical tools did I use to analyze my coaching effectiveness? How were these discursive approaches productive lenses through which to view the data in retrospect?* At this stage, I was particularly interested in reanalyzing discrepant data and challenging prior assumptions. Through this process, I was able to informatively re-see the interactions in ways that I had not seen previously. This logic of inquiry raised heretofore unacknowledged issues related to literacy coaching and may set the stage for further research from interactional perspectives.

Educational Significance of the Study

Literacy coaching may remain a mystery for some time, but with this research I offer a potential avenue toward demystification. By placing the locus of analysis on the social interaction between a coach and a teacher, this study illustrates why coaching is so difficult and so often unsuccessful. Paralleling our more advanced understandings of the social complications of teaching, the study affirms that coaching is not as simple as telling or showing a teacher what to do. It also affirms the benefit of a view of coaching as a socially co-constructed phenomenon that varies in-the-moment through language-in-use and complicates what it means for coaches and teachers to be aware of discursive theories and methods. What coaches should know and be able to do as planners of coaching encounters and partners in coaching dialogues are also shown as more complicated than previously depicted. Tactical discursive decisions made during fleeting moments of interaction can derail prior strategic planning; and, even strategic planning can be off target. The illustrations of these circumstances provided in this study urge a more expansive conceptualization of what constitutes successful coaching.

This more elaborated conceptualization of coaching may offer coaches ways to analyze teacher/coach interactions that afford new understandings of what it means to build trust and relationships considered essential to effective coaching. It introduces and problematizes the concept of alignment, and it brings into question the notion of resistance so dominant in the coaching literature by reframing the problem as interactional rather than attitudinal. With discourse analysis as a tool for investigating fraught interactions—formerly viewed as resistance, it may be possible for coaches to unearth the concerns undermining efforts to move conversations forward. By illuminating

the usefulness of discourse analytical constructs, this study may contribute to more wide spread application. The results of this study are strong testimony that studying one's own coaching discourse has the power to improve one's discursive self-awareness. What is invisible during a conversation may be re-imagined once a coach is able to see the effects of her tactical discursive choices, choices she may never have recognized without analyzing her own talk.

ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation is organized into eight chapters. What follows is a brief synopsis of each chapter to guide readers through the literature, theory, methods, results, and discussion.

Chapter II Literacy Coaching: A Review of the Literature

This chapter addresses the current state of literacy coaching. The review investigates gaps in the literature, particularly around understanding how coaches build trust and relationships with teachers and deal with resistance. Further, the review addresses recent studies that take up discursive interactions.

Chapter III: Theoretical Framing

The theoretical framing chapter addresses the foundational discursive constructs that guided this study's epistemological approach. Key constructs include discourse analysis as applied to classroom interaction and power and politeness that circulate to position speakers and hearers in ways that construct professional cohesion.

Chapter IV: Methodology

From the study design to the site, participants, and data corpus, the logic of reasoning throughout the analysis is explored. This exploration includes the data selection process, analytical examples, and complications encountered.

Chapter V: Preparation for the Coaching Conference Results

This is the first of three chapters devoted to the results of the study. Each of the three chapters addresses the three stages of the coaching conference, the preplanning, the actual conference, and the retrospective analysis once the conference is completed. This chapter focuses on the coach's preparation for the conference. It demonstrates how the teachers were teaching before the coaching conference and how the coach decided to share that data with both teachers.

Chapter VI: During the Coaching Conference Results

Exploring the ways in which the coach and teachers interacted during the coaching conversations is the focus of this chapter. Ways in which fraught interactions are initiated, escalated, and resolved are addressed. This chapter illustrates the challenges of sustaining social equilibrium during a coaching conference when status differences, face threats, and in-the-moment discursive decisions complicate interactions.

Chapter VII: Post-Coaching Analysis Results

In a retrospective analysis of the coaching conferences, the researcher analyzes the coach and teachers' interactions. What was invisible during the coaching conference to the coach that the researcher was, in hindsight and with discursive analytical tools, able to make visible? This chapter raises the coaching dilemma of tactical interactions, responsive and in-the-moment, that further complicate the work of a literacy coach.

Chapter VIII: Discussion

What is the significance of this study for teachers, literacy coaches, and researchers? This chapter reviews the research questions in light of the results and suggests new conceptions of what it means to be a successful coach and build trust, productive relationships, and address resistance. The chapter also includes qualifications of the study and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW
LITERACY COACHING: AN INTERACTIVE PHENOMENON

Introduction

>   *[L]iteracy coaching is being widely implemented based on its convergence with theory and the wisdom of practitioners, before rigorous evaluations have been carried out (Snow, Ippolito, & Schwartz, 2006, p. 36).*

It is fair to say that job-embedded[4], ongoing, sustained professional learning for teachers, often enacted as coaching, is the fastest growing professional development model in the country (Russo, 2004, pp. 4-5). The major reasons for the current coaching phenomena are two-fold. The first derives from the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation of 2001 that included funding for early literacy Reading First state grants. Coaches were expected to support teachers' implementation of research-based reading practices identified by the National Reading Panel (National Reading Panel Reports of the Subgroups, 1999). The second reason for the explosion of coaching across the country comes out of the professional development literature. Traditional one-shot workshops and conferences showed little impact on teacher practice in the classroom (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Goldenberg & Galimore,

---

[4] Job-embedded coaching refers to on-site work in schools and classrooms with teachers directly related to lesson planning, instruction, and assessment. Job-embedded coaching refers to supporting the everyday experience of teachers working with students in school and district contexts Croft, A., Coggshall, J. G., Dolan, M., Powers, E., & Killion, J. (2010). *Job-embedded professional development: What it is, who is responsible, and how to get it done well*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

1991; Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Joyce & Showers, 1980; Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987). With the rise of the standards movement in the 1990's, the complexity of teaching and learning for higher order thinking pointed up the inadequacies of short-term professional development. If teachers were to adopt increasingly sophisticated ways of teaching, it would take more time and active learning to accomplish (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001).

NCLB ushered in an era of unprecedented accountability for student achievement, with sanctions for schools failing to meet Annual Yearly Progress goals (Hess & Finn, 2007; Sunderman & Kim, 2007; Valenzuela, Prieto, & Hamilton, 2007). The pressure brought to bear on educators for continuously increasing student achievement led many administrators across the nation to rush to implement approaches that would prevent their school from being labeled as "failing." Further, many previously labeled "high-performing" schools were found to have large academic disparities between affluent, non-minority students and students traditionally marginalized in our society, including linguistically, racially, ethnically, and academically diverse students. Thus, the pressure to produce academic results as measured by state tests was felt across the board.

Second, coaching emerged as a response to professional development (PD) research that demonstrated disappointing results from traditional forms of inservice teacher education. Joyce and Showers' (Joyce & Showers, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1995, 1996; Showers, 1990; Showers & Joyce, 1996; Showers, et al., 1987) line of research on peer coaching demonstrated the efficacy of teacher dyads visiting one another's classrooms to observe, debrief, and encourage implementation of new practices. They were able to show that peer coaching increased implementation of instructional practices significantly

over workshops alone. As Jake Cornett and Jim Knight (2008) explain in their review of the coaching literature, peer coaching (Joyce & Showers, 1981) and cognitive coaching[5] (Costa & Garmston, 1994) were both early forms of coaching that preceded newer instantiations such as literacy and instructional coaching.

Because of the relatively recent arrival of literacy and instructional coaching, literature about them is limited. What exists leans heavily on established and evolving coaching models. These models overlap in practice.[6] Most avoid evaluation, try to maintain nonjudgmental language, and involve classroom practice. All have as their aim the improvement of teacher skill and knowledge as applied to classroom instruction for the benefit of student learning. All approach the improvement of teacher practice through social interaction between a teacher and a coach, who is sometimes a colleague or

---

[5] Cognitive Coaching derived from a supervisory model designed to mediate teacher thinking to support reflection, cognitive growth, and self-direction. According to Ellison and Hayes, founders of the Center for Cognitive Coaching, the model was in response to behaviorist approaches that told teachers what and how to teach. Cognitive Coaching is a process that provides teachers with choice and control Ellison, J., & Hayes, C. (2009). Cognitive Coaching. In J. Knight (Ed.), *Coaching: Approaches and perspectives* (pp. 70-90). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.. Through "planning, observing, and reflecting" Ertmer, P. A., Richardson, J., Cramer, J., Hanson, L., Huang, W., Lee, Y., et al. (2005). Professional development coaches: Perceptions of critical characteristics. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*(1), 52-75. Coaches support teacher thought processes about their instructional decision-making.

[6] Coaching models are numerous, overlapping, and ever-evolving. Poglinco et al. (2003) identified five coaching models: technical, collegial, peer, mentoring, and literacy. Jim Knight, Director of the Kansas Coaching Project, identified six types of coaching: instructional, literacy, cognitive, content, differentiated, and leadership Knight, J. (Ed.). (2009b). *Coaching: Approaches and perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.. Neufeld and Roper (2003) researched change and content coaching. Coggins et al. (2003) studied reform coaches. Rhonda Nowak (2003) identified ten types of coaching, including: technical, reflective, practical arguments, collegial, cognitive, linguistic, challenge, team, reciprocal, and "Reading Recovery 'behind-the-glass' facilitation" (p. 48). Kristin Rainville (2007) found six different instantiations of coaching. The International Reading Association (2004) identifies reading coaches evolving from reading specialists and so on.

sometimes an exemplary teacher hired for the role of coach. However, beyond these similarities, the literature is not clear on where one form of coaching leaves off and another begins. Further, researchers are not in agreement when it comes to identifying coaching models. Among researchers, no two lists of coaching models are the same. The plethora of coaching types is accompanied by a lack of consensus as to what to call coaches, the nature of a coach's work and what kind of training a coach needs to be successful (Mraz, Algozzine, & Watson, 2008; Roller, 2006) . Literacy coaching as a recent form of coaching appears to be a pastiche that borrows from many coaching models in research as well as in practice.

Recognizing these constraints, that the literature on literacy coaching is thin and borrowed and lacking in definition, in this review I will extend this review beyond literacy coaching to include results from a range of coaching studies relevant to understanding coaching challenges that are applicable across a range of coaching models, including literacy coaching.

Research Questions

This review builds on four previous efforts to assess the state of research on school coaching dominated by these models (Cornett & Knight, 2008; L'Allier, Elish-Piper, & Bean, 2010; Sailors & Price, 2009; Snow, Ippolito, & Schwartz, 2006). Each reviewer categorized the coaching literature in different ways. Reading more than 250 studies, Cornett and Knight, 2008, organized their review around four coaching models: Peer Coaching, Cognitive Coaching, Literacy Coaching, and Instructional Coaching. L'Allier, Elish-Piper, and Bean, 2010, organized their research by asking and answering practitioner questions about coaching with what reading/literacy coaching research says

about it. Sailors and Price (2009) focused on six areas of research on teaching related to reading coaching: craft, domain knowledge, teacher efficacy, special education, writing instruction, and preservice science teacher education to make the point that coaching research in relation to reading comprehension does not yet exist. Snow, Ippolito, and Schwartz (2006) looked at middle and high school literacy coaching research to determine what we know and what still needs to be known about coaching at the secondary level.

In this review, my interest is in understanding the current state of literacy coaching, prek-12, as it relates to teacher-coach interaction. My rationale for the selection of content is based on the premise that coaching is an interactive phenomenon and little has been written about what happens during coaching conversations. To date, the literature has addressed coaching roles and coaching challenges, but few studies have investigated the social interactions that occur in-the-moment between teachers and coaches that contribute to those challenges or shape those roles. Given the recent growth of coaching, it is understandable that few studies exist that apply microanalyses to coaching interactions. Also, given the Federal and State pressure for increased student achievement along with advances in statistical analyses, it is understandable that some of the most current studies are empirical, experimental and quasi-experimental (cf. Garet et al., 2008; Hough, 2008; Matsumura, Garnier, Junker, Resnick, & Bickel, 2008; Neuman & Cunningham, 2009). Increasingly, causal studies apply statistical analysis methodologies that "isolate the influence of any given factor on an outcome, taking into account the other potential influences" (Wenglinsky, 2000, p. 6). Nonetheless, case studies, surveys, interviews, and observations dominate the literacy coaching literature by

a large margin over quantitative, control group studies. The focus of this review will be the results from qualitative case studies, surveys, interviews, and observational data that contribute to a coherent picture of the coach's role, coaching actions and the challenges coaches face.

What is the Literacy Coach's Role and How is it Enacted?

These two deceptively simple questions are found throughout the coaching literature. Four widely circulated reports on coaching were published in 2003, prior to empirical evidence linking coaching teachers to increased student achievement (Coggins, et al., 2003; Neufeld & Roper, 2003a; Poglinco, et al., 2003; Symonds, 2003). All are qualitative, descriptive designs involving on-site observations, case studies, interviews, and/or surveys of teachers, schools, and/or districts using coaching models and all approach coaching as a school reform lever. Coggins et al. (2003) and Symonds (2003) focused on coaching as it was enacted in the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative. Coggins et al. looked at the distributed leadership role of reform coaches. Symonds reported on three districts' literacy coaches at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Neufeld and Roper (2003) described two types of coaches, change and content, working over time across sites, including Boston, Corpus Christi, Louisville, and San Diego. Poglinco et al. (2003) contributed an evaluation study of America's Choice reading/writing workshop literacy coaching model.

Who are Literacy Coaches?

Who are literacy coaches according to these reports? Often, they are respected teachers who have demonstrated expertise in teaching reading and writing, some hired from within a district or school, others hired from outside (Poglinco, et al., 2003; Symonds,

2003). In the America's Choice program, half came directly from the classroom and half had experiences in professional development, support, or administrative roles in addition to classroom experience. However, a significant number of coaches had little or no experience working with adult learners (Poglinco, et al., 2003).[7] Inexperience working with adult learners is a concern raised by many literacy coaches (Blamey, Meyer, & Walpole, 2009; Poglinco, et al., 2003) and provides one reason why a study of coaching interaction may be useful to coaches looking for guidance.

What Do Literacy Coaches Do?

The question that receives more attention in these studies asks what do coaches do? Symonds' (2003) and Neufeld and Roper's (2003) study reported literacy coaches were expected to work directly with teachers, modeling lessons, observing teaching, and coaching teachers individually or in small groups on both content and pedagogy.[8] This contrasts with Poglinco's (2003) study that found a lack of formal job descriptions.

---

[7] Demographic data from Reading First coaches in five states, Alaska, Arizona, Montana, Washington, and Wyoming, found that 70% of the coaches "had no coaching experience prior to Reading First" Deussen, T., Coskie, T., Robinson, L., & Autio, E. (2007). *"Coach" can mean many things: Five categories of literacy coaches in Reading First* (No. REL 2007- 005 Issues & Answers Report). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs..

[8] Numerous publications echo this job description Deussen, T., Coskie, T., Robinson, L., & Autio, E. (2007). *"Coach" can mean many things: Five categories of literacy coaches in Reading First* (No. REL 2007- 005 Issues & Answers Report). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs, Frost, S., & Bean, R. (2006). Qualifications for literacy coaches: Achieving the gold standard. *Retrieved April 12, 2010, from www.literacycoachingonline.org/briefs/LiteracyCoaching.pdf*, 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: International Reading Association.

Poglinco identified two types of coaches: change coaches, whose role was to build the organizational capacity of schools by supporting administrators and systemic reform; and content coaches, whose role was to improve instruction by working directly with teachers. Coggins et al. (2003) also identified systemic aspects of coaching, finding that reform coaches brokered knowledge through data and assessment, bringing new research and resources to the school, and acting as keepers of the vision of reform.

How Do Literacy Coaches Spend Their Time?

> *Simply knowing that literacy coaches are in schools does not imply anything about how those individuals are spending their time, because there is a difference between being a coach and **doing coaching** (Deussen, et al., 2007, pp. 4, 5).*

Systemic, whole school reforms designed to improve teaching and learning, position literacy coaches as key players, central to the success of the reform. When coaching is viewed as the lever for school reform, the coaches' role is far more than working alongside teachers to improve classroom literacy instruction. Over successive years, the role of literacy coach may include being a keeper of the vision, an anchor for the literacy initiative via data analysis, communication across multiple levels of administration, a buffer against the vicissitudes of short educational attention spans when new initiatives threaten to fragment ongoing reforms, a resource provider and manager, as well as a provider of professional development for teachers. The role of coach can be daunting, particularly in the early years of a reform initiative when the coach has not had time to establish herself with teachers and build her credibility. Regardless of her title, and whether engaged in systemic reform or not, she cannot simply walk into teachers' classrooms and begin coaching. Role negotiation with both teachers and administrators, building trust, establishing relationships, earning respect and access, take time. Given the

length of time it takes to build relationships and establish oneself in a new role, it is understandable that some coaches spend less time working alongside teachers in the first few years of a reform effort. Coaches know that improving teachers' classroom instruction is central to their work. But the role itself places many demands on a coach's time and energy, limiting the amount of time a coach has for working side-by-side with teachers.

A study of instructional coaches by Celine Coggins, Pamela Stoddard, and Elisabeth Cutler (2003) supports this claim. The coaches in the study acknowledged that the heart of their role was to improve teachers' classroom instruction. However, in practice, Coggins et al. found there was a discrepancy between what coaches said they should do and what actually occurred. The coaches in Coggins' study spent most of their time leading and coordinating school-based reforms rather than coaching teachers in classrooms, particularly during the first few years of the school improvement effort. Those were years when coaches spent much of their time attending to the establishment of the literacy initiative, coordinating and interpreting assessments, communicating with stakeholders including administrators and teachers, and determining teacher and student needs in addition to working in small groups or one-on-one with teachers. Coggins' study noted that the longer the school/coach was involved in the reform model, the more often the coach worked with teachers. Early in the reform experience, coaches spent 57% of their time in role negotiation,[9] establishing relationships with teachers, building trust,

---

[9] Others have found that initially, coaches spend much of their time in role negotiation, building credibility, trust, and relationships with teachers Ertmer, P. A., Richardson, J., Cramer, J., Hanson, L., Huang, W., Lee, Y., et al. (2005). Professional development coaches: Perceptions of critical characteristics. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*(1), 52-75..

gaining entry to classrooms, becoming a respected colleague, compared with 76% of their time working directly with teachers to improve their instruction in schools that had participated longer in the reform effort (Coggins, et al., 2003).

In addition to role negotiation during the early years of a literacy initiative that limited the time coaches spent working directly with teachers to improve instruction, some coaches appeared to prefer aspects of their roles other than coaching teachers. A report on categories of Reading First coaches (Deussen, et al., 2007), also supported the results from Coggins et al. (2003) and determined that some coaches prefer managerial duties while other coaches prefer working with teachers. Deussen et al. (2007) found that Reading First K-3 literacy coaches, while expected to spend 60-80% of their time working with teachers, actually worked with teachers only 28% of their time (p.iv). Coaches were found to be either managers, oriented toward data or students, or oriented toward teachers individually or in groups. "There is a difference between being a coach and **doing coaching**," (Deussen, et al., 2007, pp. 4, 5). It does not seem surprising that former teachers now in the role of coach would value working with students. Assisting students is familiar territory, something they likely were successful with in practice. However, the coaches in Deussen's study as a group spent less than half the expected time working directly with teachers. Deussen's results raise questions about why so little time was spent coaching, even taking into account that some coaches tend more toward data analysis and working directly with students. What challenges did coaches face that made coaching teachers difficult?

Part of the difficulty elementary school coaches have making time to work directly with teachers has been attributed to the lack of specificity in spelling out what it means to be a coach. While it is true that the International Reading Association has published reading coach job descriptions (2004) and there are standards for Middle and High School Literacy Coaches (International Reading Association, 2006) the position of coach is frequently interpreted in light of local considerations. What does a principal need from a coach? Once on the job, local contexts often interpret the role of coach to suit school or district needs. Research from Walpole and Blamey (2008) confirms that coaching roles in practice remain undefined and amorphous and vary from site to site. They claim that part of the difficulty arises from the nature of current coaching models where literacy coaches are expected to coordinate a school's literacy program as well as coach teachers in their classrooms. The demands of the job divide a coach's time making it easy for those who prefer managing reforms, assessing and analyzing data, organizing resources, and working with students to have little time or energy left for coaching teachers in their classrooms. On the other hand, coaches who do want to work directly with teachers may feel torn between serving the needs of their administrators and fulfilling their role as literacy coordinator while at the same time working to meet the instructional needs of teachers. The job of coaching teachers and managing a literacy initiative effectively demands a great deal from one person.

It is not surprising, given the inconsistency in what coaches actually do on the job, that studies of teacher/coach interaction are so limited. With many coaches spending more time coordinating literacy initiatives rather than coaching teachers and with the years it takes for coaches to get beyond negotiating their roles to actually collaborating

with teachers, it appears that researchers of coaching have asked the basic questions: who are coaches and what do they do, to establish that research base first. Once research answers these fundamental questions about the present state of coaching, then, perhaps, studies of what occurs when teachers and coaches do work together will become prevalent as a necessary means of improving teacher/coach interaction. Another factor that could have drawn attention away from teacher/coaching interaction research has to do with funding. Small-scale descriptive studies of teacher/coach interaction have been overshadowed by large-scale quantitative, experimental design work seeking to establish a relationship between coaching and student achievement (Biancarosa, Bryk, Atteberry, & Hough, 2009; Deussen & Buly, 2006; Garet, Birman, Porter, & Desimone, 2003). Current federal funding favors large-scale empirical studies such as these, making it more difficult for researchers to do the time consuming micro analyses necessary to understand how coaches and teachers interact. Understandably, funders want to know whether their enormous financial investment in coaching is worthwhile. . To make that judgment, they require consensus about what is meant by coaching. Though these are important considerations deserving of further research, undoubtedly, once operational consensus is reached as to what is meant by coaching, studies of how it is effectively done will be in demand.

Summary

Thus far, coaching as represented by the research literature leans heavily on local contexts in interpreting what it means to coach. These representations of coaching, mainly in elementary schools, report that 1) coaches spend time negotiating their role in the early years of a systemic initiative to improve student literacy achievement, 2)

coaches struggle to cope with unrealistic expectations that assume they can coach teachers while also coordinating a systemic literacy initiative, and 3) what coaches do depends on their individual propensities in that some coaches prefer to manage and work with students and others prefer to work with teachers. Much of the research that has provided these insights has involved elementary literacy coaches for primarily two reasons. First, the promotion of literacy coaches via the No Child Left Behind Act that dramatically impacted elementary schools and second, the standards based reform movement that raised the bar for literacy instruction in the early grades requiring teachers to learn to teach in sophisticated, complex ways that could not be accomplished by traditional professional development workshops. However, literacy coaches at the secondary level, while not as prevalent as elementary literacy coaches, are growing in numbers. Coaching at middle school and high school presents additional challenges, including knowing how to support content area teachers who are responsible for specialized areas of study.

How Do Literacy Coaches Perceive Their Qualifications for the Role?

To appreciate the challenges inherent in coaching, it is useful to investigate literacy coach perceptions of how well-qualified they believe they are for the role of coach. In particular, how do secondary literacy coaches assess their own skills in relation to coaching? Blamey, Meyer, and Walpole (2009) conducted a survey to find out how secondary coaches fared in their own estimation in comparison to national literacy coach standards.[10] They conducted a web-based national survey of secondary literacy coaches.

---

[10] In 2006, four national professional organizations[10] co-authored Standards for Middle and High School Literacy Coaches International Reading Association. (2006). *Standards for middle and high school literacy coaches*. Newark, DE: Author.. The standards

With a 33% response rate Blamey et al. found that coaches did not feel prepared to use data from assessments to differentiate instruction. They reported feeling unclear about their role, and wanted more support to facilitate coaching across multiple content areas and more guidance in working with adults.

The similarities between secondary and elementary coaching requests for guidance and assistance were pronounced. It seems that no matter the schooling level of teachers being served, coaches felt challenged by ill-defined roles and by working with teachers (Blamey, et al., 2009; Poglinco, et al., 2003). Elementary coaches found it necessary to spend much of their time initially establishing relationships that could pave the way for coaching to occur. Secondary coaches were faced with similar interpersonal challenges. Further, roles were vaguely presented and subject to local interpretation. In contrast, a classroom teacher's role is more unified and explicitly defined. S/he is responsible for a class of students and has a particular curriculum that students are expected to learn. A literacy coach is apt to be pulled in many directions, at one time assisting an administrator, another time analyzing trends in test data, or working with a teacher or department to improve student literacy skills. These diverse roles call for a diverse skill set, including knowing how to gain and sustain working relationships with teachers, how to select instructional and subject matter knowledge appropriate for the time and place, and how to assess the conditions unique to a classroom. These complicated, context-dependent capabilities call especially for strong social and

---

acknowledge the differences between coaching at the elementary level and coaching larger numbers of teachers in a range of content areas at the secondary level.

The four professional organizations that contributed to the report are the International Reading Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the National Science Teachers Association.

interpersonal understanding and expertise. Many secondary coaches expressed the belief

that their interpersonal skills were insufficient for working with other teachers, a belief

that surfaced again in another study where people skills were found to be high on the list

of coaching assets (Ertmer, et al., 2005). Peggy Ertmer and colleagues designed a

reflective interview process for 31 cognitive peer coaches in a large, urban Midwest

district to understand coaches' perceptions of their personal characteristics, strategies, and

impact. Twenty-four of thirty-one coaches listed people skills as their number one

personal characteristic (p. 61). The ability to build relationships, gain respect, and earn

credibility was high on their list of necessary qualifications, taking precedence over

content expertise. These results suggest that coaches understand that their content

expertise remains dormant and therefore of less consequence if they cannot gain entre to

a teacher's classroom or are unwelcome as a literacy partner.

Professional literacy organizations reverse this order of consequence, while

regarding them as the top considerations. Informed by research, the International Reading

Association in collaboration with other professional organizations identified interpersonal

skills and content expertise as essential for coaches in the Standards for Middle and High

School Literacy Coaches (2006). [11] Though high on the list of qualifications at the

---

[11] Other factors also mitigate the coach's role and qualifications such as the local demand
for highly qualified literacy coaches which can lead to hiring people unprepared for the
job Frost, S., & Bean, R. (2006). Qualifications for literacy coaches: Achieving the gold
standard. *Retrieved April 12, 2010, from*
www.literacycoachingonline.org/briefs/LiteracyCoaching.pdf. and the role of
administrators Leithwood, K., Louis Seashore, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K.
(2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. Minneapolis:
Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement: University of Minnesota;
Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto,
Poglinco, S. M., Bach, A. J., Hovde, K., Rosenblum, S., Saunders, M., & Supovitz, J.
(2003). *The heart of the matter: The coaching model in America's Choice schools*

secondary level, building interpersonal productive relationships follows: "working with

the school's literacy team, literacy coaches determine the school's strengths (and need for

improvement) in the area of literacy in order to improve students' reading, writing, and

communication skills and content area achievement" (p. 8). Similarly, people skills are

third on the IRA (2004) position statement on qualifications for reading coaches; being

an excellent reading teacher at the level being coached and possessing deep knowledge of

reading take precedence over interpersonal skills. It appears from Ertmer and colleagues'

study (2005) and Blamey et al. (2009) that coaches may disagree with the priority

ordering in these formal documents. Conversely, it is also possible that because the

coaches were selected on the basis of their literacy skills, coaches might agree with the

IRA's ordering if they already possessed the ability to assess a school's literacy needs

when hired, but found that the quality of their interactions with teachers enabled or

prevented them from applying all they knew. Either way, there is clear consensus that

coaching involves building relationships and requires strong interpersonal skills.

     Particularly interesting is the recognition in these documents that engaging

teachers in the work of improving instruction is likely to entail stressful interactions. The

position statement of the IRA (2004) on the Role and Qualifications of the Reading

Coach in the United States acknowledges stress levels associated with coaching teachers.

(Evaluation Study). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. as well as state and district contexts Deussen, T., Coskie, T., Robinson, L., & Autio, E. (2007). *"Coach" can mean many things: Five categories of literacy coaches in Reading First* (No. REL 2007- 005 Issues & Answers Report). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs, Mangin, M. M. (2009). Literacy coach role implementation: How district context influences reform efforts. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(5), 759-792.

The document advocates a range of informal to formal activities that comprise the work of a reading coach, from less stressful to more intense, including conversing with colleagues to co-planning lessons to co-teaching lessons. As the IRA position paper demonstrates, even informal interactions have the potential to create stress for the coach or teacher. In other words, talking with teachers may be slightly stressful but it is not as stressful as co-planning with teachers. However, the highest intensity coaching with the most at stake for both teacher and coach that results in the greatest amount of stress may be encountered when co-teaching lessons; the closer one gets to the instructional core, the greater the stress. This depiction of a coach's greatest stress point begs the question: Is the stress encountered when working to improve a teacher's literacy instruction the source of coaches' requests for more guidance when working with adults?

Why are Interpersonal Skills Highly Valued when it comes to Coaching?

One arena in which to pursue possible answers to this question is the coaching literature that acknowledges but does not theoretically define, teacher resistance (cf. Brown, Reumann-Moore, Christman, & Riffer, 2008; Donaldson et al., 2008; Gibson, 2005; Knight, 2009a; Lord, Cress, & Miller, 2008; Mangin, 2005; McCombs & Marsh, 2009; Neufeld & Roper, 2003b; Poglinco, et al., 2003; Stoelinga, 2008; Weber, Raphael, Goldman, Sullivan, & George, 2009). Much of this literature rests on the assumption that supporting teachers to make changes in their practice challenges longstanding norms of autonomy, egalitarianism, and seniority (Donaldson, et al., 2008; Little, 1982; Mangin, 2005). Recall that the IRA's position statement on Reading Coaches (International Reading Association, 2004) classifies coaching teachers in classroom contexts as high intensity with the potential to create anxiety. The authors of that position paper recognized the challenges

coaches face whenever they reach out to teachers. When a coach works with a teacher it is implicitly understood that the teacher will learn approaches to improve her instruction, the inference being that there is something inadequate or lacking in the teacher's pedagogy or content knowledge. Given the long history of teacher isolation in classrooms, simply having a coach approach a teacher to arrange for collaboration is a breach of norms of teacher autonomy. Further, the widely held conceptualization of teachers-as-equals is reinforced through equal pay scales and principal only evaluations. Only the administrator can evaluate a teacher. It is socially awkward and unacceptable for a colleague to critique another teacher's practice to her face. Coaches violate this norm of egalitarianism even when they carefully avoid evaluation. A coach's role implies critique, otherwise, why would a teacher need a coach's assistance? Finally, the norm of seniority that ties teacher longevity to increases in salary, with no regard for performance, makes it especially difficult for a less experienced coach to collaborate with a more senior colleague. Casting coaches as challengers of teacher autonomy makes it easier to understand why they would ask for help in working with adults. The nature of their role counters century-long norms of teacher independence.

Recognizing that coaching is a complicated social interaction and that coaches experience resistance on the part of teachers in many ways, researchers have sought answers through studies of social capital (Coggins, et al., 2003; Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond, 2003), of how coaches gain access to teachers' classrooms (Mangin, 2005), of how coaches are positioned in a school (Stoelinga, 2008), and of how the context and culture of individual schools promotes or subverts a coach's agenda (Weber, et al., 2009). Each of these studies draws upon different theories and methodologies to approach the

dilemma of teacher resistance to coaching.

Believing that bringing about change in instruction is based in social interaction that requires influence, Coggins et al. (2003) and Spillane et al. (2003) investigated forms of capital and the influence they exert on coaching success. One reason coaching is a fraught endeavor is that giving a person the title of "coach" does not necessarily legitimize the role. According to Coggins et al., coaches are legitimized or not based on social capital[12] and specialized knowledge that others do not have.[13] Spillane and colleagues, based on observations and interviews with 84 Chicago elementary teachers identified four forms of capital that contribute to a coach's influence: human, cultural, social, and economic. In their scenario, leadership is a co-constructed dynamic that changes with the situation, the subject matter, and the degree to which followers value different forms of capital. Cultural capital accrues when others value one's style of social interaction. Cultural and social capital work in tandem, to build trust and social networks. Human capital defined as specific content area knowledge, was also influential with teachers when it came to recognizing teachers as leaders. Implicit in the research on the role of capital in leadership is the corollary that without valued forms of capital, coaches may not be recognized by those whose instruction they are hired to improve, creating resistance.

How elementary coaches gain access to classrooms in the face of teacher

---

[12] Social capital is defined as "the coach's position in the school network of roles and relationships" Coggins, C. T., Stoddard, P., & Cutler, E. (2003). *Improving instructional capacity through field-based reform coaches*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association. .

resistance is the subject of Melinda Mangin's 2005 investigation. In a comparative case study of twelve mathematics coaches in urban, underperforming schools, principals and coaches helped researchers identify coaching resistant and coaching receptive teachers. Teacher and coach interview data found coaches first had to establish their credibility and be recognized by teachers prior to gaining access to classrooms and that building relationships took time. Principal endorsement[14] also played an important role in the coaches' acceptance. When teachers did not understand the coach's role or perceived it as supervisory, they were reluctant to participate.

Mangin (2005) found coaches used three strategies to access classrooms: 1) building relationships; 2) providing non-threatening and often, non-instructional support, such as helping with managerial needs, going on field trips, or offering to teach difficult lessons; and 3) identifying specific subgroups of teachers who would benefit from a

---

[14] Principal leadership to create a culture of learning, clear support, and accessibility for the literacy coach is often recommended Camburn, E. M., Kimball, S. M., & Lowerhaupt, R. (2008). Going to scale with teacher leadership: Lessons learned from a districtwide literacy coach initiative. In M. M. Mangin & S. R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 120-143). New York: Teachers College Press, Donaldson, M. L., Moore Johnson, S., Kirkpatrick, C. L., Marinell, W., Steele, J. L., & Agee Szczesiul, S. (2008). Angling for access, bartering for change: How second-stage teachers experience differentiated roles in schools. *Teachers College Record, 110*(5), 1088-1114, Ertmer, P. A., Richardson, J., Cramer, J., Hanson, L., Huang, W., Lee, Y., et al. (2005). Professional development coaches: Perceptions of critical characteristics. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*(1), 52-75, Leithwood, K., Louis Seashore, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. Minneapolis: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement: University of Minnesota; Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, Poglinco, S. M., Bach, A. J., Hovde, K., Rosenblum, S., Saunders, M., & Supovitz, J. (2003). *The heart of the matter: The coaching model in America's Choice schools* (Evaluation Study). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Symonds, K. W. (2003). *Literacy coaching: How school districts can support a long-term strategy in a short-term world*. San Francisco, CA: Bay Area School Reform Collaborative..

coaches' efforts, thereby avoiding resistant teachers and targeting more receptive teachers. Mangin's findings point to a counterproductive dilemma in that the coach's avoidance response to resistance may limit instructional improvement, with the most assistance given to willing teachers and the least assistance given to resistant teachers. While broad generalizations cannot be made from context specific case studies, it is worth noting that another study—Donaldson et al. (2008)— found that coaches in reform roles who were leaders of instructional change, used strategies to negotiate classroom access and deal with the stress of resistance similar to the strategies used by the coaches in Mangin's (2005) study. An emphasis on the strategies of building relationships and providing non-instructional support when offering advice for coaches faced with resistant teachers appears in the most recent research on coaching (L'Allier, et al., 2010).

These strategies were reported by experienced coaches and tied directly to teachers' actions perceived as resistance. Whether hired as reform or instructional coaches, second stage teachers, those with three to ten years of experience, were described as facing resistance, sometimes from more senior teachers, sometimes from teachers resentful of a leadership role intended to change instructional practices (Donaldson, et al., 2008). Coaches appeared to assume these strategies of their own volition, given the circumstances reported in Donaldson, et al's (2008) study that they received little support for dealing with resistance. Without specific guidance, similar to Mangin's findings (2005), some coaches were observed to avoid the resisters; others offered their support to colleagues but allowed teachers to decide how and what to incorporate into their practice; and some avoided referring to the teachers and stayed focused on what students were doing. As a result, some reform coaches watered down the

role to avoid or minimize opposition and the accompanying emotional stress. Coaches appear to find a number of ways to avoid having to deal with the stress of difficult interactions with teachers.

Another way to approach the issue of resistance is by understanding the informal school structure, the networks and relationships that support or derail coaching (Stoelinga, 2008). Stoelinga used two network analysis techniques: degree centrality, the number of ties to other staff in the network; and CONCOR, a technique used to cluster individuals to create subgroups of staff that report interacting with each other (p. 103). In this way, she was able to show how three different elementary schools, three case studies, positioned the coach in relation to other staff to account for the success or failure of coaching in different school contexts.

In one school where coaching was successful, the focus was on instruction with a high degree of overlap between formal and informal leadership. The second school had a strong culture of autonomy. The coach was not viewed as part of the informal leadership network. The data showed that not one teacher selected the coach as someone to talk to about literacy. Resistance was also intensified because the coach was young and norms of seniority and union disputes exacerbated the difficulties. In the third case, the principal allowed teachers to pursue whatever approaches they deemed best. The fragmented nature of professional learning undermined the literacy coach's focus and limited the effectiveness of coaching. The second school ended the coaching position. Reasons given included a lack of commitment on the part of the school and a lack of knowledge on the part of the coach. However, Stoelinga (2008) challenged those reasons. She asserted that the norms of autonomy in the school clashed with the collaborative nature of coaching

48

and that studies of the success or failure of teacher leadership should take into account the informal school structure.

Following Stoelinga's (2008) advice and taking into account the informal school structure, is a seven-year study of literacy coaches (LCs) in fourteen high needs Chicago Public Schools that examined how literacy coaches vary in the enactment of their work. The study begins to explain how school context and culture impacts coaches' work (Weber, et al., 2009). While all of the schools at the outset were similarly characterized, as the study continued, school progress toward reform varied. To determine whether schools were making progress or demonstrated the potential to make progress toward a Standards Based Change Process (SBC), researchers grouped schools into four categories: *Progressing* with high systemic implementation; *Aspiring*, enacting SBC as separate activities versus a school-wide approach; *Emerging*, working to put in place a leadership team and counter a history of isolation; and *Struggling*, where faculty were distrustful of SBC and one another, had spotty participation, and professional development lacked coherence.

Based primarily on interviews and observations over seven years with twenty-three coaches and their principals and teachers, Weber, et al. (2009) concluded that literacy coaches (LCs) enacted their roles in different ways, depending on the type of school they served. On the way to that conclusion, they ascertained that, though they may have enacted them in contextually and situationally specific ways, all the literacy coaches assumed five roles as: "a) change agent, b) community builder, c) instructional facilitator, d) curriculum leaders, and (e) negotiator" (Weber, et al., 2009 p. 23). They also determined that they all directed their attention in these roles toward five issues: 1)

working with resistant adult learners; 2) time constraints 3) sustaining the school infrastructure to support learning communities and opportunities to collaborate; 4) meeting role and responsibility demands; and 5) communication with collaborative teams (professional learning communities). The researchers concluded that the most dominant influence on their enactment profile was the building type. A comparison of two buildings taken from the study illustrates the powerful influence of building cultures and conditions on how literacy coaches enacted their roles., These two—a Progressing school and a Struggling school—began with fragmented professional development (PD) plans, as did all the schools in the study. However, literacy coaches in Progressing schools were able to facilitate learning communities that prioritized and targeted professional development appropriate to teachers and the school. This was not the case for literacy coaches in Struggling schools. In those buildings, incoherence dominated and multiple initiatives competed for professional development attention. The literacy coaches were unable to sustain attention on one among many competing demands that changed annually.

Another comparison of building effects in Progressing versus Struggling schools dealt with resistant teachers. All coaches experienced and were concerned about resistance. Literacy coaches in Progressing schools were described as able to be effectively firm and polite with resistant teachers, and hold everyone accountable for shared student work, learning, assessment, and curricula. In Struggling schools, literacy coaches were unable to build successful relationships or earn the respect of their teachers, rendering literacy coaching ineffectual.

By contextualizing literacy coaches' work, Weber et al. (2009) reconceptualize

the coach as one whose actions are enabled or constrained by the local culture s/he steps into. They describe the dimensions of those cultures as reflected in the complexity of school communities, their histories, leadership, networks of influence, and nested contexts. Although the study does not directly address the importance of relationships between coaches and teachers, it does illuminate the working conditions and social tensions that make building and sustaining stable relationships more difficult. By implication the study's findings reinforce the centrality of social relationships and interpersonal challenges in coaching. It is not surprising, then, that much of the literature on the qualifications of literacy coaches (International Reading Association, 2004, 2006) focuses on the skill sets of the individuals hired for these complex roles.

What does the Literature Say about Building Relationships?

To summarize, the coaching literature recognizes resistance as derived from norms of autonomy, egalitarianism, and seniority. Also recognized in the literature is the importance of interpersonal skills to a coach's success. Suggestions for what coaches should do to offset resistance to be successful are found throughout the literature. Writing about literacy coaching at the secondary level, Rita Bean (2008) offers guidelines based on her experience with coaches that include time to build trusting relationships. Suggestions for first steps include "serving as a resource, helping teachers solve problems, and providing specific feedback about aspects of classroom instruction" (p. 280). Jim Knight (2009a) asserts that teachers will be less resistant and more open to learning if the teaching practices introduced are few, powerful and easy, researched, aligned with other school professional development, monitored through data, effectively coached, open to teacher revision, involve teacher choice, and create relational trust (pp.

512-513). Based on over 200 interviews he conducted with teachers, Knight recommends that coaches communicate effectively by listening, responding positively, honoring teachers' professional knowledge and autonomy and "understanding the role of reflection" in professional learning (p. 511).

The question is, how? It is one thing to advise coaches to respond positively and honor teachers' professional knowledge and autonomy if the coach and teacher are willing to engage with one another. However, as others have demonstrated and surveys reveal, it is one thing to advise and another thing to enact. In practice, coaches are continually faced with complex social situations for which no easy answers exist. There is a gap between recommendations for *what* coaches should achieve through their engagement with teachers and illustrations of *how* one might achieve these conditions in varied challenging situations. This dearth of research-based guidance is particularly apparent for coaching issues based in social interaction. Beyond recommending establishing non-evaluative, trusting relationships, the literature is mostly silent on how to accomplish productive coaching interactions.

What does Literature Say about Coaching Interactions?

I looked for any scholarship that could offer insight into questions central to coach-teacher interactions. I was looking for studies that dealt directly with what happens when a teacher and coach talk together? What can be learned from a close study of coaching as social interaction? Talk is the medium of coaching. Are there studies of language-in-use that offer guidance toward understanding resistance when coaches work with adults? At the time of this project, I was only able to discover three studies that approached coaching from a discourse perspective. One involves speech acts during

novice cognitive peer coaching sessions (Perkins, 1998) and two are dissertations about literacy coaches and their discursive interactions with teachers (Nowak, 2003; Rainville, 2007). What can these studies offer theoretically or methodologically to my project: *How does a coach of teachers in a professional development situation make use of Discourse Analytic approaches?* All three conclude that coaches need to be conscious of their discourse during coaching conversations, and each offers a uniquely instructive approach for how to theorize and study coaching discourse in particular coaching situations.

Sally Perkins' (1998) studied a version of a cognitive peer-coaching program designed to improve classroom practice. Her investigation of inexperienced peer coaches combined quantitative frequency distributions with qualitative discourse analysis and questionnaires. The coaching process involved two teachers, one who was observed and one who coached. They met to discuss one teacher's upcoming lesson. After a pre-conference where the teacher identified what s/he wanted the coach to notice, the coach visited the teacher's class which was then followed by a post-conference to discuss the lesson in light of the teacher's goals. The two teachers then changed places and the other teacher took a turn as coach and observed his/her partner's lesson.

For her study, Perkins' trained peer coaches in one six-hour session on Costa and Garmston's (1994) nonjudgmental communication skills. These skills included "paraphrases, open-ended questions, probes, positive presuppositions, and descriptive statements about the coaches' observations" (1998 p. 235). Coaches were discouraged from using evaluative statements: closed ended questions, suggestions, and negative presuppositions. A key tenet of peer coaching that distinguishes it from supervision is the avoidance of evaluative comments.

Four elementary teachers taped their coaching conversations, which Perkins then analyzed for the speech acts performed during interactions. Perkins found coaches used closed ended questions usually before the teachers could respond. Coaches also used negative presuppostitions and positive and negative evaluations that Perkins discerned reflected power relations. Further, she posited that teachers did not want to take up issues that would cause overt conflict, possibly jeopardizing their collegial relationship[15].

Perkins findings led her to conclude that the inexperienced coaches in her study were either resistant to the communication skills or unable to benefit fully from the coaching model, and either way limited their learning. Even teachers who were enthusiastic about exercising the communication skills were unable to benefit when their partners would not follow the approach, and questionnaires indicated that resistant participants seemed unaware of their judgmental statements, and so unlikely to change. That colleagues would not risk their relationship to offer a critique of one another's practice is reminiscent of research on teacher norms of autonomy and egalitarianism. There is a long history of teachers deciding independently how and what they will teach (Donaldson, et al., 2008; Little, 1982; Mangin, 2005). These studies and related scholarship document traditional norms among school teachers for acceptable and unacceptable social behavior. Critiquing the practice of colleagues has traditionally

---

[15] Unwillingness to critique colleagues is found in other studies as well Lord, B., Cress, K., & Miller, B. (2008). Teacher leadership in support of large-scale mathematics and science education reform. In M. M. Mangin & S. R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 55-76). New York: Teachers College Press, Murray, S., Ma, X., & Mazur, J. (2008). Effects of peer coaching on teachers' collaborative interactions and students' mathematics achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research, 102*(3), 203-212, Schwartz, S., McCarthy, M., Gould, T., Politziner, S., & Enyeart, C. (2003). *Where the Rubber Hits the Road: An In-Depth Look at Collaborative Coaching and Learning and Workshop Instruction in a Sample of Effective Practice Schools. Boston Plan for Excellence*. Boston.

always fallen into the category of socially unacceptable, dangerous, and even traitorous activity. One way to read the implications of Perkins' study (1998) is that it attests to the power of this entrenched social norm. Even though the teachers in the study spent six hours learning ways to productively respond to their colleagues prior to coaching, in practice, many did not employ what they learned, and they were unaware they were actually undermining the approach through the ways they talked with their colleagues. Assuming that the coaching instruction was performed properly, these results beg a number of questions for further research including one especially salient for this study: What can studying peer coaching conversations reveal about why and how teachers engage in coaching?

Perkins' (1998) focused on the implications for teacher learning and proposed that beliefs might play a role in the learning being asked of her study's teachers. As a result of her analysis, she challenged what she came to regard as narrow conceptions of talk and interaction such as the communication skills repertoire (Costa & Garmston, 1994) that accompanied cognitive instantiations of coaching and questioned behaviorist or skills based concepts of teacher learning. Though an older model of coaching, Perkins' (1998) study of cognitive peer coaching raises issues that continue to confound more current coaching models such as literacy or instructional coaching. Her research moves attention toward more socially constructed notions of teacher collaborative learning seen in the following two dissertations in which attention is focused on interactive coaching discourse (Nowak, 2003) and on the power positions negotiated through it (Rainville, 2007).

Rhonda Nowak (2003) investigated directive and collaborative coaching discourse. She found that when school districts imposed coaching as a way to implement a prescribed program of literacy practices, discursive interactions between the coach and the teachers increasingly, over time, became directive and lacked any critical exchange of ideas. Nowak studied the discourse between six dyads of teachers and their coaches during a summer practicum on literacy for struggling readers. She asked, "How did the teachers and coaches construct meaning about literacy instruction through their discourse?" (p. 6).

Drawing, in part, upon conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) and early studies on classroom discourse (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), Nowak found that the patterns of discourse were constrained by the administrative directive to implement a prescribed literacy program. The purpose of the coaching influenced what topics the coaches initiated and led to coaches doing most of the talking. Teachers seldom initiated questions or topics and replied to coaches with brief statements. Because the coaches dominated the conversations with teachers, reflective thinking was largely absent from the interactions that tended to focus on student characteristics, limiting potential teacher understandings about the relationship of teacher instruction and student learning.

From the literature on classroom discourse (cf. Cazden, 2001; Mehan, 1979; Wells, 1993), Nowak identified three forms of talk relevant to the analysis of interactions between the teachers and their coaches: progressive discourse (Wells, 1999), exploratory talk (Wegerif & Mercer, 1996), and Initiation, Response, and Evaluation, IRE, (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), as well as Initiation, Response, and Feedback, IRF (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Wells, 1993).

In progressive discourse, opinions are revised as ideas are built upon during sharing and questioning. Similarly, exploratory talk is a type of verbal reasoning researched by Rupert Wegerif and Neil Mercer (1996) in the context of computer use in elementary classrooms. By studying student to student discourse while engaged in partnerships at computers, the researchers identified three types of talk: disputational, where children disagree and make decisions alone; cumulative, where partners agree and build on one another's ideas; and exploratory, where challenges exist but students publicly work through their reasoning with one another's ideas (1996, p. 51). In addition, Nowak found IRE and IRF sequences relevant to teacher/coach interactions. How and in what ways teachers and coaches question, respond, and then either follow up or evaluate the response was of interest to Nowak.

Her study showed that most initiating moves were by coaches with the intent of giving information, thereby limiting teacher reflection, as inquiry was not the purpose of the interaction. "The key to effective coaching seems to be in striking a balance between dialogue that is responsive and dialogue that is intentional" (2003, p. 306). Nowak also suggested that having the dyads consist of an "expert" coach and a teacher learner skewed the distribution of initiating topics and fostered an unequal distribution of talk.[16] In all, the talk was cumulative where ideas were put forth without examination.

---

[16] Literature involving the discourse of "expert" coaches and related dilemmas includes Achinstein, B., & Villar, A. (2002). *Politics of the mentoring process for novices: Negotiating professional relationships and new teacher learning*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA. Manouchehri, A. (2002). Developing teacher knowledge through peer discourse. . *Teaching and Teacher Education* (18), 715–737.
Richardson, V., & Valdez, A. (1991). *The role dialogue plays in long-term teacher change*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.

The most supportive type of discourse in a coaching situation, according to Nowak (2003), is cause-effect that involves recognition of the "relationships between teaching actions and learning outcomes" (p. 356). When teachers and coaches can talk about other ways this could have gone, posing alternative scenarios and growing theories of action leading to changes in practice, then coaching becomes increasingly supportive. Further, setting up expectations for teacher-coach interactions so that high-quality, elaborated responses are expected is another recommendation of the study. Finally, Nowak acknowledges the situated and individualized nature of teacher-coach interactions and asserts that other studies should address ways coaching can support "reflective thinking, analysis of instruction and student progress" using evidence gathered from a variety of resources (p. 364).

Nowak's investigation points out the dilemma of unequal status between the coach and teachers, particularly when the coach's role is to directly instruct teachers to carry out district literacy mandates. In that situation, the coaches in her study adopted a "telling" discourse style that precluded reflection on the part of the teachers. The implication was that the teachers had little opportunity to make individually meaningful sense of the literacy approach and had little assistance with envisioning and shaping the curriculum for their own students and teaching conditions. Nowak's study reinforces the importance of local context and the situatedness of coaching. Perhaps if the district had not required that coaches impart a particular program, the style of discourse between the teacher and coach might have been different. Perhaps if the coaches had been less directive, the status differences between the teachers and coaches could have been ameliorated to allow more constructive interchange.

Kristin Nicole Rainville's (2007) investigation of the discourse of three New Jersey literacy coaches extends the direction in which Nowak's (2003) study has moved research into discourse between literacy coaches and teachers. Rainville asserted that coaching was situated in complex social interaction and that coaches' identities changed in response to different contexts. She located power and positioning (Harré & Van Langenhove, 1999) in all interactions but argued that the exercising of power was contingent upon the situated identity of the coaches within a specific literacy event within a particular context. The central premise of the study is that coaching is situated. This is a push back at notions of coaching that divorce it from the contexts, histories, and cultures of the interactants. Rainville is critical of forms of coaching that only focus on changing teachers' behavior and do not take into account the complexities of coaching and language-in-use, arguing it is "trust and relationship building that occurs over time that ultimately leads to collaboration and growth" (p. 48).

Rainville's (2007) conception of power derives from Foucault (1997/1984). Although she does not explicitly explain how she has adapted Foucault, it is clear from the analyses that she makes that she assumes power does not belong to individuals. Rather, power is present in all relationships as the force field, or ability to exert strength, in which interactants engage that influences what they can say to each other and the consequences of what they say for their social relationship. Power, or an individual's sense that she can exert her strength, is negotiated during turns of talk and can take the form of resistance. An interactant may assume a resistant stance toward the topic or agenda of the conversation, as a way to exert her power, when she perceives her sense of

59

herself and her agenda in the conversation to be threatened or diminished.[17] She notes

that both the coach and teacher use language for power to position themselves in response

to situations and negotiated interactions which in turn, constructs identities such as,

"friend, colleague, authority, expert, learner, resistor" (p. 18).

All three literacy coaches positioned themselves and were positioned in relation to

multiple Discourses (Gee, 1999), federal, state, and local. Their contexts varied, from

being new to a school to assuming a new role as expert in a former school setting. Some

teachers and administrators perceived coaches as change agents, while others saw them as

a quick fix to issues of instruction and student achievement. Just as their uses of power

and position varied in situ, so too, did their commonly shared literacy events:

demonstration lessons, examining student work, and grade level meetings. Rainville found

that though the events were intended to be similar and the coaches had received the same

training and guidelines as to what they were to accomplish with the teachers, the events

played out differently in each situation.

A subsequent article (Rainville and Jones, 2008) drawing from Rainville's (2007)

dissertation data corpus illustrates moment-by-moment and turn-by-turn coaching and

demonstrates what can be observed in micro interactional segments. Through selective

short clips, Rainville makes visible how one literacy coach shifted her interactional moves

based on how she was reading the context. The reader is shown how through language, the

---

[17] This is but one of many definitions of power. Previously, Lesley Rex and Laura
Schiller conceptualized power based on Max Weber's classic definition (1947) as the
probability that a person will be in a position to carry out her own will though there may
be resistance. Rex, L., & Schiller, L. (2005). *A critical analysis of power and politeness
during literacy professional development workshops.* Paper presented at the National
Council of Teachers of English Assembly for Research Mid-Winter Conference,
Columbus, Ohio.

coach and teacher "wield power and position themselves in various ways: as friend, colleague, authority, expert, learner, and so forth" (p. 441). The following example demonstrates the coach and a teacher struggling for power. The coach, Kate, felt intimidated by Mr. Blue, the teacher, who was rumored to have worked with an expert in the field of reading. Mr. Blue was resistant to learning how to use the running records method that Kate was coaching. In this excerpt, the two are in Mr. Blue's classroom practicing close observation and record keeping for each child that the method requires. The coach wants the teacher to take his time observing each child's reading practices, and the teacher hurries things along. Mr. Blue tells Tommy that his decoding of a word is correct so as to move along to the next student. What follows further illuminates for the reader the struggle underway between the teachers' stance—that his way is more efficient—and the coach's efforts to replace his approach with a different protocol.

Mr. Blue:	Tommy, you were right about the word.
Kate:	Thank you, Tommy. And come back as soon as you're finished, all right?
[to Mr. Blue] Do you want to go back and look at the scores?
Mr. Blue:	What I really want to do is have you do some over on the other table. This is going to take 10 days if we don't get going. That's only the third kid.
Kate:	Right. I completely understand (p. 441).

Using an indirect request "Do you want to go back and look" rather than a more directive move such as "Let's go back and look" is an implicature of indirection common to American middle class vernacular. However, the coach's politeness move is taken up literally as a request for preference by the teacher, who straightforwardly tells the coach what he "really" wants to do other than what they are doing. Kate's urging to go back and look at scores is directly rejected by the teacher who, rather than learn more about running records scoring, wanted to share the task with the coach so as to complete the

mandated assessment process as quickly as possible. For Mr. Blue, taking ten days to complete a reading assessment was counterproductive. The coach's response to the teacher's sense of urgency was to say, "Right. I completely understand." Rainville et al. (2008) claim that the coach definitely understood the teacher's resistance to her coaching, but not how to change it at that moment.

Rainville et al.'s (2008) episode demonstrates a form of what they refer to as teacher resistance to coaching. The researchers posit that the interaction might have been more productive if the coach had established an informal relationship with the teacher prior to the coaching session as they illustrate with interactions in different transcripts. Further, they posit that the coach's role may not have been clear to the teacher, leading to miscommunication that is counterproductive to effective coaching. In addition to describing how a coach can build an informal relationship through awareness of power and politeness that permeate all coaching situations, the study also suggested that coaches can strategically self-position themselves in relation to teachers, for example, positioning themselves as co-learners or partners to help teachers take charge of their own professional growth.

Rainville's (2007) study asserts that coaches can strategically adopt particular, what they call, identities, in anticipation of and during coaching conversations that have the potential to reposition coach and teacher in productive ways. However, their research does not address whether those identities shift during coaching interactions as power moves back and forth from teacher to coach. Complicating that question is Perkins' (1998) finding that peer coaches were unaware they were being judgmental. Are coaches today able to be more aware and strategic as conversations unfold and power shifts from

one speaker to the other? What happens if the persona the coach chooses to adopt with a teacher turns out to be counter-productive to the aims of the coaching conference? Will the coach be able to consciously adopt a different persona in the midst of a conversation? What will the teacher be doing while the coach enacts such shifts? How might the teacher respond and with what consequences?

In a body of literature that discussed coaching without delving deeply into the ways in which language-in-use constructed meaning and relationships, all three studies contributed to research by investigating ways in which talk constructed coaching interactions. However, all three studies raise a host of additional questions that have resonance for the present study. What is the nature of talk among coaches and teachers? How does the presence of power during coaching conversations influence the interaction? Are only teachers resistant or are there implications for coaches as well? How realistic is it to count on proactive strategies during in-the-moment coaching interactions when expected courses of action may change?

Conclusion

Given that coaching as a model of school reform continues to spread, the questions of today ask if our investment is a wise one. To that end, quantitative, control group studies are just beginning to address whether or not coaching produces improvements in student learning. However, when what is meant by coaching is still vague and interpreted in practice at the local level, determining whether coaching is worth the money it costs will require careful analysis of how coaching is enacted in specific contexts. Generalizing one coaching context to another, even one coach and one teacher to another, may turn out to be a complex problem that goes beyond the capacity

of newer statistical models to address.

What we do know is that coaching counters long established norms of schooling, creating challenges for coaches that extend beyond their expertise in content or pedagogy. Resistance, a term used loosely throughout the literature, remains undefined. It is a layman's term referring to teachers who do not want to work with or learn from a coach. Repeatedly, coaches ask for help working with adults and resistant teachers. Their job preparation did not include how to deal with resistant colleagues. It is no wonder that studies find that many coaches spend more time on managerial tasks instead of working with teachers in their classrooms. It is difficult to offer advice to coaches when so little is known about the nature of interactions between coaches and teachers. Hence the aim of the present self-study of a literacy coach and two case study teachers: To describe the nature of interaction between a coach and teacher and how a literacy coach makes use of discourse analytic approaches to understand that interaction.

CHAPTER III: THEORETICAL FRAMING

As a literacy coach, I had been using a range of discourse analysis constructs when working alongside teachers. Based on my experience as a coach and my readings in the discourse literature, I selected particular discursive constructs and approaches that I thought would be useful for understanding and improving my coaching. I constructed an interdisciplinary approach to understanding teacher-student and teacher-coach interactions grounded in Ethnomethodology, theories of power, politeness, and positioning, and frame theory. There are particular ways of doing discourse analysis and particular ways that I am conceptualizing and combining discourse traditions. An explanation of this theoretical frame and how it informed my study is the purpose of this chapter. This project enabled me to conduct an empirical study of how I have been using these selected discursive constructs and to test out my hypothesis by assessing their usefulness to coaches and teachers alike. Does the framework I conceptualized actually yield results that can be useful for coaches and for teachers working with coaches?

Defining Discourse and Discourse Analysis

"[D]iscourse--language above the level of single utterance or sentence--is central to the study of teaching and learning interactions,"(Rex & Green, 2007) .

Following Barbara Johnstone (2002) I take discourse to mean "actual instances of communication in the medium of language" (p. 2). While discourse analysts might consider the relationship between language and other semiotic systems that also communicate, such as architecture, dance, photography, dress, my focus in this study is

spoken language, though written or signed language could also be considered discourse. I use the term discourse analysis, rather than language analysis, to distinguish between the study of language as form, a more classical linguistics, and the study of language as a more applied linguistics that studies ways in which language performs. I chose the perspective of "using language to do things" (Wetherell, Taylor, & Yates, 2001, p. 3), "language-in-use," because it allowed me to perceive spoken language as generative performance. Conceptualizing discourse as language-in-use enabled me to ask, what happens in classroom and coaching interactions in-the-moment and over time that shapes and is shaped by how people speak to each other?

Discourse analysis (DA), as a social theory of language, a logic of inquiry and a repertoire of methods, offers an interpretive approach that allows new meanings to appear for social aspects that have become naturalized. By examining the language basis of normative social practices such as teaching and learning, DA promotes opportunities to view what is often invisible or taken for granted. Discourse analysis, as I applied it in this study and will use from this point forward, is the study of spoken language-in-use. Observing spoken language-in-use this way made it possible for me to describe the consequences of talk and what can be learned by the interactants as a result of those consequences (Putney & Frank, 2008; Putney, Green, Dixon, Duran, & Yeager, 2000).

This approach to discourse analysis involves capturing, transcribing and studying episodes of consequential talk constructed from sequences of interactions comprised of individual utterances (or turns of talk). Describing language-in-use at this scale of moment-to-moment interaction is necessary to understand how what is being accomplished through talk is dependent on successive exchanges. Understanding talk as

language-in-use is particularly helpful in a classroom or coaching context to observe knowledge-construction interchanges. A significant body of work focused at this scale has, for example, described how teachers often say one thing, aiming for a particular outcome, while students sometimes learn something quite unintended (Cazden, 2001; Rex, 2003; Rex & Nelson, 2004). As the coaching literature has revealed that coaches have similar outcomes with their coachees (Nowak, 2003; Rainville & Jones, 2008, p. 441; Weber, et al., 2009) this perspective appeared well suited to this project. It has allowed me to represent and interpret how talk is taken up by the listener or responder and to follow that exchange through successive interactions to observe meaning as it is co- or misconstructed (Rex, 2006b).

By capturing talk at this scale, on video or as transcription, it is frozen in ways that allow researchers, coaches and teachers to analyze interactions that otherwise would be fleeting and difficult to capture. Patterns of utterances that shape the interactions become noticeable. Speakers, as well as researchers, benefit from this meta-awareness of their talk as it opens up possibilities for reconsidering how they engage with others. Because improving coaching conversations was the key aim of my project, discourse analysis became the central focus of my thinking as both a coach preparing my coaching protocol and researcher collecting and analyzing my data. Before I began coaching, I spent time in teachers' classrooms recording all language-in-use and analyzing teacher-student interactions to understand what was meant by reading and writing and the consequences of those understandings for student learning. With regards to coaching, I wondered how social relations between those teachers and myself as their coach were constructed? Given the difficulties coaches confront when they work with or try to work with teachers, I

wondered what our joint study of their classroom talk during our coaching conversations would offer? Could we use DA to understand how teachers and students and teachers and coaches use language to accomplish their goals? Could we see how discursive choices were consequential for learning and how they were consequential for coaching?

Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis: Constructing and Interpreting Social Order

My framework relied on discourse analysis traditions derived from ethnomethodology, interactional sociolinguistics, microethnography, and discursive psychology. To explain my combination of theoretical approaches, I have clustered terms referred to in this study that are associated with each discourse analysis tradition. My aim will be threefold: 1) to explain how I found each term useful for understanding teacher/coach discursive interactions; 2) to situate each term within its respective tradition; and 3) to illustrate why these particular conceptual constructs were relevant to the broader goal of this study, *How does a coach of teachers in a professional development situation make use of discourse analysis approaches?*

Ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967) is a way of looking at social phenomena-- how social structures are constructed and reinforced in and through talk. Theoretically, it allowed me to look at discourse as a way of constructing social worlds and drawing from and reinforcing social worlds and relationships. Garfinkel grounded ethnomethodology in the ordinary commonplaces of daily life to show how social structures are produced and reproduced. Speakers have agency and are not simply subject to society's rules. Through everyday talk, speakers create social order. Understanding how social order is created is the project of ethnomethodologists. Applying discourse analysis in the tradition of ethnomethodology, I was able to investigate the social worlds constructed on a small

scale, through language-in-use of two classrooms, and I could observe how that social

order played out in the social relationships coach and teachers produced and reproduced as

we engaged in coaching conversations.

At the time ethnomethodology emerged, sociologist Erving Goffman (1974, 1981)

was conceptualizing a complementary interpretation of talk in everyday conversations—

frame analysis. According to Goffman and linguist Deborah Tannen (1993), frames

organize meaning for those engaged in face-to-face talk. However, it is possible for people

in a conversation to assume different frames, different understandings of what is

occurring. Speakers and hearers may be said to be in alignment when they are framing the

situation in the same way and are in tacit agreement with one another. When speakers and

hearers take turns speaking, they are in alignment when they are both thinking that the

purpose for their speaking is the same, and that they are both speaking in good faith to

achieve it.[18] During face-to-face talk alignment occurs when participants' utterances

indicate they share the same frame and a tacit understanding of what they are trying to

accomplish. Communication can derail even when interactants assume they share a frame

and have the best of intentions. Linguistic anthropologist, Michael Agar (1994), calls such

---

[18] This is reminiscent of Paul Grice's cooperative principle. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic
and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts*
(Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). New York: Academic. Grice proposed that when speakers and
listeners interact they follow a set of logical assumptions, Grice's four maxims. People
assume they are interacting to create meaning. Their conversation is not random or
pointless. As frequently quoted, Grice's co-operative principle states, "Make your
contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose
or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (p. 45). When a speaker does
not follow the cooperative principle, his/her utterance is still considered meaningful. The
speaker has a reason for his/her talk. The listener may infer the speaker's meaning though
the meaning was indirect. Grice refers to an inference made when a speaker does not
follow informal speech "rules," an implicature. See also, Cameron, D. (2001). *Working
with spoken discourse*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

incidents frame clashes, when speakers and hearers may be operating with different expectations for what is appropriate or expected in a given situation. These differences may be based in different language forms and resulting conversational inferences, as Gumperz has demonstrated (Twitchin, 1979). Or, they could be based in differences in beliefs, values and dispositions originating from different social or cultural orientations (Agar, 1994). When there is a breach in expectations or frame, participants may be out-of-alignment. Their tacit understandings of what is occurring break down and interaction may become awkward or difficult.

When I theorized my coaching conversations, I borrowed Goffman's notion of alignment in two ways. First, I approached alignment in-the-moment through turn taking. Was the response called for? Did the teacher and coach appear to be in agreement? How did I know? Could I be sure teacher and coach really were in alignment? Second, I viewed alignment across multiple interactions to understand what was occurring across sequences of talk. I found it necessary to look at strings of interaction to recognize patterns. Was a frame clash a single occurrence or were there multiple occurrences? Did discursive patterns become visible when multiple turns were analyzed? What did those patterns indicate about how the teacher and coach were making sense of their conversation?

My theoretical framework was also informed by conversation analysis, derived from ethnomethodology (Sacks, et al., 1974). Conversation analysis (CA) allowed me to systematically, empirically investigate classroom and coaching talk-in-interaction. By following sequences of talk as threads of adjacency pairings to investigate what was being meaningfully performed with each turn, I was able to theorize about the social relationships and the meaning co-constructed through discursive interactions. I selected

particular prosodic features that assisted me in interpreting lexical choices to understand

what was happening when I spoke with the teachers or the teachers spoke with their

students. These features included latching, when one speaker begins to talk immediately

after the other without a pause, backchanneling, when speakers do not take a turn but

rather express agreement or disagreement with what a speaker has to say, repetitions,

pauses, hesitations, and overlapping speech.[19]

Employing conversation analysis methodologies, I discovered that both the coach

and a teacher invoked a linguistic pattern based on sequences of conditional turns known

as I-R-E (initiation, response, evaluation) first recognized in English classroom interaction

by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and shortly thereafter, by Mehan (1979) in United States'

---

[19] For example, in this excerpt from the coaching conference with Ms. East, the equals signs indicate latching and the brackets indicate overlapping speech. Repetition is evident when Ms. East utters "babies" simultaneously with me. The abundance of latching and overlapping speech in this excerpt indicated increased interest, importance or urgency on the part of the speakers. As an analyst, I paid particular attention to what was happening in such interactions, reading them as especially meaningful for the speakers at that particular time. Considering this excerpt in the context of the broader conversation, what might I theorize is occurring? Are we in the same frame? Are there signs of alignment? How would I know? I relied on conversation analysis to assist my transcription of talk and to provide interpretative clues as to meaning and the building of social relationships.

      S: But the reason they stay out of alignment (pointing at the transcript lines)
             Is because=
      Ms E: =It's something they already [know (nodding)
      S: [they're feeling less than=
      Ms E: =right
             Ummm=
      S: =so
             It's not that you praise them falsely
      Ms E: Umhm
      S: But you've positioned them as=
      Ms E: =fourth grade
      S: =you've positioned them as [babies
      Ms E: [babies

classrooms. I-R-E classroom discourse patterns have positive and negative consequences

for teachers and students and as the results chapters will demonstrate, they also have

positive and negative consequences for the coach as well. During reading lessons, the I-R-

E pattern helped the teacher focus students on information the teacher thought they should

learn. The same pattern also limited student options for responding to teacher questions

and narrowed opportunities for making sense of the teacher's instruction. For the coach, I-

R-E's became a default pattern of discourse, naturalized by years of classroom teaching.

The coach, unaware of her discursive choices in-the-moment, invoked I-R-E patterns

when her sense of professionalism was threatened. The coach's strong belief about best

teaching for students led to an emotional appeal that unconsciously relied on teacher-to-

teacher, familiar discourse patterns. Further, the coach's appeal included sermonic

qualities, all in an effort to persuade the teacher to shift her instructional practices.

Conversation analysis made these otherwise invisible and naturalized interactions

available for interrogation.

Politeness Theory

Speaking and listening are reflexively related in an ecology of mutual influence (Erickson, 2004, p. 4)

According to microethnographer Fred Erickson (2004), interaction is social

because each conversational participant adjusts his/her discourse in response to the other

in the immediate moment and in consideration of moments just past. While Erickson drew

from developments in linguistics and anthropology to study classroom interactions in his

seminal early work (Erickson, 1977), complementary developments were occurring in

linguistic studies of social interaction. Crediting the work of ethnomethodologists who

preceded them, and the theories of social organization attributed to Erving Goffman,

Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1978) theorized universal principles of social

interaction. As renowned originator of Interactional Sociolinguistics, John Gumperz

(1992) wrote in the introduction of their seminal book, *Politeness: Some universals in

language usage*, "Politeness...is basic to the production of social order, and a precondition

of human cooperation" (viii). Brown and Levinson's work on politeness, since qualified in

relation to issues of cultural difference,[20] gave added strength to my theoretical

framework. According to their work, there are two kinds of face, called face wants. One

kind of face is positive. It represents the desire for approval. The other kind of face is

negative. It represents the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions (p. 13). Brown and

Levinson theorized how people in social interaction manage threats to their face or the

face of others. They also theorized bald faced threats, those threats that directly accuse or

challenge during a conversation. Face threats (FTA's) are central to my project because the

work of coaching challenges established norms of teaching and collegial interaction. The

premise behind coaching is that a teacher can improve her instruction to increase student

learning and a coach will show her how. The proposition is fraught from the outset, with

coaches and teachers frequently in asymmetrical positions--the coach often having more

status than the teacher and the teacher put in a deficit position--with something lacking in

her approach to teaching. How face threats are managed during the course of the coaching

conversations or during the teachers' classroom instruction is salient to understanding what

---

[20] Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978/1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
In the introduction to the 1987 edition, John Gumperz acknowledges that since the first edition, the researchers now accept that not all cultures invoke politeness in the same ways.

73

meaning to attribute to the social relationship being built by students and teacher or teacher and coach.

Microethnography

      1   The conduct of talk in local social interaction as it occurs in real time is unique, crafted by local social actors for the specific situation of its use in the moment of its uttering and

      2   the conduct of talk in local social interaction is profoundly influenced by processes that occur beyond the temporal and spatial horizon of the immediate occasion of interaction (Erickson, 2004, p. viii).

Erickson defines microethnography as "[E]thnographic microanalysis of social interaction" (2004, p. viii) and describes a paradox or tension between social interaction carried out by agentive participants in real time and the accumulation of communicative experiences over a lifetime that play into conversations in-the-moment. Local conversations are at once responsive to immediate interactions and simultaneously informed, consciously or not, by social worlds that predate the interaction of the moment. When participants speak, they bring with them prior experiences with the world that shape and reshape their language-in-use as they respond to one another. Implicit in microethnography is the understanding that local and global influences impact social interaction. Erickson calls this shifting "from a social microscope to a social telescope" (2004, p. 16). Conversations are situated in time, within social institutions, historical events, and ideologies at the same time that they are co-constructed in-the-moment. As a theoretical construct, understanding that conversations are both local and global, reflecting prior experiences and situated in multiple contexts over time enabled me to ask what a teacher or student meant by a given utterance, wondering not just about the literal meaning but also, about the social and historical experience of the speaker that would inform her

74

meaning. Given that I came to the coaching conversation with a different set of experiences and beliefs from the teachers I coached, adopting a microethnographic perspective provided me with the understanding that people speak from prior experiences and part of my goal as coach was to attempt to make sense of why a teacher would embrace certain beliefs or practices. When I experienced a frame clash during a coaching conversation or when I thought that a teacher might be experiencing a clash, I found these moments to be productive for further study in the post hoc analysis.

As applied specifically to classrooms, a microethnographic approach has revealed how language use changed and was changed through teacher-student face-to-face communication and how those communications extended over time to create common understandings in the classroom culture. Rather than an inert physical space in which students and teacher are located, classrooms are viewed as cultures where language and social relations constitute and are constitutive of particular social practices, knowledge building, and ways of being (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Wetherell, Taylor, & Yates, 2001). David Bloome and colleagues (2005) described classrooms as "cultural sites where children and adults enact a series of cultural practices including "doing school," "doing lesson," doing classroom reading and writing," and "doing learning" (p. 51). I borrowed the microethnographic approach from Bloome et al. of identifying the cultural practices of the classrooms I observed in order to learn what was meant by reading or writing. From there, I was able to investigate how language was used during reading and writing (Bloome, et al., 2005). I reasoned that by studying the language that constructed the classroom's cultural practices I would be able to illustrate

through transcripts or video to the teachers I coached how language shaped what was available to learn.

The importance of a microethnographic lens for understanding normative classroom practices, viewed as successive, redundant, discursive practices, can be seen in an interaction from Ms. East's eighth grade summer school class. The students and teacher were at odds over what it meant to do school. The teacher wanted to impress upon the students that they had to take school seriously and work hard because there was a lot of competition in the world. If they did not work hard enough, others would leave them behind. In an effort to make her point relevant to her urban students, the teacher reminded them of a movie called "Pride," about two competitive swim teams, one black and poor, the other, white and privileged. Ms. East wanted to make her point in a way her rebellious students would hear. To demonstrate solidarity with her African American students and to gain their attention for a story that dealt with race and competition, Ms. East spoke in an urban dialect rather than a more formal teacher register.

> Black kids thought they were the best swimmers but they were only competing against themselves. There's a bigger world out there than right here. Rude awakening when they competed against whites in suburbs. You're lookin at just here where you are. I'm telling you there are other people working hard to be the best. Kids thought they were all that. I'm not specifically talking to you—don't miss my point. Kids got backsides beat. Total embarrassment. Back on the bus—kids clowned—didn't understand the big picture. Kids kept laughin and clownin—missed the point—Kids didn't think how to improve. I see a lot of that going on in here. This is a bigger world. When you leave this classroom I hope everybody will graduate and get a diploma. Even McDonald's won't hire kids without a high school diploma. You need to take your education seriously. You need to say what am I going to do differently. Once their coach talked to them the kids thought of how to get themselves together. Calling out individual kids who think they're all of that. There's been times when I wish I could go back. When I sat in the back of the classroom I didn't learn as much.

76

How did the students respond to this lecture? They were silent. They looked at the teacher with expressions that suggested they were listening. However, the same behaviors that prompted the lecture in the first place continued day after day accompanied by additional lectures or reprimands. Whatever the teacher meant to convey to the students, was not taken up in the way she intended. The students continued to act out. There is no way to know whether in the long term the teacher's message had an impact on individual students. However, in the short term, for the remainder of the summer, the teacher's and the students' expectations for social behavior were out of alignment.

Had only the lecture been analyzed, without the context of ethnographic data, it might have been construed as an effective teaching tool. According to some extant criteria for effective teaching, the teacher's lecture utilized student centered material. The teacher used a popular movie to illustrate what it would take for her students to be successful. However, in the context of weeks of interactions, over the course of the summer, such lectures did not alter the pervasive tense interactions between teacher and students. When viewed as a discourse practice meant to improve her students' desire to succeed academically, the teacher's lecture was observed to be ineffective. As part of my theoretical framework, I approached classrooms as cultural and social sites in which interactions have meaning as they are constructed over time. My analyses were not limited to one-time events. Rather, what it meant to do school in these classrooms emerged as a consequence of discursive patterns established over time (e.g., Bloome, et al., 2005; Rex, 2006a, 2006b)

Positioning Theory

Another discourse analysis tradition that informed my framework for this study came from positioning theory (Davies & Harré 1990). Through our interactions we position and are positioned in various consequential ways. Davies and Harré theorized that selves are multiple, not fixed, and are constituted through successive interactions that foreground some selves and background others depending on how one wants to be perceived and how others choose to recognize the person in question. Whether the context involves professional development encounters or classroom contexts, learning is at stake if the self one chooses to put forward is not recognized over time.

The reading of the transcript excerpt below illustrates the applications of this concept in this study. A first reading observes that as Ms. West (W) is teaching the meaning of vocabulary words to students, she calls out Ray and Ana for not sitting up (lines 24 and 25). One could surmise that she did so because these two students were exhibiting behaviors that countered the behavioral norms she expected in her classroom. In her interaction with Amar that follows (lines 26-34), we can observe a different response to student behavior. In what he says and when and how he says it Amar presents himself as a learner and a class contributor and Ms. West recognizes both of those selves. Amar had waited his turn and provided an appropriate answer to her question. His answer likening the word "trace" to the work of a forensic scientist, went beyond what might be expected for a youngster going into fourth grade, though at the time, crime shows filled many TV hours and likely accounted for the sophisticated vocabulary choice. Ms. West publicly acknowledged Amar's competence by calling on him to help Sharyl and by evaluating his response as "good."

The theoretical construct predicts that over time, as Ms. West and her students continued the same patterns of behavior and interaction, the selves they intended to put forth would become recognizable. That is, if the teacher continued to respond negatively to the two girls' behaviors, others in the class might also come to recognize the girls' as challengers of class norms or resistant to school learning. The same could be said of Amar. If, over time, he continued to offer knowledgeable answers and the teacher continued to turn to him to help others, Amar could come to be recognized as the class thinker or a class leader.

1	W: Our next word is draw.
2	And it's not the kind of draw like you draw a picture.
3	Dani?
4	D: (unintelligible)
5	W: Oh that's pretty good.
6	When you pull something out of a container.
7	But we're going to talk about a different kind of draw.
8	So she said there is the draw like you draw a picture.
9	There's a draw like you draw something or pull something
10	out of a container.
11	Sharyl?
12	Sh: (unintelligible)
13	Students: (correct Sharyl)
14	W: That's one we talked about yesterday and that one was trace.
15	Now tell us about the trace?
16	Sh: (unintelligible)
17	W: And what's gonna happen when they get back over the line?
18	Sh: (no response)
19	W: I like the detective part of it.
20	Okay
21	Finish helping her out with the trace
22	If we were to trace something
23	And it's not like when we trace a picture
24	Uh sit up, Ray.
25	Sit up Ana.
26	Umm Amar.
27	A: (unintelligible)
28	W: Oh okay
29	What do you mean so
30	Help us out with her detective story

31	What if a detective was tracing something?
32	A: (unintelligible) like a forensic scientist.
33	W: Oh yeah
34	Good.

In this classroom interaction, Sharyl was positioned socially as a student who needed help. This happened three times in the space of a few utterances, once when other students stepped in unasked to clarify for Sharyl (line 13), again, when the teacher asked others in the class to help her (line 21), and a third time when the teacher asked Amar to assist (line 30). Sharyl's responses reinforced this positioning when she unsuccessfully responded to Ms. West's first question and then said nothing in response to her second question (lines 16-18). When others recognize students in particular ways, classmates and teacher come to expect that student will participate in the same way during classroom lessons over the course of the term. The consequences for students of redundant negative and positive social positioning are powerful. In this instance, opportunities for learning became limited when a student was continually positioned as needing help. During the coaching conference, the teacher and coach discussed ways to reposition Sharyl through the teacher's discursive choices. Discourse analysis that drew upon a view of discourse as positioning, as constructing social selves, and as being consequential over time were well suited to reveal and disrupt one of Ms. West's teaching practices.

Discursive Psychology

Discursive psychology investigates discourse in naturally occurring every day and institutional social interactions as an alternative to cognitive approaches in the social sciences that emphasize experimentation and questionnaires. Discursive psychology studies talk and text, borrowing principles and methodologies from conversation analysis,

to study how language performs in different contexts (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). From the tradition of discursive psychology I borrowed the notion of stake and stake innoculation (Potter, 1996). People in a conversation have a stake or vested interest in some way. When a coach works to develop a relationship with a teacher to facilitate access to that teacher's classroom and future collaborative learning interactions, what is at stake for the coach is her ability to do her job. A coach cannot be effective if she is unable to negotiate access to a teacher. The coach's reputation is on the line or at stake each time she attempts to engage a teacher in conversation. If a teacher is apprehensive about being judged by a coach she may reject the coach's advances. At stake for the teacher is her sense of professional competence and how she is perceived by her colleagues. Is her teaching less accomplished than her peers if she needs someone to coach her? According to Potter, some interest is at stake in interactions. When speakers want to divert attention away from their stake in the conversation, when they want their version of events to predominate, they can invoke what Potter terms, stake innoculation. It is a way of managing one's stake so as to seem as though there is no self interest. An example of stake innoculation occurred when Ms. East first saw her lesson transcript and noted its length and recognized that she had been criticized before for talking too long at her students. Too offset potential criticism, she innoculated her stake in the interpretation of the lesson transcript. Before the coach could offer an interpretation, Ms. East acknowledged that she was well aware of talking too much but she had a reason for that, implying that because she had a reason for her talk time she was justified in doing so. Through stake innoculation, Ms. East attempted to manage a potential face threat critiquing her teacher

81

talk time. Her stake innoculation was effective. The coach was unable to critique her

practice and instead had to turn to other issues.

Power

As invoked by Ms. East, stake innoculation is one way to maintain power when

face threats occur. Ms. East circulated power, her freedom to act without restriction, away

from the coach. She did so by preventing the coach from critiquing her talk time. This

action limited the coach's freedom of action in ways that had consequences for the coach's

sense of professionalism and limited opportunities for the coach and teacher to explore

this aspect of instruction. This phenomenon will be addressed in greater detail in the

results chapters. Here, in my theoretical framework, I conceptualize power as an aspect of

in-the-moment social interaction that moves back and forth from speaker to speaker in

response to speakers' and listeners' contingent tactics for managing social equilibrium.

Social equilibrium is at stake throughout conversations as speakers and listeners attempt to

communicate without offending the other person while at the same time, protecting their

own stake in the conversation. Often, the stakes are different for speakers and listeners.

Balancing one's self-interest while considering the face needs of others in-the-moment is a

communicative dance. Negotiating threats to face, implied and overt, are part of social

interaction. How speakers and hearers manage those threats implicates exchanges in the

speaker's experience of being powerful. The locus of power can be said to move in

relation to speakers' sense of themselves and the other in the conversation.

According to a transcript excerpt in Rainville and Jones (2008, p. 441), power was

at the center of a conflict between a teacher and coach. The coach wanted the teacher to

learn more about assessing young readers. The teacher was concerned about the amount of

time such assessment would take given all he had to do. In Rainville and Jones' example the coach was intimidated by this particular teacher who held strong beliefs about literacy assessment and had worked with a researcher in the field, which lent credibility to his views. The teacher rejected the coach's attempt to work alongside him and told the coach to help finish the assessment process at the other table so they could each take half the class and complete the task sooner. The teacher was powerful in this conversation. The coach's actions were restricted by the teacher's directive. In the example exchange, the coach was unable to fulfill her responsibilities. She was confronted with a form of resistance based on the teacher's self-interest.

Resolving Disagreements through Power, Politeness, and Positioning

In my theoretical framework, politeness and power worked together to sustain conversations. Miriam Locher's scholarship (2004) demonstrated for me that power becomes observable in disagreements when power and politeness work in tandem to make visible the relational work needed to resolve clashes and "maintain social equilibrium" (p. 99).

> Power is…expressed through language…cannot be explained without contextualization…is relational, dynamic and contestable. The interconnectedness of language and society can also be seen in the display of power. Freedom of action is needed to exercise power. The restriction of an interactant's action-environment often leads to the exercise of power. The exercise of power involves a latent conflict[21] and clash of interests which can be obscured because of a society's ideologies. The exercise of power is often accompanied by displays of unmarked or positively marked relational work in order to maintain the social equilibrium and to negotiate identities (p. 101).

---

[21] Locher uses the terms latent and emergent networks (after Watts 1991) to describe the negotiation of power within an interaction. "Interactants will carry over their status and power from one encounter to the next. These links are latent. In the emergent network, however, the interactants can contest and negotiate their respective positions" (2004 p.28).

Locher takes the view that one has power to accomplish one's goals when one's freedom of action is unimpeded. In a report of our research (Rex and Schiller 2005) Lesley Rex and I analyzed teacher disagreement during one particularly fraught professional development day through the lens of power and politeness. Power was defined after Max Weber (1947) as, "the desired state for an individual…the probability that a person will be in a position to carry out her own will though there may be resistance." Following Locher, we agreed that "[a]ll group members needed to experience "freedom of action" (Watts, 1991), to sense that they could freely achieve the goals they set for themselves." The self-interests of participants are at stake during disagreements and it is through the negotiation of those interests that power becomes visible.

Power, in this sense, is about the freedom to have one's self recognized by others, the power to speak without embarrassment, the power to share one's point of view without fear of retribution. Power is an essential construct in discourse analysis because it is so integrally connected to social stability. The restriction of one's power by others often leads to face threats (Brown & Levinson, 1978/1987). Further, face wants, met when participants in a group feel recognized and efficacious, are always in play during interactions.

According to Locher (2004) all discourse "consist[s] of a content and a relational aspect" (p. 51). The content aspect of discourse is about "achieving things" which implicates power in order to get things done. The relational aspect is complicated because "[e]very utterance contains information about the speaker, the addressee and the present situation" (p. 51). Further, relational aspects are continually recreated through interaction. It is through relational work or face work that power can be exercised politely. According

84

to Brown and Levinson, negative face is "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others…positive face [is] the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" (1987; 62). When teachers and students and teachers and coaches come from different worlds and bring a myriad of prior experiences, beliefs, and values into the classroom or the coaching context with them, face-threatening-acts (FTAs) are unavoidable. How face threats are repaired and negotiated is of concern to discourse analysts studying learning interaction with implications for how we recognize one another and sustain social stability. In relational work, face needs are important to maintain for the participants to consider the interaction successful.

The example below, selected to illustrate the circulation of power, politeness, and positioning was chosen because the exercise of power was not overt. During coaching conversations, there is often a status differential between the teacher and the coach. One way the coach invokes her power is by reserving the right to critique the teacher's instructional practice. In this interaction, the coach used her power to notice and name the teacher's instructional practices, but she did so in a positive way, intended to position Ms. West as an effective teacher. Power and politeness work together toward the end of a difficult conference to re-establish the teacher's sense of professional competence. Further, when the coach moved to position Ms. West in a positive light, Ms. West felt comfortable enough to risk reflecting on the writing conference in a way that would support her growth as a writing teacher.

In earlier parts of the coaching conference, when the coach set Ms. West up for critique and face threats, Ms. West was not forthcoming with ways she wanted to improve her practice. Only when the coach genuinely complimented Ms. West's teaching

decisions, did the teacher talk about changes she would make. In doing so, Ms. West credits the coach for the new ideas about teaching writing (lines 22-25). She accepted new learning, giving power back to the coach. Notice the coach's move (lines 26-27), when the coach circulates power back to Ms. West by crediting her with insight into working with another student. Power and politeness moved back and forth through positioning to sustain social equilibrium and move the conference forward.

1	LC: Such rapport
2	And you're teasing her
3	And that made them feel comfortable
4	It was very relaxed and very easy
5	Very friendly
6	And the fact that Pamela could come back to you
7	Your patience with Pamela was great
8	You kept going back and back and back
9	Giving her a little bit
10	Going back again
11	And uh
12	You gave her an opportunity to be successful
13	That was really nice.
14	W: Yeah. I do see some things that I would like to uh
15	Work on.
16	Like you say it's to let her get past this one part
17	and let her go on to another part. (referring to conferring with Pamela— how she focused on coaching Pamela for clarity but she might try letting Pamela get all her thoughts on paper and then go back to clarify and work on conventions.)
18	And I did that kinda sorta with the thing where she went on to say that
19	Dani wants to be a fashion designer.
20	People think she's mean but she's nice.
21	To give her a chance to do that,
22	but I think I should have given her more opportunities for that
23	versus like you say,
24	just asking a question and just notice something was not right with the
25	paper.
26	LC: And that goes back to Sharyl's piece, too.
27	So you're helping me analyze this a little better, too.
28	W: Yeah.

Where power underlies all interactions, to have power is to have the freedom to act, the freedom to be seen as the person we choose to present in a given moment. Classroom and coaching contexts are fraught with risk-taking. In a complex negotiation of self and other recognition interactants both position and are positioned (Harré & Van Langenhove, 1999). Power and politeness work together to construct positionings negotiated in and through interactions. These interactions over time have implications not just for one's sense of self and sense of accomplishment but also for differential access (Rex, 2006a, 2006b).

In the following illustrative monologue, after talking with the coach, Ms. East reflected on her lesson and decided that she should have moved her class more quickly through the anticipatory set lesson and started the reading sooner.

> As I'm looking at this now, we should have gotten into the reading by now. Gotten really into the lesson. Then maybe at the end of that particular chapter, then we have an assessment or a review with questions at the end. It could have, should have been more independent work. It was too much of me. As I look at this now, it was too much of my talking, too much of, which I have no problem engaging with the kids. That's wonderful. Those things could have been shorter. Okay. And more reading. More discussion of the actual lesson. And that's probably, that's where I fell short.

Ms. East positioned herself as a teacher who "fell short" of the standard. She recognized she needed to improve her lesson pacing and focus. The coach, though pleased that Ms. East acknowledged an area of need, did not want Ms. East to feel inadequate as a teacher. Thus, the coach, in a politeness move intended to soften the threat to Ms. East's face, responded, "I wouldn't call it falling short. I would just say that's one thing that you can really see when you're looking at the transcript." To maintain social equilibrium, both coach and teacher exchanged power and politeness moves to position one another in safe

ways that moved the conversation forward. When the coach said the teacher did not fall short, she exercised the power to reframe the teacher's self-critique. However, the coach did not completely exonerate the teacher, because she told her that what the teacher described could be seen in the transcript. Therefore, it was accurate to say that the lesson needed to move forward more quickly. It was just that the way the teacher framed her actions as, "falling short" was an unnecessarily sharp critique.

In this instance, Ms. East continued a pattern of strong self-critique that, throughout the coaching conference, left the coach in the position of not wanting to cause more injury to the teacher. Therefore, Ms. East's stinging personal rebuke served to inoculate her from the coach's critique. She repeatedly criticized herself before the coach could, leaving the coach with a need to soften Ms. East's face threatening acts (FTA's). Thus, this example serves to complicate notions of positioning. We position others and ourselves, but the reasons we position and the effects of that positioning vary greatly.

<h1 style="text-align:center">CHAPTER IV: METHODOLOGY</h1>

> *Researchers are charged with both demonstrating their orientation with respect to the phenomena under study **and** their capacity to "bracket" their standpoint…"* (Josselson, 2004, p. 12).

Accounting for the Challenges and Complications of Studying One's Own Interactions

In his book, *The Trouble with Ed Schools* (2004), David Labaree writes that "like teachers, researchers build on their own experience in important ways that gradually accumulate into individual professional biographies and these biographies exert a powerful personal impact on the kinds of work they pursue" (101). In my case, Labaree's statement resonates strongly. My professional biography has shaped the research work I pursue, grounding that work in practical applications of actual teaching dilemmas. The circumstances of my schooling and my simultaneous working life necessitated research that informed and was informed by my lived experience. Given my circumstances, I consciously set out to be a bridge person or boundary spanner, bringing together the worlds of K-12 education with university scholarship. As a boundary spanner, I have evolved from someone who could talk about practice to someone who has a scholarly language for talking about practice and is conscious of the benefits derived from that scholarly language.

Nonetheless, the challenges and complications of researching one's own interactions are substantial. It was difficult to separate myself as a coach from myself as a researcher. When I research drawing upon scholarly language, methods, and theory, I

also draw upon my experience and knowledge of the teaching world I inhabit. However, I attempted to bracket my personas in order to be cognizant of what I, as coach, recognized and what I, as researcher with analytical tools at my disposal in hindsight was able to see. In this chapter I report on what I did as a researcher to analyze my literacy coaching. I begin with ways I attempted to strengthen the trustworthiness of this study to address the methodological challenges and complications of a self-study.

Strengthening the Trustworthiness of the Study

Being a teacher researcher of my own coaching practice necessitated a certain kind of awareness of how this complicated the study. Throughout, I have attempted to distinguish my lay knowledge of discourse as a literacy coach from that of my researcher's scholarly knowledge. One advantage to this self-study is that I am aware of what I, as literacy coach, knew prior to more formal, scholarly study of discursive interaction. This reflexivity increases the probability that I will be able to separate my understandings as a coach from my understandings as a researcher. I mark my early knowledge of discourse as beginning with an advanced institute sponsored by my writing project site, the Michigan Classroom Discourse Group (MCDiG). By reviewing the agendas and the readings from those sessions, all of which I had saved, I was able to reconstruct where I first learned of particular discursive concepts. Through MCDiG, I came to understand the power of transcripts to make visible classroom negotiations. I learned about frame clashes (Agar, 1994) and big D discourses (Gee, 1999) that shape what is available to see and say. I came to understand how ethnographic work could reveal micro-interactions that helped explain how people made sense of their lived

experiences. That MCDiGian perspective informed my interactions as a literacy coach with each teacher during the coaching conferences.

As a result of my MCDiG experience, as a literacy coach, I knew some things but not others. For example, I knew very little about theory underpinning discourse analysis constructs. Neither did I understand how to systematically research and align theory and methodology to address specific research questions. Though my knowledge of discourse analysis prior to graduate school was scant it was possibly not unlike the knowledge of other literacy coaches or teacher researchers of today. Literacy coaches today have opportunities to study discourse thanks to publications that share what once was the domain solely of university scholars (Cazden, 2001; Johnston, 2004; Rainville & Jones, 2008; Rex & Schiller, 2009). It is not unlikely that today, a literacy coach might have some understanding of teacher discourse patterns, such as Initiation-Response-Evaluation or Feedback questions (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Wells, 1993) or ways in which coaches can position themselves with regard to teachers in particular contexts or situations (Rainville & Jones, 2008) . These discourse analysis constructs have been written about for the lay audience. Thus it is possible that other literacy coaches who did not have the benefit of a MCDiGian study group, might still have understandings about discourse similar to my own understandings prior to graduate school. It is possible that other literacy coaches might engage with teachers in ways similar to some of the ways in which I coached the two teachers in this study. However, in order to report on the methodology I employed as a researcher to understand how the coach and teachers interacted, I have attempted to distinguish my lay knowledge of discourse as a literacy coach from that of my researcher's scholarly knowledge. By distancing myself from my

own interactions, separating what I understood as a literacy coach from my methodology as a researcher, I am better able to support resulting analytical claims.

The recognition that maintaining sufficient distance from my own interactions was a challenge to the trustworthiness of this study led me to build cross-checks into the study. The methodology was designed in such a way that categories and interactions were analyzed using a constant-comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This permitted transparency as well as a strategically organized plan for data analysis. Further, claims based on the data were substantially warranted. I refrained from high inference conclusions and remained grounded in those discursive interactions that accounted for interpretations.

I recognized that transcription itself is a form of interpretation. I held myself accountable by using the extensive video files as further cross-checks on the validity of interpretation. The video allowed me to see and hear all of my interactions with each teacher as we viewed classroom tapes of her practice. One can hear clearly what is happening on the tapes of classroom practice while watching coach and teacher interactions with one another and with the classroom tapes. In this way, the duality of the videotape of our interviews offers another cross-check on transcription interpretations.

Further, I did my best to be aware of the importance of reflexivity. I attempted throughout to disclose my role, background, and perspectives that might influence this study. Finally, a complication during data analysis was that the interviews were a co-construction of meaning between the coach and the teacher. The design of this study took advantage of that co-construction by applying discourse analysis theory and methods to study how I interacted with each teacher. I wanted to know what it was in the way the

teachers and I talked that afforded or closed off learning opportunities. Toward that end, the logic of inquiry is presented as clearly as possible, closely aligning theory and method. I carefully supported any assertions with data and took into account any discrepant data.

Study Design

The complications of studying my own practice were further complicated by the study design. I designed this study to work at a scale in which I could spend weeks at a time closely observing two African American teachers who taught in different urban schools. The necessity for this design derives from the nature of literacy coaching and the discursive approach I aimed to pursue relevant to the data corpus. First, I will explain these further design complications related to literacy coaching. Then I will address how the nature of discourse analysis also influenced and complicated the design of the study.

Part of a literacy coach's job is to figure out what areas of a teacher's practice could benefit from coaching. Then the coach has to determine how best to address those areas of need with a particular teacher. In order to make such determinations, a literacy coach usually has to spend time with a given teacher while s/he is instructing students before the coach is able to identify teacher needs and offer alternative approaches. The more time a coach is able to spend in a teacher's classroom, the more likely the coach is to recognize recurrent patterns of practice that are counterproductive to student learning. Often, literacy coaches are on site and are in a position to encounter teachers in and out of their classrooms over time. Since I was not on staff but rather, a researcher coming from outside of the school district, I wanted to design the study so I could compensate for the time an on-site coach might have to interact with a teacher in order to provide appropriate support. Thus, I designed the study to enable me to be a participant observer in each of

93

the teachers' classrooms over five consecutive weeks during which I took field notes, collected artifacts of teaching, and video and audio taped in each classroom.[22]

The second reason the study design was complicated was due to the nature of studying a teacher's discursive interactions in the classroom. In order to identify patterns of discourse, single or isolated visits have the potential to mislead the researcher. I wanted to know, how does the teacher talk with her students during which types of activities? How does the teacher's talk change with changes in purpose or activity? How do students respond to the teacher's discursive patterns in a range of activities? How does the teacher, in turn, respond to the students and with what effect? These are not questions that can be answered based on a few observations. To understand the range of classroom activities, a researcher has to be present to witness classroom routines or activities repeated frequently enough to enable the researcher to identify discourse patterns. Classroom teaching involves many different activities, such as teaching reading or writing, answering questions, class discussions, helping individual students, handling behavior problems, doing board work etc. Thus, it was important to extend the time the researcher spent in the classrooms in order to gather data on a range of classroom practices. Together, the nature of literacy coaching and the nature of investigating discursive phenomena required an extended study of each classroom teacher's instructional practice.

---

[22] In addition, three days were spent in one teacher's classroom during the school year when she was teaching in her usual elementary school position. These additional days were intended to contrast with her middle school summer teaching. The teacher was uncomfortable with her summer school experience and appreciated the opportunity to share her teaching during the regular school year with students she normally taught.

Once the classroom data was collected and analyzed, I held a separate coaching conversation with each teacher to share the patterns that emerged from my analysis. These patterns were shared with the teachers via videotape and/or transcripts during one three-hour interview per teacher. During the interview, I pointed out topics and patterns in their instruction that related to discursive constructs. After both coaching conversations were completed, I conducted a retrospective analysis of the videotape filmed during both coaching conversations. With each step in the process, new questions emerged. How does the coach prepare for the coaching interaction? During the coaching conversation how do the teachers' and the coach co-construct understandings of discourse analysis for the purpose of understanding the teacher's classroom talk? In a retrospective analysis of my own coaching, what discourse analytical tools did I use to analyze my effectiveness as a coach? These questions guided the data analysis that led to the results reported in this study.

Context of the Study: Conner Public Schools

Conner Public Schools is a small, urban, African American district in the metro Detroit area. Median income is below state averages with 19.5% of the population below the poverty line. Unemployment is substantially higher than the rest of the state. High debt and low test scores led to a state take-over of the school district in 2002. At the time, Edison Schools, a for-profit school management company, ran the district. In 2005, no longer working with Edison and released from state control, the district re-invented itself under the leadership of a highly regarded superintendent. Previously, the majority of students who lived in the city opted to attend private or charter schools rather than attend the public schools. The new superintendent visited every church within the six mile city

radius and rallied public support for the schools. He started academies, brought in staff developers to work with the teachers, and concentrated on raising student test scores. Within two years, enrollment increased from 1200 to 2300 students, eliminating district deficits. Test scores were on the rise. Building repair was scheduled and new teachers were being hired from other urban declining districts.

The superintendent was one year into his reforms when I contacted him with my research proposal. We knew each other professionally and I was confident he would fully support my study in his district. Though I did not ask him to, he personally selected the two teachers for my study based on their strengths with students. Of one, he said, "The kids will do anything for her." While each teacher agreed to participate in the study, they were both aware that I knew the superintendent and that he had recommended them.

The Teachers: Ms. West

The teachers the superintendent recommended taught in different buildings in the district and had different areas of experience and expertise. Both agreed to participate in the study which was to take place during summer school. They had taught summer school previously and were already planning on teaching it the summer of this study.

Ms. West was an African American middle-aged teacher. During the regular school year of the study, she was teaching math to special education middle school students. In the summer, she taught math and language arts to incoming fourth graders. I observed only her language arts classes because I traveled to the middle school right after language arts to observe Ms. East.

Ms. West was well-liked by her students. They complimented her on her clothes, fussed with her hair, hung around her desk, and behaved according to the norms she

96

established in class. She was fair and consistent with the students and liked to joke and talk with the students. She asked them if they were feeling okay and spoke privately to any student who misbehaved. Students were allowed to sit on blankets or desks. She played bulletin board games with them around turning in homework and learning spelling words. She taught them a physical clapping and movement game to help them memorize their basic math facts. However, there were no books in the classroom. The school library was closed. The only reading that occurred was from short stories read aloud daily from student workbooks. These were followed by literal, short answer questions. Most of the talk related to these stories was about vocabulary words because the stories were condensed versions of literary classics such as Tom Sawyer or stories of presidents long ago and the language was unfamiliar to the students.

Twice during the summer, students were asked to write stories. Most of the remaining language arts class time was spent on reading workbook stories. Ms. West interacted very differently with the students during story writing time. She talked to each student individually rather than address the whole class as she did during reading. At times, she helped students figure out how to get their thoughts on paper. Other times, she encouraged or complimented students about their writing. Her discourse during writing was in stark contrast to her discourse during reading. Reading was frontal teaching focused on vocabulary and getting the right answer from the text. Writing was unique to each individual, involved conferring, and an acceptance of student ideas.

The Teachers: Ms. East

Though her superintendent told me he recommended Ms. East because the "kids would do anything for her," Ms. East's strengths as a teacher were overwhelmed by last

minute unexpected summer school student and course assignments. Her assignment was a middle school study skills class. She had never taught the middle school study skills classes before and she was concerned about duplicating the language arts curriculum the teacher next door was instructing. Further, she received her teaching assignment for summer school two days before and without materials or a curriculum, she struggled to design viable content for the class. Her default position was to focus on test preparation. At first students appeared bored but were still willing to do as the teacher requested. However, when the same instruction occurred too often, students began to rebel against test-taking strategies such as finding the author's purpose or identifying the main idea of a passage.

Unfortunately, the content of the course was not the only problem. Ms. East was in the habit of repeating directions and talking at students for long periods of time. When students resisted or mocked her talk, she resorted to lengthy lectures that only served to increase the distance between her and her summer school students. Her teaching discomfort during the summer classes was why I agreed to visit her fourth grade class during the regular school year. This way I could observe her in a more comfortable teaching environment. Ms. East was confident that if I observed her teaching her fourth grade academy class, I would see her teaching to her strength and view her as a more successful teacher.

Her fourth grade class was part of a wing of the elementary school dedicated as an academy. Students wore uniforms with white shirts and red blazers. They had passed a test to get into the academy and were segregated from the rest of the school. Contrary to Ms. East's expectations, the analysis of my observations at the academy reinforced many

of the same discursive patterns evidenced in Ms. East's practice during the summer. The curriculum was still low level based on discrete skills. The students identified subjects and verbs or complete and incomplete sentences and did not write more than a sentence at a time. The teacher controlled whole class discourse and talked at length giving directions. Group work was limited to finding correct answers. I did not observe extended reading or writing or discussion when I visited her advanced fourth grade class though I recognized that it was possible that other activities took place when I was not present. Most students appeared to enjoy her class. Behavior problems were minimal. And in contrast to her summer school teacher-student interactions, Ms. East complimented her fourth graders telling them how smart they were.

When I observed in both teachers' classrooms, I was concerned about the heavy emphasis on test prep curricula. Here were two teachers trying to do the best they could for their students but in the context of high stakes tests and pressure to succeed on those tests. They were teaching in a district that recently was released from state control. Rising or falling test scores could mean the difference between district autonomy or a return to outside governance. Under these conditions, the teachers focused their instruction on content they thought might influence how well students did on state tests.

Why this site? Why these teachers?

When it came time to identify a district in which to conduct my research, I was aware of some of the history of Connor Public Schools. I knew about their state takeover and their subsequent release from state control. I had some ideas about the student population: that the majority of students came from lower income families and most were African American. I selected Connor Public Schools as the site for my study primarily for

three reasons. From a pragmatic perspective, I needed a site outside of the county I served as a literacy consultant in order to avoid any perception of a conflict of interest. I knew the new Connor superintendent professionally and was hearing positive news about the changes he had implemented in his first year. That would give me entrée to the district. Further, I wanted to locate my work in an underserved district where teachers were less likely to have experienced sustained, high quality professional development. My reasoning follows.

Some of the teachers I worked with in more affluent districts were the beneficiaries of years of learning communities, enlightened leadership, extensive resources such as classroom libraries and technology, and county support. These teachers would have welcomed my presence. I assumed, based on prior experiences, that they would be receptive to discursive approaches to understanding classroom interaction. Further, they would have a professional knowledge base and often, a stance as a teacher researcher that would make sharing my analysis with them easy. Discourse analysis would be viewed as a next step in their ongoing professional growth. Our conversation would likely be at a high level in terms of current practice in English/language arts and implementing change in their practice would be something they were used to and comfortable doing.

If I was to understand the affordances and constraints of discursive methods and theory related to literacy coaching, I believed collaborating with teachers who had fewer professional learning opportunities would give me a more realistic picture in relation to teachers in general. I also wanted to support teachers who taught in under-resourced districts and who taught students who were often marginalized in our society. I believed

that improving teacher knowledge and practice improved student learning. I hoped by helping Connor teachers re-see their practice in light of DA approaches, their students would be the beneficiaries.

Summary of the Data Collected

The data corpus consists of video and audiotape, field notes, and classroom artifacts collected during summer school plus three days during the regular school year. I spent five weeks in each classroom, one hour and a half each day, videotaping the language arts class taught by Ms. West and five weeks, four days per week, videotaping Ms. East's sixth and eighth grade study skills classes. Every Friday the students played organized games outside facilitated by a different teacher. Therefore, I did not videotape in Ms. East's classroom on Fridays. In addition to a few informal conversations with the teachers either at the beginning or end of classes, documented in my fieldnotes, I also videotaped three additional days during the fall and winter in Ms. East's fourth grade class. After the data collection was completed, I interviewed both Ms. East and Ms. West. I shared videotape and/or transcripts of their summer classes and in Ms. East's case, her school year class as well. Each interview lasted three hours. The charts below indicate the content of the data corpus.

4.1 Data Corpus Chart Ms. East

Summer School *June-July, 2007 Ms. East Grades 6 and 8 Study Skills*	1120 minutes or 18.5 hours of videotape and audiotape over five weeks	83 pages of Field Notes	Student Artifacts: assignments, workbook pages
3 Classroom Observations *Grade 4 October, 2008*	360 minutes or 4 hours of videotape and	19 pages of Field Notes	Student Artifacts: assignments, workbook

to January, 2009	**audiotape over 3 days**		**pages**
Interview *Ms. East March, 2008*	**180 minutes or 3 hours of videotape and audiotape**		

4.2 Data Corpus Chart Ms. West

Summer School *June-July, 2007* *Ms. West* *Grade 4* *Language Arts*	**2,250 minutes or 37.5 hours of videotape and audiotape over five weeks**	**210 pages of Field Notes**	**Student Artifacts: assignments, workbook pages**
Interview *Ms. West March, 2008*	**180 minutes or 3 hours of videotape and audiotape**		

I did not analyze all the data collected. Ms. West had a substitute for one of the five weeks. She had enrolled in a graduate class that overlapped with her summer school responsibilities and told her students she would be "vacating the premises" for a week. While I did videotape and take field notes as usual, when I analyzed the data, I did not include the week she was absent. The same substitute stepped in for Ms. East one day. Again, I videotaped and took field notes as usual but did not analyze that day in preparation for the coaching conference that would follow my classroom observations.

Approaches to Data Analysis

The units of analysis for this study are the interactions between teacher and students and the coach and teacher. They are drawn from 1) my preparation for two teacher-coach interviews and 2) the interaction between me and two teachers during their coaching sessions. The data analysis approaches are threefold: first, a thematic analysis (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995) was conducted of the data collected in both teachers' classrooms prior to the coaching conversations. The purpose was to identify areas of concern that would merit further analysis before and after the coaching discussions. The thematic analysis was a first round of data analysis intended to identify broad trends in the data corpus that could organize subsequent analyses under ordinate categories. Second, a content analysis identified interactional events (Bloome, et al., 2005) that took place prior to and during the coaching conversations. What did the teacher and students and the teacher and coach talk about? How did they talk about the topics? This led me to analyze each interactional sequence to determine both the content of the interaction and the dominant discursive constructs. Third, a discursive analysis was performed to determine the nature of the talk between teacher and students and coach and teacher. This analytical sequence was applied to both the preparation for the coaching conference and the teacher-coach conversation during the coaching conference.

Two overarching analytical approaches served to organize and highlight the data. One approach was the thematic analysis and the other was the notion of classrooms as cultural sites comprised of routine practices. The thematic analysis (Emerson, et al., 1995) of the interactional events (Bloome, et al., 2005) identified in the classroom field notes foregrounded issues of concern to take up with the teachers. Three interconnected

themes appeared to recur throughout the classroom data. The first theme considered ways in which teacher discourse influenced student opportunities to learn. The second theme considered ways in which the teacher's interpretation of curriculum influenced student learning opportunities. The third theme recognized teacher-student tension in both classrooms and wondered if that tension could be influenced by teacher discourse patterns and teacher curricular enactments.

By separating the data into general themes, frame clashes within those themes were easier to notice (Agar, 1994). The frame clashes marked fraught interactions when the teacher, student, or coach was caught by surprise when a response was not what was expected. Identifying frame clashes within the themes made visible interactional events that could illustrate fraught patterns of discourse and make them available for further interrogation. The second productive approach to making sense of the data was the conceptualization of each classroom as a cultural site (Bloome, et al., 2005). As theorized by Bloome and colleagues, each classroom has its own culture with routine practices that can be discursively analyzed. As with frame clashes, identifying the routine practices that comprised the world of the classroom afforded another lens through which to isolate repeated events and study their discursive patterns, particularly in the preconference analysis as that was the stage when classroom routines were analyzed.

By identifying frame clashes and routine classroom practices recurring discourse patterns became visible. These repeated discursive patterns appeared in the teacher-student talk as well as the coach-teacher conversation. The following key discursive patterns dominated the data. First, the exercise of power and politeness (Locher, 2004; Rex & Schiller, 2009) was continuous throughout the data and asked, who controlled the

104

talk, in what ways, and how was politeness exercised to save face for the interactants? A

second DA construct was that of recognition. Were speakers recognized in ways they

intended? Did listeners acknowledge the self the speaker wanted to project? Who we are

and how we choose to be recognized accounted for many of the interactions in the data.

Third, the patterns of talk that co-constructed classroom routines (Cazden, 2001; Mehan,

1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Wells, 1993) influenced what was available to be

learned and who the learners could be. Fourth, asking what it meant to reason, read,

write, or talk in a classroom (Bloome, et al., 2005) surfaced complicated issues of what

teachers teach and what is worth learning. Were students learning what teachers thought

they were teaching? Asking what was privileged in the talk and tasks students were asked

to perform uncovered unexamined biases and personal theories of learning with

consequences for students (Fairclough, 1989). Fifth, throughout the interactions, both

classroom and coaching conference, participants positioned themselves and one another

as they protected their sense of professional competence and tried to save face, their own

and others' (Harré & Van Langenhove, 1999). Thus, these five recurring discursive

constructs afforded insight into understanding the interactions between the literacy coach

and the teachers.

This study is a "telling case" (Mitchell, 1983, 1984)[23] evolving new

understandings about the selection, application and consequences of particular discourse

analysis approaches applied to literacy coaching conferences. The intent was to make

visible via two teacher-coach case studies what discourse analysis theories and methods

---

[23] Ethnographer J. Mitchell (1984) first conceptualized a telling case as one that is not
typical or representative but rather one that makes visible theoretical relationships. In this
study, by focusing on two particular cases it is possible for the study to "tell" something
about the discursive interactions of a coach and two teachers.

were suitable for what purposes in these coaching contexts. The overarching aim of the study was to explore the potential of discourse analysis approaches to inform coaches and teachers as they co-constructed new visions of productive classroom interaction.

THE DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS

Stage I: Data Corpus Selection Process

As a researcher, I began by asking, how were the teachers teaching before the coaching conference? To answer this question I began by rereading my field notes and my analytical notes derived from my field notes (Emerson, et al., 1995; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). As I read, I coded the notes according to thematic issues that recurred throughout the data. This thematic analysis yielded three categories of issues that emerged from the data: 1) how did the teachers and students talk together? 2) how did the enacted curriculum influence student learning? and 3) how was tension in both classrooms influenced by teacher-student discourse and curriculum? As a literacy coach preparing for a coaching conversation, I surmised that times when teacher discourse dominated class activities, opportunities for student learning were constrained. As coach, it also appeared to me that narrow conceptions of curriculum seemed to limit student opportunities to reason logically with intellectual depth. Further, as a coach, it appeared to me that a significant source of classroom tension was associated with both teacher dominated discourse and an intellectually weak classroom curriculum. When I returned to the data as a researcher, my coach's inferences seemed to be affirmed. I discerned that both case study teachers used patterns of discourse that limited interaction with their students during whole class activities. The scarcity of extended talk with students made this a possible topic of conversation during the coaching conference. Where curriculum

was concerned, both case study teachers appeared to have narrow notions of what they were teaching. Most instruction was rote or limited to test preparation. Further, I noticed overt and covert tension between the teachers and their students and wondered about the relationship between teacher talk, curriculum, and teacher-student tension.

These thematic areas of focus shaped the next questions to be addressed and led to a more fine grained analysis. How did the teachers and students talk with one another? What was the nature of their discursive interactions with students prior to the coaching conference? In order to identify discursive patterns in the teachers' talk, I approached the classrooms as cultural sites (Bloome, et al., 2005) that have particular ways of enacting routines. Both of the case study teachers had ways of doing reading and ways of doing writing that had consequences for students. I read through my field notes to determine each teacher's culturally embedded classroom routines. Both teachers shared the following routines though they were enacted differently in each classroom: connecting school and home worlds, giving directions, establishing rules and procedures, following rules, asking questions, teaching reading, sharing personal stories, teaching writing, giving reprimands, giving compliments, teaching to the test, teaching from workbooks, allowing students to teach, checking homework, connecting personally with students, giving grades, conferring with students, and timing lessons.

Once the classroom routines were identified in the field notes, the analysis shifted to the video archive. How were the teachers and students talking during these routine practices? What patterns of talk interfered with learning and what patterns of talk supported learning? What I discovered were patterns of talk related to some of the cultural practices but some cultural practices were not associated with specific discursive

patterns of interaction. Also, while some discursive patterns were detrimental to student learning, other discursive patterns promoted learning. Further, where particular patterns of discourse marked one teacher's cultural practice, such as teaching reading, the other teacher had discursive patterns that emerged in a different cultural practice, such as giving directions.

Having identified those cultural practices that were marked by recurrent discursive patterns of interaction, my next step was to analyze the language used during those recurring patterns. What meaning was co-constructed during teacher-student interactions? Were frame clashes (Agar, 1994) evident, moments when the teacher expected one reaction but was taken aback by an unexpected student reaction? I noted the same phenomenon for students as well. Where were interactions when communication appeared to break down, when the student expected one reaction but was caught off guard by an unanticipated response? These moments were transcribed for more in-depth analysis. Further, representative samples of interaction for each of the recurring discourse patterns embedded in classroom cultural practices were identified, transcribed, and analyzed.

By analyzing the interactions of the preconference data, I confirmed that as coach, I had identified illustrations of productive and unproductive discourse patterns for each teacher[24] and that the illustrative patterns I selected were significant aspects of each

---

[24] My decisions as coach of what video clips to share with the teachers were based on whether or not the clips illustrated the areas of concern identified in the thematic foci. In addition, decisions of what to share or not during the coaching conversation were also based on considerations of face. Along with sharing problematic illustrations of practice, I also wanted to share positive illustrations of practice. As coach, I wanted both teachers to recognize their strengths as well as their areas of need. Further, examples were selected that could serve as foils for one another. If a practice was

teacher's practice and would provide viable topics for discussion during the later

coaching conversations. Additional analysis indicated that several discursive constructs

were continually represented among the data: the concepts of power and the circulation

of power, face wants, questioning patterns, positioning students, and recognition. These

discourse analysis constructs came into play repeatedly as the most robust ways of

describing what was happening in the video clips selected to be shared with the teachers.

In all, 36 iMovie clips were prepared for the coaching conference with Ms. East and 22

iMovie clips were prepared for Ms. West. (See appendices A and B for a complete listing

of the iMovie clips.)[25]

There were more video clips for Ms. East in part because I spent more time in her

classrooms. Ms. West was absent for one summer school week and I spent three

additional days in Ms. East's classroom during the school year. That is the equivalent of

seven additional days in Ms. East's classroom. However, there was no analytical

significance to the difference in number of iMovie clips for each teacher. Some clips

were shorter; others were longer. The video clips ranged from thirty seconds to just over

eighteen minutes, showing a teaching interaction from start to finish. Depending on the

---

counterproductive, I wanted to find evidence from the data corpus of a similar productive
practice. Not only would such an example bolster a teacher's sense of professionalism,
but it would also demonstrate how she could and had accomplished the desired practice.

[25] Brief labels identify the iMovies. When labeling the video clips sometimes
discourse analysis terms were most descriptive of the interaction. Other times a reminder
of the activity itself offered a clue as to the nature of the interaction. However, with so
many clips from which to choose, the labels needed to convey a sense of the issue at hand
thematically and/or discursively. I did not limit the labeling of video clips to only
discourse analysis terms or only thematically identifiable terms. Examples included: IRE
sequence-student/teacher alignment, circulating power-negotiating meaning, or power,
face, or getting an education.

109

type of interaction, the length of the clip varied. For example, a clip showing a teacher asking a question and receiving a brief response could be half a minute in length. However, a clip showing an open-ended classroom discussion could go on for eighteen minutes. The interactions were uncut so the coach and teacher could see how the interactions began and how they ended. An ending meant moving to another subject or activity and closing out the interaction displayed on the tape (Bloome, et al., 2005; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992)

Adapting transcription notation from Jefferson (Atkinson & Heritage, 1999), I created eight transcripts for potential use during the conference with Ms. East. The transcripts focused on issues of alignment and dissonance. Where were the moments where the teacher and students were working together and where were the moments when teacher and students were working against one another? Only three transcription conventions were used in the transcripts so as not to confuse the teacher who had never seen a transcript of her own talk before.

4.3 Transcription Conventions

[	Simultaneous talk
=	Latching on of talk
xx	Unintelligible talk

I transcribed a fourth grade reading lesson in its entirety from the audio when the videotape failed to record that lesson. The other seven transcripts illustrated the thematic foci. However, the middle school interactions were particularly fraught and as coach, I decided to begin the conference with transcripts to distance Ms. East from face threatening interactions. (See Appendix C for a complete list of transcripts prepared for the coaching conversation.) With Ms. West, the classroom interactions were less fraught and I selected video clips in lieu of transcripts.

Analyzing the Coaching Conference: Ms. East

Next I analyzed the actual coaching conferences with the two teachers. First I transcribed each conference. Then I analyzed the transcripts to examine what was said during the coaching conference to observe how the teacher and coach negotiated the challenge of working to improve practice. The first step in analyzing the transcripts involved identifying each topic of discursive interaction. An interaction began with a new topic and ended when another topic of conversation was raised. In this manner, I divided Ms. West's coaching conference transcript into twenty topical sequences. Ms. East's coaching conference was divided into twelve topical sequences. This step prompted the next question for analysis: What was happening discursively during these interactions in terms of the theories of discourse I was invoking?

In the case of Ms. East, six recurring discursive constructs were identified: recognition, positioning, power, politeness, teacher talk time, and worlds. To explain how I am using each construct, I will provide an example and comment on each construct drawn from the transcript of Ms. East's coaching conference.

The title I gave to the following interactional event was Ten: Eighth Grade Recognition, Face Threats, and Repair. In this context, Ms. East and I were reading and discussing a transcript from her eighth grade summer school class. In the transcript, the teacher and students were out of alignment. Both were angry. The students were angry because they believed their teacher, Ms. East, was teaching them material they already knew. Ms. East started the lesson by saying, "This is something you should have learned in fourth grade. You should already know…fourth, third grade. Author's purpose." The transcript shows that both Ms. East and S, the coach, agreed that the students were out of

alignment because they believed the lesson was something they had already learned. As

coach, I take the interpretation further, saying, "they're feeling less than." Again I extend

the interpretation and in a bald face threat says to Ms. East, "You've positioned them as

babies." Ms. East appears to recognize that she positioned her students not as eighth

graders, but as fourth graders. Note the latching at "fourth grade" that accounts for my

interpretation of Ms. East's meaning.

<pre>
        LC: But the reason they stay out of alignment (pointing at the transcript
               lines)
               Is because=
        Ms E: =It's something they already [know (nodding)
        LC: [they're feeling less than=
        Ms E: =right
               Ummm=
        LC: =so
               It's not that you praise them falsely
        Ms E: Umhm
        LC: But you've positioned them as=
        Ms E: =fourth grade
        LC: =you've positioned them as [babies
        Ms E: [babies
</pre>

Though this is a brief excerpt out of a much longer interactional event, it

demonstrates that power is working in several ways. During the classroom lesson, Ms.

East asserted her power as teacher to name the grade level of the eighth grade lesson. The

coach asserted her power as coach to label what the teacher did as positioning students as

babies. The students asserted power when they complained to the teacher about the

lesson. The students wanted to be recognized as eighth graders, older, not younger

students. The teacher was upset because the students challenged her authority as teacher.

Both cases invoked issues of recognition. I challenged the teacher's sense of self as a

competent professional when I told Ms. East that she positioned the students as babies.

Politeness moves are barely perceptible in this excerpt although the latching between me

and the teacher could indicate understanding and possibly alignment with me on the part of the teacher. However, in later parts of this interactional event politeness moves are evident as I recognized the bald face threat I made to the teacher, "You've positioned them as babies" and tried to make amends.

> LC: That's why I don't recommend those classes for anybody anytime ever.
> And so that's not your doing
> Per se
> Ms E: Unhuh
> LC: It's the whole skills class=
> Ms E: =umhm
> LC: I mean
> That's

In this interaction, I try to take the burden of responsibility off of the teacher for providing a low level skills class that implicitly demeans the students. I intend to repair the face threat about treating students as babies. To do so, I blame the type of class the teacher was required to teach in an effort to re-establish social equilibrium, stability in the relationship between me and the teacher. My intent was to circulate power back to the teacher as a way to make amends for the bald face threat.

In this exchange, four of the six discursive constructs that appeared repeatedly in the data are present. The prevalence of the issue of teacher talk time and the notion of worlds are illustrated in the following examples from Ms. East's coaching transcript and are elaborated in greater detail in the results chapters. Aware that talk time was an issue for her, Ms. East brought it up before I could address it. This confirmed my coach's assertion that teacher dominated talk probably interfered with learning in Ms. East's classroom. However, as will be explained later, the teacher and I did not agree on what to do about the concern.

Ms. East and I disagreed again when we had a long discussion about how Ms. East had students point to others in class to select partners. I repeatedly questioned Ms. East about her approach to partner selection. We appeared to be at an impasse on this issue. Ms. East wanted her students to be independent and deal with the consequences of what seemed to me to be a harsh selection process in which student feelings could be easily hurt. While not explicitly stated, the worlds of coach and teacher seemed to be different. Ms. East came from a blue collar world of work where a boss watched and evaluated your performance and where having a paying job was of primary importance. I came from a middle class world where higher education was an expectation. I envisioned education as societal empowerment and life enrichment. The idea that students would feel isolated as a result of a teacher designed partner selection process left me wondering if this approach was in the best interests of the students? Both of us had reasons for our beliefs. We came from different social worlds where success and what it took to be successful in society resulted in divergent views.

Such divergence of worlds occurred between Ms. East and her students when she tried to relate to their worlds and lectured the students on the importance of competing in a white world. The students resisted her characterization of them as poor students who, unless they changed their academic aspirations and work ethic would be unable to succeed in a world that favors those who are prepared, work hard, and have financial advantages. The worlds we attribute to others are assumed but not always agreed upon. Who we are, where we come from, and how our experiences shape our perspectives reflect the worlds in which we live and the assumptions we make about others. Throughout the data, divergent notions of worlds elicited frame clashes.

Ms. East's Tally Chart

The tally chart helps to illustrate how, in the ways the teacher and I talked together, we enacted seminal discursive constructs. The chart illuminated the dominant discursive patterns. Having analyzed the data and having discovered six recurrent discourse related patterns in twelve topical sequences, rather than analyze each of them separately, I needed a way to select those interactions that encompassed the greatest number of discursive constructs. By tallying up the number of times within each interaction the six constructs appeared, I was able to identify specific interactions for a more detailed analysis.

4.4 Ms. East's Interactions Tally Listed by DA Construct

Totals	Interactions	Recognition	Positioning	Power	Politeness	Discourse Patterns: IRE or Guess What I'm Thinking—Teacher Talk Time	Worlds
4	I	✓	✓		✓	✓	
3	II			✓	✓	✓	
3	III		✓	✓	✓		
2	IV	✓	✓				
3	V	✓	✓	✓			✓
2	VI	✓				✓	
5	VII	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
3	VIII	✓			✓	✓	
6	IX	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4	X	✓	✓	✓	✓		
5	XI	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
3	XII		✓	✓	✓		
Totals		9	9	7	9	6	4

Ms. East's tally indicates the prevalence of the six headers of discursive constructs found throughout the coaching conversation. (A complete listing of Ms. East's interactions is found in Appendix D.) The tally makes visible how Ms. East and the coach

negotiated the interactions. According to the tally chart, the interaction that includes all six discursive constructs is number nine. This tally was a first step in determining which interactions to analyze in depth. What was happening during that particular interaction? In what ways were those constructs salient? Another question the tally chart raised is how power, politeness, and positioning influenced recognition? Their incidences are spread fairly evenly across the construct headings. How were these constructs enacted during the coaching conference?

Analyzing the Coaching Conference: Ms. West

I followed the same approach to analyze Ms. West's coaching conference interactions that I followed to analyze Ms. East's coaching conference interactions. There were twenty topical sequences in Ms. West's coaching conference transcript. Again I asked, what was happening discursively during these interactions in terms of the theories of discourse I was invoking? In the case of Ms. West, the following recurring discursive constructs were identified: power, positioning and recognition, Worlds--home/school literacies, a curriculum of meaning and reasoning, and directed versus dialogic discourse patterns. These constructs are similar to those identified in Ms. East's coaching conference. However, there are some differences. To explain how I am using each construct, I will provide an example and comment on each construct drawn from the transcript of Ms. West's coaching conference. Interaction number 10 included all of the listed discursive constructs. Therefore, I will draw upon that instance to illustrate how I am referring to these recurring constructs.

In the excerpt below titled *It's Okay Not to Know: Ms. West Reflects on Her Practice*, Ms. West tries to make sense of dialogic discourse as she enacted it

116

inadvertently during one of her class lessons. Ms. West and I had just watched a video

clip of Ms. West having an authentic, open-ended discussion with her students as the

class and teacher tried to learn more together about football. I shared the video clip

hoping it would illustrate for Ms. West how to move from teaching as telling, a more

directed discourse, to teaching as discussion and meaning making, a more dialogic

discourse.

29	Ms. West: I do want them to be comfortable with the wrong answer.
30	And um so I guess
31	That's what I'm doing here too but just in a different way.
32	*(Video clip resumes)*
33	Coach: Do you see what happened?
34	The kids were now talking to each other.
35	If we can create a dialogue that is exchanged around the room
36	It's sort of like you can think of it like the
37	power is kind of circulating around the room.
38	People speaking up who have answers.
39	Who doesn't have answers.
40	And people are trying to question each other
41	Those kids
42	I mean they're not shown on the screen
43	But you can hear how they're talking to each other
44	And you're listening in as a participant.
45	Ms. West: Okay.
46	Coach: You're not listening in here as an authority.
47	Look how you're leaning into the kids.
48	And how you're really trying to make sense and make meaning
49	of it.
50	Ms. West: Okay.
51	Coach: They can see that.
52	Wow.
53	Ms. West: This is so amazing.
54	Cause I'm not paying attention to it.
55	Like I say it's not
56	Coach: You're doing it.
57	Ms. West: It's not intentional
58	Coach: But now
59	Ms. West: Now I will be.

If we analyze this excerpt from the perspective of power, positioning, recognition, and discourse patterns the following becomes apparent. First, the topic itself is about creating more open-ended discussion opportunities in the classroom. Ms. West wants to position her students in ways that allow them to ask questions. She wants them to know they do not always have to be correct (lines 1-3). As coach, I explained how power was circulating around the classroom when Ms. West facilitated more open-ended dialogue (lines 5-20). I attempted to recognize Ms. West as an effective professional who competently led meaningful class discussions (line 27). Ms. West appeared to recognize herself as a teacher who can intentionally facilitate rich class discussions (line 30).

The construct of worlds is implicit in this exchange and elaborated on in greater detail later in the transcript. Part of the reason Ms.West wanted students to know it is acceptable to be wrong is because she wanted to show them respect. At another point in the transcript, Ms. West decried those teachers who made children fearful and obedient. She believed that children should be treated as adults, with respect, and should like being in school. However, Ms. West had difficulty connecting the social-emotional needs of students with their academic needs. Therefore, she did not recognize the home literacies the children brought to school creating a disconnect between the worlds of school and home. For example, when students brought chapter books to read or shared stories of parents staying up late at night to complete their own schoolwork, Ms. West did not know how to capitalize on those events to promote literacy in the classroom and make a strong connection between school and home literacies.

Implicit in this interpretation of worlds is a dual meaning. Worlds points to physical spaces, such as homes and schools, in which we go about our daily lives.

However, worlds also refers to our experiences, values, and beliefs that shape our perceptions. Ms. West came to her beliefs about how children should be treated in school because of her personal experience with a friend's disabled child and how that child was treated by others. Thus, Ms. West's school interactions were shaped by prior experiences that influenced her beliefs and values and predisposed her to respect and honor students in her classroom.

Ms. West's Tally Chart

Ms. West's tally indicates the prevalence of the four headers of discursive constructs found throughout the coaching conversation. (A complete listing of Ms. West's interactions is found in Appendix E.). According to the tally chart, the interaction that includes all four discursive constructs is number ten. As with Ms. East, this tally was a first step in determining which interactions to analyze in depth. What was happening during that particular interaction? In what ways were those constructs salient? How were those constructs enacted during the coaching conference?

4.5 Ms. West Interactions Tally Listed by DA Construct

Totals	Interactions	Power	Positioning and Recognition	Worlds—Home/School Literacies	A Curriculum Of Meaning/ Reasoning	Discourse Patterns: IRE vs Open-ended Interactions
3	I	✓	✓	✓		
2	II	✓	✓			
2	III	✓	✓			
2	IV	✓	✓			
3	V	✓			✓	✓
1	VI		✓			
3	VII	✓			✓	✓
1	VIII					✓
4	IX		✓	✓	✓	✓
5	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4	XI		✓	✓	✓	✓
3	XII		✓		✓	✓
2	XIII			✓		✓
2	XIV				✓	✓
2	XV			✓	✓	✓
1	XVI		✓			
3	XVII		✓	✓	✓	
2	XVIII		✓	✓		
1	XIX	✓				
2	XX			✓	✓	
Totals		**8**	**12**	**9**	**10**	**10**

In the case of Ms. West, there were more segments of interaction than there were

for Ms. East. (A complete listing of Ms. West's interactions is found in Appendix E.)

Many were of shorter duration. The tally also points out that issues of positioning occurred

most frequently throughout the coaching conference. How did positioning work during the

conference? While the constructs for Ms. East and Ms. West are not identical, they are

closely related. Ms. West's tally includes a curriculum of meaning/reasoning, a heading

that is not a discursive construct commensurate with the other headings but a heading that

depended on discursive constructs in order to become visible. Recognizing the cultural

practices in a classroom, what it means to do school or to read or to write reflects a

teacher's beliefs and values based on experiences. Narrow conceptions of curriculum that limited learning opportunities was a thematic focus reflective of both classrooms and as such, was accorded its own heading: A Curriculum of Meaning/Reasoning. The reason it only shows up in Ms. West's tally chart is because Ms. East's coaching conversation never discussed curriculum. Ms. East's conversation focused mostly on lengthy talk and classroom control issues.

I now wondered whether all of the discursive constructs were equally viable. Which constructs were most robust when it came to understanding coaching and discourse analysis? To answer the questions raised by the tally charts, I returned to the coaching conference transcripts and the thematic foci.

Returning to the Thematic Foci: A Second Stage Analysis

Now that both conferences were completed, I wanted to return to the organizing themes to see if they applied during the conversations. I laid out each coaching conference transcript on a chart divided by interactional events as identified in the tally charts. Then, I coded each interaction depending on what theme it represented. All of the interactional sequences related to one or more themes increasing the trustworthiness of the original thematic foci. Then I asked, what can be seen from studying each of these interactions? This was a cross-check on the original tally charts where the initial analysis was less extensive than this next stage of investigation. To illustrate how these analytic tables operated to inform the data analysis, I insert and explain one portion of a table below.

4.6 Analytical Table

Thematic Focus: How did the enacted curriculum influence student learning?	During the coaching conversation: What the coach and teacher said while viewing the video clip.	Analytical memos
Fourth Grade November Video **Types of Sentences—Group Reporting** **Punctuation focused, not meaning focused.** "These animals are curious, but they move very slowly." *Take away the comma and the "but" to have two simple sentences.* No discussion of what each simple sentence means and how that meaning could determine whether to keep the sentences together or separate them. When the student read, "These animals are serious…" the teacher response was, "What makes this a compound sentence?" "Serious" does not make sense in that sentence. However, meaning was not questioned. The focus was on correct punctuation, not meaning.	LC: Do you see how you're I saw you pulling it together at the end You're positioning them as being successful and that makes a big difference (watch video—Ms E laughs through it) so that's that one anything you're thinking or wondering Ms E: (laughs) No I was thinking I just love Ari I think he does an awesome job speaking out I just love how they work together LC: Umhm Ms E: As a team And uh I was just pleased with this group And this kid her	Using positioning again. That appears to be key with Ms E. How she positions her middle school students in comparison to how she positions her elementary students is part of why she had difficulty—but only part. Talk, curriculum, and tension work in tandem. I like that the coach asked for her thinking. I notice I did not mention the punctuation focused, not meaning focused work. I went right on to the next clip. This segment is after the transcripts that were fraught and filled with face threats. At this point, I assume I've said enough. Now let's see what was taken up.

There are several benefits to the researcher by laying out the transcripts in this format. First of all, the format demonstrated that the interactional events all linked to one or more of the thematic foci. I reflected on prior transcripts shared during the coaching conference and how they were filled with face threats and surmised that when I coached I did not want to take up another fraught example of practice at the moment represented in the transcript above. As a researcher, I distanced myself from the interactions to study my coaching decisions along with the teacher's discursive interactions. In so doing, I took a more critical stance toward my coaching actions and intentions, noting alternatives, missed opportunities and different interpretations of interactions.

By reviewing the data from multiple lenses via analytical memos, first the thematic foci, then the coach's decisions, actions, and interactions, and third, the researcher's analytical perspective, patterns in the data emerged with greater clarity. It became possible to see a more nuanced significance of worlds. One meaning was where the teachers and coach and teachers and students shaped and were shaped by their values, beliefs, and experiences related to schooling (Johnstone, 2007). Worlds came to embody how teachers as well as the coach were socialized into their families, their neighborhoods, their schools and churches. Those experiences were then translated into decisions and actions in their classrooms. While not always visible, both teachers and I justified our instructional approaches and the ways in which we interacted with students and adults. Those justifications often alluded to our upbringing and social history. The second meaning of worlds in the charts was to convey the link or lack of a link between home and school literacies. Sharyley Brice Heath (1983) established that different races, cultures, and classes use literacy in different ways for different purposes. She found that depending on the ways in which literacy was culturally enacted had advantages and disadvantages for student access to school learning. Could part of the explanation for a skills-based orientation to curriculum be derived from the teachers' upbringing? Did teaching to the test account for only a portion of the curricular decisions made in both classrooms?

Another aspect of the data that became more transparent through this analysis was the difficulty I, as coach, had recognizing in-the-moment opportunities to influence the direction of the conference. My missed opportunities created dissonance in the data analysis. What was happening during the coaching conversation that made it so difficult for me to support teacher learning? This question led the researcher back into the data to

123

search for answers. That search for further answers led to a micro-analysis of one particularly fraught interaction that at the time of the conference, as identified in the Researcher Tables, did not appear problematic when I was coaching. A retrospective analysis of a nearly unnoticed frame clash created the analytical opportunity to study my discourse as a coach. The transcript demonstrated that the same discursive constructs found in the tally charts were at work in my discourse. Thus, the series of analytical approaches beginning with thematic foci, followed by content analysis, and ending with discursive analysis, made the invisible visible and addressed the orienting question: How does a coach of teachers in a professional development situation make use of discourse analytic tools?

Complications in the Study Design and Execution

One of the dilemmas of working in an urban district under stress is that often, many initiatives occur simultaneously. The press to improve under state and federal mandates does not leave time for the luxury of addressing one area and then moving on to another area of need. After my study received district approval, the Coalition of Essential Schools in Michigan was hired to consult with the district. That staff development work started slowly in the elementary school just before the summer of taping. That work did not involve Ms. West. It did involve Ms. East.

However, Ms. West and Ms. East both received staff development from Lorraine Monroe, a Chicago teacher known for her success with urban youth. Ms. West explained at some length during her interviews the learning that took place in relation to Lorraine Monroe. However, this is more a matter of disclosure than a concern for the validity of the

124

study. This staff development influenced the teachers just as any other teaching experience influenced their practice and did not relate to the study's research questions.

Another unforeseen limitation was that the teachers were teaching out of their subject or grade level expertise during summer school. The teachers and I were under the impression that they would be teaching elementary language arts classes. I expected the teachers to both be English/language arts teachers. It turned out that Ms. West was a middle school special education mathematics teacher during the school year and Ms. East taught fourth graders all subjects including English/language arts in a select academy during the year. When the summer school assignments were released the Friday before classes started, with only a weekend to prepare, the teachers found they were teaching outside of their comfort zones. Ms. West was teaching fourth grade language arts and math. Ms. East was teaching middle school study skills to sixth, seventh, and eighth graders. There were no materials for Ms. East's summer classes. Ms. West was provided with workbooks. From one angle, this could be seen as a coach's worst nightmare. From another angle, there would likely be issues for the coach to address.

A third complication was the length of time between summer school and the coaching conference or interview. I had not expected to spend additional time during the school year in the teachers' classrooms. But Ms. East's summer school teaching embarrassed her and she was glad to have a chance to demonstrate her teaching skill in her regular position during the school year. Not all the dates Ms. East and I selected worked out. The data collection was extended through January due to assemblies, field trips, and inservice for Ms. East. With February for data analysis, I did not meet with both teachers for our follow up conversation until March. I could have proceeded with Ms. West's

conference and not waited until I completed data collection for Ms. East. But I chose to proceed at the same pace with both teachers and therefore, waited until all the data was collected and analyzed before conferring at length with the teachers.

There were pro's and con's to this lengthy delay. Under the circumstances, by distancing the teachers from the actual instruction, it allowed us to analyze the data together from a less personal, bird's eye view. In turn, this may have helped to soften inevitable face threats. In Ms. East's case, her fraught summer teaching did not showcase her teaching skill. Perhaps time helped her heal and gave her space to reconcile some of the more challenging interactions. The con's were that in an actual coaching situation, a coach and teacher would see each other more frequently to work on issues in practice and the time lapse would not have been so great. As it was, the coaching conferences did not take place until March.

Conclusion

By laying out my methodological logic of inquiry, I have attempted to address challenges to the trust and veracity of this self-study. How could I bracket what I did as a coach from what I did as a researcher? I addressed the challenges of a self-study through built-in cross-checks in methods, multiple levels of analysis, and attention to reflexivity. The combination of approaches made my coaching interactions visible and available for interrogation. The study design is reflected in the three results chapters that follow in that they are organized by the phases of the coaching conference: preparation for the coaching conference, the coaching conference itself, and the retrospective conference analysis.

CHAPTER V: RESULTS
PREPARATION FOR THE COACHING CONFERENCE

Earlier, I conceptualized the coaching conference as more than the immediate teacher-coach interaction. Based on typical descriptions of coaching interactions as well as my own experience in this study, I found that the coach often visits a teacher's classroom to observe or model, then meets with the teacher to discuss the observation and then plans ways to follow up with the teacher. This tripartite format helped me recognize ways in which my work as a literacy coach varied when I prepared for the conference, interacted during the actual teacher-coach conversation, and reflected post-conference on what occurred during the interview that would have implications for future encounters. By separating each stage it became easier to see what approaches were or were not productive at different points in the coaching conference. Further, the research literature has yet to study the coaching conference in ways that make visible the decisions a literacy coach faces and how those decisions impact and are impacted by subsequent interactions. Dividing the coaching conference into three phases offered a way to name and make visible previously unrecognized coaching conference stages. This chapter and the two following will address the results from each part of the coaching conference.

PREPARING FOR THE COACHING CONFERENCE

My analysis of the coaching conference preparation found that I addressed four areas of concern. First, I reviewed the data I had collected from observations, artifacts,

127

and conversations with each teacher. Second, I identified the themes or pressing issues evident in the data that I planned to share with the teacher. Third, I had to decide what data would best illustrate the issues I planned to present during the coaching conversation. Finally, I imagined in advance ways in which to share that information that would promote a successful conference. With so little written about what the literacy coach does to prepare for the coaching conversation, naming and explaining four layers of preparation and illustrating how to do the work entailed in those layers of preparation, offers guidance to other literacy coaches.

How I Used DA Approaches to Prepare for the Coaching Conference

To explain the process of preparing for each teacher's coaching conference I will clarify why I chose some classroom discourse interactions but not others and how I went about making those decisions. Further, I will explain how I determined the discourse analysis approaches I planned to share with the teachers.

Throughout the time spent in each teacher's classroom, I collected video and audiotape, student work, notes from conversations with each teacher, and notes I took during the observations. Periodically, I reread my notes and wrote brief memos to myself to remind me of something that occurred that I wanted to reflect on or to jot down my thoughts while they were fresh in my mind. Taken together, this collection formed my data corpus. As I reviewed this data corpus I thought about the classrooms as cultural sites. By that I mean that each classroom had routine practices that offered insight into what was acceptable to do and say under what circumstances and with what consequences. What did it mean to do school in each classroom? How did the teachers and students talk when it came to learning to read or write?

I began by listing all the cultural practices I noticed in each classroom, for example, checking homework, doing reading, doing writing, conferring, giving directions, asking and answering questions, reprimanding a student(s). In a recursive process, I returned to my notes taken during my classroom observations and identified multiple instances of each routine all the while asking myself how language was used to accomplish goals. I returned to the video collection with my notes as a guide to help me identify all the instances of each cultural practice. Then I analyzed the way language was used during each practice paying careful attention to patterns that emerged.

Reviewing the Data and Determining Recurring Themes

I noticed both Ms. East and Ms. West used language in ways that I believed limited student options for response. When directing whole class reading lessons, Ms. West would continually ask known answer questions. These are questions where the teacher has in mind a particular answer and wants to determine whether the students know that answer. There are times when quizzing students to see if they learned a particular term or concept may assist the teacher with further instructional decisions. Did the students understand what she was trying to teach? Does she need to re-teach a particular concept? However, when asking known answer questions is the sole discourse pattern during whole class reading lessons, student opportunities to generate thinking and reason with text are limited. Rather than extended discourse[26] that supports sense-making

---

[26] Research by Fred Newmann and associates on Authentic Academic Achievement (AAA) identified extended classroom discourse as a key component of lessons that promote high levels of student learning. Their standards for AAA were part of Michigan's State Standards project from the mid 1990's until 2010 when Michigan adopted the Common Core State Standards. Newmann, F. (1990). Higher Order Thinking in Teaching Social Studies: A Rationale for the Assessment of Classroom Thoughtfulness. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22*, 41-56, Newmann, F., Marks, H. M.,

with text, students try to guess the answer the teacher hopes to hear. In the following example Ms. West asks, "Khan, what does it mean to summarize?...Go ahead." Khan replies. Ms. West says, "You're real, real, real close." Another student answers, "To summarize is to remember what you read?" Ms. West responds, "That's part of it." Rather than extended conversation that built meaning, student answers were brief and unexamined. Students tried to guess what response the teacher wanted to hear. Opportunities for follow up questions asking students to explain their thinking were not present. I imagined that I could bring this discourse pattern to Ms. West's attention and discuss alternatives to known answer questions that would promote deeper thinking on the part of the students.

In the case of Ms. East, she talked at length to her students. Repeated directions, frequent reprimands, and lectures about the importance of school, teamwork, future careers, and job security, marked her talk. Her teacher talk dominated class time, limiting student opportunities to practice new learning independently. In response to her extended discourse, students grew restless, talkative, and at times, rebellious when Ms. East's directions lasted too long or were repeated too often. A careful re-reading of the field notes showed that Ms. East's extended talk time for giving and repeating directions or lecturing students on behavior, occurred on nearly half or 45% of the days I was present in her classrooms.[27]

& Gamoran, A. (1996). Authentic Pedagogy and Student Performance. *American Journal of Education, 104*(4), 280-312.

[27] Ms. East's remaining class time was taken up with small group work where students collaborated to answer questions and Ms. East circulated to talk with students, checking answers, student presentations of individual and small group work, and teacher-led lessons using the overhead projector to display questions and answers.

My interpretation of Ms. East's discourse was shaped by the discomfort I shared with the students while videotaping her classes. It was challenging to be an observer, watching student reaction to her repeated directions and explanations in the moment. Student reaction was intense, some rolled their eyes, others fidgeted, put their heads down, or whispered to their friends. Yet Ms. East did not appear to connect her way of talking to students with pupil behaviors. She continued repeating directions regardless of student reactions. She was aware that she was not connecting to her summer school students. She just did not know why. On three occasions at the end of her summer school lessons she told me how dissatisfied she was with her teaching. Once, I suggested that she might want to reconsider the repeated test preparation lessons and have students read books instead. On another occasion I offered to come to her fourth grade class during the school year. She was more comfortable teaching fourth grade and I wanted to offset the negative summer school experience by contrasting it with her teaching during the school year. Together, we set up dates for me to visit in the fall and winter.

Most of my coaching I saved for Ms. East's coaching conference. As she did not appear to recognize the effect her talk pattern was having on her students in-the-moment, I did not think raising the concern after a class would be productive. The time we would have to talk would be brief and I believed I needed the video to show her how students' reacted to her talk pattern and to illustrate alternatives. I decided to wait for the coaching conversation when we could explore the issue in greater depth.

However, my personal discomfort while observing student reaction to her teaching interfered with my ability to imagine ways to coach her effectively. So sure was I of the inappropriateness of her lengthy talk time based on student reaction as well as my

own discomfort, that I stopped looking for possible reasons behind the pattern that could help both Ms. East and myself understand her discourse pattern. In so doing, I may have missed an important opportunity to connect with Ms. East and help her re-see her classroom interaction in more productive ways.

It was not until much later in the study as part of the post-analysis reflection, that I began to revisit Ms. East's discourse from the perspective of the African American church. Only much later did I wonder if her repetition and fill in the slot questions were a form of call and response associated with Black worship services. Her lectures to her students could be read as sermons, laying out what she hoped her African American students would come to value and believe (Moss, 1989). They could have been a way to build community and connect with her students in a genre familiar to both teacher and students but unfamiliar to the literacy coach who came from a different religious tradition.

I bring this to light at this point in the thematic analysis as a cautionary tale for myself and for other literacy coaches. Determining thematic issues to raise with teachers is not an exact science. We are hampered by our biases, our backgrounds that will likely be different from those we coach, and that no matter how many times a discourse analyst goes back into the data, there is nearly always something new to see. Had I been as aware of my fallibility going into the conference, I might have listened more carefully and guided more gently. At the least, I could have made the complications of this work more visible for the teachers as another way to offset insecurities brought about during the coaching conversations. During my preparation for the coaching conference, I had yet to consider why Ms. East spoke at great length in the ways that she did. All I knew was that

132

I wanted to address issues of talk with both teachers. As a literacy coach I wanted to show both teachers ways to open up conversation for more thinking and ways to limit teacher talk so students could have more time during class to work independently. In preparation for the coaching conference I sorted the video, audio, and transcript data illustrative of teacher discourse that appeared to narrow opportunities for extended student reasoning. These discursive illustrations would provide a common text that each teacher and I could discuss during our conferences.

A second issue that concerned me when I observed in the teachers' classrooms was the heavy emphasis on test prep curricula. While this may not appear to be directly related to the study of discourse, what is available to talk about impacts the nature of the classroom discourse. Classroom talk is circumscribed by the content of the curriculum and the materials used to enact that curriculum. Is the talk about finding a correct answer on a page or about interpreting a character's motivation in a complex text? Is extended discussion required to make sense of a concept or is the focus on skills out of context? While the materials available for summer school use were limited, how the teachers chose to use those materials could make a difference for student opportunities to learn. The issue of how to enrich a narrow literacy curriculum was one I believed could be productively addressed through a discussion of classroom talk.

Throughout the time I observed in Ms. East's classes, either summer school or during the regular school year, only twice did students read a complete text. Once was during summer school when newspaper articles were posted on the wall for students to read and another time when fourth grade students were asked to look up answers in their science textbooks. In the case of Ms. West, there was a discrepancy between her reading

instruction and her writing instruction. During writing, students were invited to write complete personal stories. The choice of topic and the teacher's personalized response to students received during writing did not extend to reading instruction. Reading anything during class other than a worksheet was not encouraged. Reading consisted of handing out single workbook pages, each with a story, that the class took turns reading aloud. While students read aloud, Ms. West periodically stopped the reading to ask literal questions about the text. Many of the questions involved vocabulary words, in part, because the content of the stories was foreign to the children in class.

Ms. East also relied on workbook pages with short passages and questions that followed. The topics focused on author's purpose, distinguishing between main idea and details, and summarizing. In younger grades, grammar was a regular topic as students identified nouns and verbs and subjects and predicates. While these are useful instructional practices, as a coach, I wanted the teachers to be able to do more--to elevate the content of the literacy learning in their classrooms and to increase student opportunities for more sophisticated reading and writing of whole texts. That would give teachers and students more to talk about in ways that could push thinking and extend discourse. Thus, another theme that emerged from my reading of the data was that narrow notions of literacy, particularly when it came to reading, limited opportunities for student learning.

Finally, I noticed overt and covert tension between the teachers and their students in both classrooms. As I read the data, tensions were exacerbated by ways the teachers talked to their students and/or by a curriculum that did not adequately address student needs. However, tension manifested itself differently in each teacher's classroom. In the

case of Ms. East, tension was overt and at times, a direct challenge to the teacher's authority. Where Ms. West was concerned, tension was less disruptive and was displayed primarily during reading lessons when some students were not engaged in the whole class lesson.

During summer school, the tension in Ms. East's sixth and eighth grade classes was overt. Most days the classes averaged ten students. A large, noisy fan ran continuously to cool down the 90 plus degree temperatures. As previously mentioned, Ms. East's study skills class was a last minute administrative directive. The district did not provide materials and Ms. East did not want to duplicate the next door English teacher's curriculum, the curriculum Ms. East taught the summer before. To further complicate a difficult situation, Ms. East was teaching middle school students, two to four years older than the fourth graders she taught in an academy setting. Though she knew some of the middle school students from the previous summer or from her elementary classes, she was unsure of how to relate to adolescents, let alone adolescents who were in summer school mostly because their grades or test scores were poor. Ms. East was placed in an unfamiliar and challenging situation.

However, watching her teach, I was aware of approaches Ms. East could take that might de-escalate teacher-student tension and promote learning. As a literacy coach, I realized that the summer school experience was not typical of Ms. East's school year teaching. However, teaching assignments are not fixed. One year a teacher can be assigned to teach in a select academy, another year she can find herself in an entirely different context. Budget cuts, changes in student enrollment or administration, retirements or unforeseen staffing needs, can result in teaching assignments at different

grade levels, subject areas (if certified), and schools. Further, as states become increasingly hard pressed to fund education, class sizes may increase significantly. All of these factors influenced my decision to take into account Ms. East's difficult teaching circumstances but not shy away from addressing ways she could have improved a challenging situation for both her and her students. I believed I could help her become more responsive to whatever students she might have in the future by helping her understand her discourse patterns and the effect they have on classroom interactions and by becoming aware of ways to increase the intellectual rigor of her instruction.

Ms. East's eighth grade students were by far the most challenging for her to teach. Five times the first day she met with the eighth graders, she either reprimanded individual students or lectured the class. Over the course of the summer, meeting with her eighth graders twice a week for eighty minutes each day, Ms. East lectured the class or reprimanded students thirty times. This does not count the number of times students acted inappropriately and Ms. East did not address their misbehavior. However, the sixth grade study skills class was also a challenge for Ms. East. There was only one day during the summer when Ms. East did not reprimand any students. It was a day when students were told they would have an exam the next week, there would be treats for those who stayed on task, and the assignment asked students to read a short story and write test-like questions that required focused effort for most of the class period. By contrast, Ms. East's fourth graders during the school year were anxious to please their teacher. However, one day during a lengthy explanation and re-explanation of directions, some of her fourth graders disregarded their teacher's request to pay attention and carried on with their

assignment. Only the teacher's rebuke and insistence brought their attention back to the whole group.

The summer school students were reluctant learners. Given that they were in summer school because they had not been successful during the school year, they most likely would have been a challenge for any teacher under the best of circumstances. However, the combination of Ms. East's curriculum and some of the ways she interacted with the students made a difficult situation even worse. From a curricular perspective, the lessons Ms. East taught did little to stimulate students' intellectual curiosity. The lessons were similar for sixth and eighth grade and are listed in the chart below.[28]

Table 5.1 Sixth Grade Chart of Lessons

Draw yourself as an introduction to who you are. Share your picture with the class.
Write what you know about taking the state test. Share what you know. Stand and share a strategy you heard about taking the state test.
What makes test questions easy or difficult? Translate test questions into something you understand.
Find the main idea in each paragraph of a text viewed on the overhead projector. What is the difference between a summary and details? Class discussion.
Why do author's write?
Students read a text and write test questions including one main idea question and questions with "not" and "except."

Table 5.2 Eighth Grade Chart of Lessons

Write what you expect from this class. Students share future career plans. Draw yourself as an introduction to who you are. Share your picture with the class.
Write what you know about test-taking. Write about what makes reading easy or hard?

---

[28] During the summer, over a span of five weeks, I observed Ms. East teach thirteen lessons represented in the charts above. Classes were not held every day. Fridays were outdoor activities days. Classes were cancelled over the Fourth of July weekend. Ms. East was absent one day. The last week of summer school did not follow the regular schedule due to special activities.

Careers and future goals: students were to go to the computer lab to research three careers. The lab was not open. Students list and discuss possible jobs.
Why do author's write? Read article and determine the author's purpose.
Read articles posted on walls. What is the author's purpose?
Study and define words that confuse students when taking a test. *Trace, analyze, infer, predict, explain, support.* (These are the same vocabulary words used by Ms. West with her fourth grade summer school class.)
Test review.

Given that each class lasted approximately eighty minutes and that the lessons were review for most students, there did not appear to be enough content that was intellectually challenging and novel to engage the students.

When students were not engaged in the work they misbehaved. Some of the inappropriate behavior was attention seeking or a bid for peer approval, such as boys talking to girls and vice versa when they were supposed to be working, or boys falling out of chairs. This occurred in both sixth and eighth grade. Some behavior directly challenged teacher authority, such as when sixth graders, Joyce and Alice remained seated while the rest of the class stood to share or eighth grader, Mikela, refused to read her paper to her neighbor. "But they know how to read," she complained. On two occasions, student dissatisfaction was directly connected to the curriculum. Eighth grader, Demar, complained that the work was not something they would need to know in eighth grade. On another occasion, Tasha, his classmate, groaned loudly, "Oh my go-sh!" in a tone that indicated "not again" or "this is too much," when the lesson was repeated as answers were checked. However, the test preparation curriculum, though significant, was only one of several factors contributing to student resistance. Based on my reading of my

field notes and video analysis, some of the ways Ms. East spoke to her students also contributed to their challenging behavior.

The first day of summer school, Ms. East lectured her eighth graders twice. The first lecture involved setting boundaries and expectations. After five minutes, the lecture shifted from classroom expectations to future careers. "When you turn eighteen," Ms. East said, "what are you going to do?" Ms. East called each student by name to answer this question. Five students responded. When she came to Cliff, he said he wanted to be a doctor. Ms. East pulled his arm to get him to sit up straight. At that point she told the class about Thurgood Marshall and how he wanted to be a dentist. She said he was sent out of class, implying he misbehaved. Then, she continued, he read the Constitution and realized things were not equal. Ms. East continued to call on individual students to tell what they wanted to be in the future. Kevin's behavior caught Ms. East's attention, though it was off-camera and I did not see what he did. She said, "Three strikes you're out. I'm giving you a strike." At this point, students were asked to draw themselves to let others know about them. While students began their drawings, Ms. East spoke further to Kevin about expectations. Later, when individual students were sharing their drawings at the front of the room, Kevin fell out of his chair. Ms. East asked him to step out.

The second time the eighth graders met, there were no lectures and discipline was kept to a minimum. Students worked in small groups to answer the question, what do you know about test-taking? On the third day the eighth graders met, Ms. East began by calling Kevin's parents due to his talking. Then she started class with a personal story. She told how she became a teacher and how for a long time she did not take her education seriously. She said her mother was a domestic. Then she asked students to

write a description of two or three careers they would like to pursue. There was a discussion of what different jobs pay and how much it costs to live. Thirty-five minutes later the discussion continued. Ms. East told students that, "Without money you might turn to stealing." Then she said, "Guys, women don't want no dumb man either." Six minutes later she said to one student, "I love how you listen. You listen so well." The student replied, "Sarcasm." By the third time the eighth grade class met, the teacher and students were at odds with one another most of the class period. Overt tension, reprimands, and resistance marked subsequent classes becoming increasingly pronounced as summer school continued. What happened to create this downward spiral of miscommunication?

As I read the data and experienced the tension in the classroom, it appeared that Ms. East assumed these particular students rejected traditional schooling. Her first day lecture on what students wanted to become and her reference to Thurgood Marshall to inspire her students indicated that she was concerned about her African American students not realizing their goals if they dropped out of school. On day three, Ms. East explained to the students that even McDonald's would not hire a person without a high school diploma. Further, she had students add up their income from a minimum wage job to show that they would have difficulty supporting themselves even if they could get a job selling hamburgers. The difficulty, from my literacy coach perspective, was that Ms. East stereotyped the students showing what she thought of them through repeated lectures that assumed the students were anti-education, headed nowhere as far as future careers might go, and in competition with more affluent white students in the suburbs (this lecture came later when Ms. East told the students about the movie "Pride"). Her lectures

included references to hurdles her students would face because they were African American. On day three, she invoked African American dialect when she said, "Guys, women don't want no dumb man either." This statement served two purposes. First, she attempted to align with her African American students, indicating she was one of them. But there is a negative, undercutting edge to this statement as well. From the teacher perspective, she may mean, get an education because women like educated men. However, the utterance also implies that as they are now, the boys are uneducated and "dumb." And if they stay uneducated, without a job, they might turn to stealing. Her scenario may have been realistic from her perspective, but it placed students in an unflattering light.

Ms. East's assumptions about her students were evidenced in her lectures and choice of stories. Her actions of calling parents in front of students and physically tugging on a student to get him to sit up, set her apart as an authority who was judging these students and found them wanting. This was an affront to the students' sense of self and the class worked hard to enact their teacher's expectations rather than rising to their best selves academically or behaviorally. Thus, the combination of Ms. East's portrayal of the students through her lectures and reprimands, and a curriculum that offered little in terms of intellectual stimulation, contributed to the overt tension.[29]

In contrast, the second teacher, Ms. West, continually built strong, positive relationships with nearly all her students. Her class size averaged fourteen students. However, her students were fourth graders who tended to be far more malleable than

---

[29] While Ms. East's style of talking to her students and the intellectually weak curriculum contributed to the tension between her and her students, other factors such as last minute course assignments, a lack of materials, and students' previous schooling encounters also made teaching these students a difficult proposition.

middle schoolers. Ms. West's nine year olds were willing to "do school" and follow the teacher's directions and assignments. On the few occasions it became necessary, Ms. West rarely reprimanded a student in front of the class. She asked how students were feeling and noticed new hair styles and clothes. Students were permitted to bring blankets to class that they could stretch out on. They were allowed to move desks together. With a different teacher, Amar, who tested boundaries day one when he kept his head on his desk, chewed gum, his cell phone went off, and when he pulled two desks together to create a space for himself, might have become a discipline problem. But Ms. West deftly defused his challenges to authority. She did not say anything about the gum chewing. When his cell phone rang she turned it off and returned it to Amar before the end of class. When Amar moved two desks together Ms. West said, "You can stay that way if you're comfortable." When Claire tried to compete with Amar to see how many desks she could put together to create her classroom space, Ms. West calmly said, "Let's just have two. Put one of the desks back." By saying "Let's" instead of calling out Claire by name, Ms. West referred to everyone, including herself. The words "let us," reminded the class of the common rules they established together that first morning, the first of which read, "Respect yourself and others."

On day two, Amar did not chew gum, his cell phone was not visible or heard, and he sat up at his desk. Students were asked to write an essay on, "If I had a million dollars." Ms. West spent part of the writing time at her desk and part of it circulating around the room, conferring quietly with individual students. By the end of week one, students were gathering around Ms. West's desk during break time, vying for recognition, joking, and practicing clapping routines and spelling word sign language Ms.

West taught them. The daily routine began with a homework check-in. Students who turned in their homework moved a paper racecar along a bulletin board track. Summer school appeared to be a positive experience for these children.

Yet, when it came to reading, Ms. West's instructional discourse promoted covert and overt tension that was not present during different instructional activities such as writing or math. When Ms. West taught reading, her purpose for students was to answer comprehension questions similar to questions that could be asked on a test. All of the readings came from a test preparation booklet and were condensed summaries of classic works, such as Tom Sawyer whitewashing the fence, or a summary of American historical figures and their families, such as John Quincy Adams or Thomas Jefferson. The readings were unfamiliar to the class and the language was closer to a textbook than anything literary. Students who struggled with the readings had difficulty following along. Disengaged, they tilted their desks, rolled their pencils, or put their heads on their desks. During reading, Ms. West asked students to put their desks down or sit up and pay attention. Slumped in their chairs or easily distracted, frequently the same children acted in ways that suggested they were disengaged. These were particularly pronounced when students took turns reading aloud workbook stories or orally answering teacher questions about the text.

During reading time, Ms. West's instructional discourse followed a classic initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) pattern. Children had little opportunity to extend their thinking or reason through their answers. Ms. West sought specific words that mirrored her own thinking and students often tried to guess at what response their teacher was looking for. As a result, reading was reduced to an exercise in vocabulary and

answering quiz-type questions. Reading to make sense of a story or relate to a character or reading for information or pleasure, was not part of the instructional routine. The frustration some students felt when unable to participate successfully led to tension that was exacerbated by the teacher's discourse pattern, a pattern that further closed down sense-making and reasoning with text.

As a literacy coach, I now had three issues to raise with the teachers, teacher talk and ways to open up student opportunities to reason in the classroom, increasing the rigor of the classroom curricula to go beyond test prep and provide challenge for children so they would have something of substance to talk about, and consideration of overt or covert tension that resulted from some types of teacher talk and a narrow literacy curriculum. Further, I had some idea of examples I might share to illustrate my points. The fourth and very important consideration I faced as a coach was to consider what I already knew about each teacher and ways in which I might share these difficult issues without alienating them.

Considerations of Race, Status, and Face

I had good reason to be concerned about how I would present issues of teacher talk that influenced the quality of learning available to students. I was a white educator asking to conduct research on teacher talk in an African American district with two African American teachers. My status as a researcher who knew the superintendent created an asymmetry between the teachers and me even before the study began. My colleague, the superintendent, selected these teachers. Though they appeared interested in the study, they may not have felt free to turn down a new superintendent. They were aware from the outset that I knew their superintendent and whether that knowledge

engendered trust in my work or a fear of repercussions on the job if they did not

participate, I was unable to ascertain.

There were layers of potential miscommunication embedded in this context. To

begin with, racial inequities are perpetuated in many urban school contexts. Such was the

case with the Connor School District, an underserved African American district

surrounded by more affluent white districts. I would be stepping into the district as a

white outsider, someone of higher status, who had come to research African American

teachers and students. Regardless of my intent, I embodied long-standing hierarchies of

race and privilege that undoubtedly created a subtext for my researcher/teacher

interactions.

Race and status differentials are only two of the complications that could derail

my interactions with the teachers. The fact that the first part of my research involved

spending time in the teachers' classrooms gathering data on ways the teachers talked with

their students to promote learning held the potential for further miscommunication.

Historically, African American dialect has been marginalized in public education. The

teachers did not know about classroom discourse when I began this study and could

easily misconstrue my purpose and think I was there to monitor their use of Standard

English though I tried to dispel such misconceptions through explanations and language

provided by the University Institutional Review Board.

Taking into account these racial, historical, and status differences that could

interfere with communication, I considered how I could address them in my coaching. Of

all the ways I thought the teachers would respond to me, I was most concerned that they

would feel threatened, diminished, or intimidated by what I would say to them about their

teaching. While the teachers could express many different reactions to suggestions for improving their teaching practice, they were likely to be constrained in their response due to several factors. First, they knew their superintendent identified them for this project and even though they gave their consent, they were aware that I knew their superintendent and that gave me, as literacy coach, additional status. Further, unfamiliar with formal research projects, though they signed release forms that guaranteed privacy, they could not be certain I might not share something with their employer. In fact, Ms. West said as much during her coaching conversation.

Second, I was a literacy coach and also a university researcher. To further complicate our relationship, Ms. East had attended a workshop I presented the previous year, prior to meeting one another personally. Under these circumstances, both teachers, regardless of what they were feeling, were likely to restrain their responses and hold their emotions in check, uncertain of future interactions. Finally, both teachers were African American. Given a raced and classed society, the fact that the literacy coach/researcher is White, complicates a relationship that is already taxed by occupation, friendships, and status.

These were my assumptions as I planned carefully for ways to save face for teachers when I shared complicated classroom interactions. How could I make available new ways of seeing their teaching without offending either teacher? How could I overcome the inequalities between us for the purpose of effective literacy coaching? Whatever I said or did as a coach carried weight and raised the stakes for any critique that might arise. However, though my case may carry more weight than is typical for a school or district literacy coach, by virtue of the role, to be more effective, literacy coaches are

confronted with finding ways to offset status differences and reduce the sting of critique. I agree with Parker Palmer. Teaching is a personal act (Palmer, 1998). Palmer writes, "We teach who we are" (p. 1). Whether Ms. West was talking during her coaching conference about her reasons for becoming a special education teacher or Ms. East shared her personal story of becoming a teacher with her students, both teachers value what they do and care about the students they teach. Under these circumstances, critique, offered in ways that preserve a teacher's sense of competence in a job, that respects who that teacher is and what she values, is more likely to be heard and acted upon than critique that frames the teacher as ineffective.

Whether the literacy coach is part of the school community, operates at the district level, or is someone from beyond the district working in the school context, the role is designed to guide teachers toward improved practice with better learning outcomes for students. Critique is implicit in the role no matter how gently presented and with critique comes face threats. The literacy coach's ability to soften those face threats when sharing the complications of teaching practice may mean the difference between acceptance or rejection of the coach's ideas. If the teacher feels critique is unduly harsh, she may withdraw from the conversation, resist new perspectives on her practice, or challenge the coach in unproductive ways. On the other hand, if the coach is overly concerned with saving face for the teacher at all costs, the coaching conversation may gloss fraught issues of practice reducing the potential benefit of the coaching conference.

How to Present Potentially Challenging Ideas to the Teachers

Both Ms. East and Ms. West had reputations as successful teachers. In the case of Ms. East, the superintendent told me the students would do anything for her. She helped

write curriculum, ran a school store with the help of students, and taught in a special academy for academically strong students. Ms. West was a middle school special education mathematics teacher who was willing to teach language arts for the summer though the subject was not her forte. She was sensitive to the needs of her students and created a warm and caring environment so students would like school. Both teachers were well regarded and interested in learning more about teaching. They expected that I would study their classrooms to learn about the ways they talk with their students. I hoped to learn how literacy coaching could be informed by studying classroom discourse.

Given our differences in status, race, and role, I wanted to level the playing field as much as possible to give each of us similar opportunities and advantages for accomplishing our aims; me, for accomplishing my research aim and the teachers for maintaining pride in their competence and ability to improve their teaching. That meant having conversations that were open and frank. I wanted to consider ways to share my assessments that would be useful and productive, not negative. Yet some of the issues I planned to raise were likely to create discomfort. Discussing ways in which a teacher's questioning approach may limit student thinking or probing how a teacher's approach to motivating reluctant learners may have contributed to further resistance on the part of students has the potential to offend or embarrass a teacher possibly leading to resistance or denial. Analyzing curriculum for the purpose of learning new approaches to instruction may make a teacher feel ineffective or defensive. Literacy coaching opens the black box, goes right to the heart of teaching, and holds the potential to create disequilibrium for a teacher whom others respect for the quality of her work. Planning ways to account for

potentially charged conversations became a dominant concern when planning for the coaching conference.

My solution was to contrast positive examples of classroom interaction with negative examples from the data I'd collected from each teacher[30]. I reasoned that I could highlight and examine each unsuccessful interaction with a similar successful interaction for the same teacher. My thinking was that by showing teachers ways in which they were successful, they would feel competent and reassured of their capability as educators while remaining open to examining less successful interactions.

Asking teachers to re-envision their classroom talk in light of new interactional considerations raises potential face threats. Coaching a teacher about her discourse practices is not as simple as advising a teacher to "do this" or "say that" and expecting her to adopt a new way of interacting in the classroom. This is particularly true in the two case studies that comprise this research. The teachers had no knowledge of DA approaches before we began talking about them. Further, viewing transcripts or video of one's teaching and analyzing the interactions with students and the consequences of those interactions can be threatening to one's sense of professional competence. For these reasons, I intended to be conscious of softening face threats. I aimed to choose my words carefully, avoiding direct accusations. This might mean sharing some things but not others. It also means avoiding bald face threats that directly challenge the teachers' competencies (Brown & Levinson, 1978/1987). I wanted the teacher to be willing to stay in the conference with me in a way that was open to new learning and not become

---

[30] See Appendix G for an expanded transcript of the literacy coach and Ms. West discussing positive and negative examples of Ms. West's classroom discourse.

defensive, angry, hurt, or react in any other way that might jeopardize teacher learning if the conversation grew too threatening.

My intent during the coaching conversation was to carefully select those discursive and curricular patterns that would help each teacher re-see her practice with the goal of improving her instruction. I prepared more iMovies than I knew we could share in the time allotted, approximately two hours for each conference. For iMovies, I selected clips that spread across the days of summer school and in the case of Ms. East, into the school year. I had already identified specific instances of discourse patterns in the teachers' talk, IRE patterns and variants, and examples of lengthy or repetitive directions. I reanalyzed the data corpus to identify examples of discourse that were supportive of student learning. For Ms. East, these positive examples included times she praised her students, times her teaching point was clear and specific, and times students in middle school followed her directions. For Ms. West, examples of positive interactions included open-ended dialogue when both teacher and students tried to figure a diagram out together, times when she interacted with a challenging student in a positive, productive way, times when she conferred individually with students, and times when she named what strategy a student used when writing. My intent was to have ready to use as positive examples instances when the teacher discourse was conducive to student meaning-making and extended discourse.

With the plan to use transcripts and video in mind, I determined to give the teachers some choice as to which among a number of video clips they wanted to review. I reasoned that offering each teacher choice where possible lessened the threat level and generated a more informal, collegial atmosphere for our conferences. However, in the

case of Ms. East, I worried that if we began the conference with video clips from her

summer school teaching, teaching she was disappointed with, the video would threaten

her sense of professionalism. Therefore, I decided to begin, in her case, with three

transcripts[31] and then offer Ms. East an opportunity to select from among the prepared

video clips. My thinking was that a transcript is once removed from the actual, in-the-

moment teaching experience and it would shelter her from having to re-watch

unsuccessful teaching interactions. Once I guided Ms. East through the transcripts of her

teaching, if time remained in the conference, she could decide whether or not to view

video of her teaching and if so, which video clips. I was confident of inviting the teachers

to select the clips they wanted to view because the three issues of teacher talk,

curriculum, and tension reappeared with such frequency throughout the data that I was

certain that no matter which clip they selected, we would have plenty to discuss.

Therefore, I created iMovie clips of representative interactions and planned to bring my

computer to the coaching conference so we could re-watch video together.

I ran into one fortuitous snag with Ms. East's data. Her strongest teaching

occurred with her fourth graders during the school year. We agreed that I should visit her

class during the regular year as the summer school experience was uncomfortable and

unsuccessful for her. However, her most effective school year class lesson did not record

on videotape. I had to rely on backup audio. As a result, I created a transcript of the

lesson. When I thought about it, asking Ms. East to view video clips from the summer

seemed punitive as she had already acknowledged the negative experience. I hoped

reading some of the interactions in a transcript would be less uncomfortable for her than

---

[31] See Appendix F for a lengthy excerpt of the first classroom transcript I shared with Ms. East.

re-watching her unsuccessful teaching on tape. Transcripts do not show all the classroom interaction. They focus on the speakers. Reading the experience on paper puts distance between the actual event and the written transcript of the event. At this point, as a literacy coach, I felt ready for the conference. I had prepared the issues to be discussed, the illustrative data, and the positive counter-examples. I had considered ways to protect the teachers' feelings and created transcripts and iMovies of representative moments. I was confident of my preparation.

How to Decide What Interactions and DA Approaches to Share?

In the case of Ms. West, one example occurred when she was drawing a Venn Diagram on the chalkboard to compare football and basketball. The students knew more about football that their teacher and the conversation that ensued was a collaborative effort to understand one another and learn more about football. This conversation was in sharp contrast to the IRE questions that dominated most whole class discourse. I planned to share this interaction with Ms. West to help her see that she could and did engage in authentic conversation with her students. My goal was to point out to her what substantial knowledge-building conversation looked like and to show her how she and her students accomplished it in the ways they talked together. The video illuminated a class discussion in which students and teacher built on each others' knowledge and ideas through comfortable turn taking without the need for raised hands and teacher mediation.

In the case of Ms. East, I was much more deliberate and cautious when it came to selecting transcripts and iMovie clips. She was clearly uncomfortable with her summer school experience. I did not want to criticize her teaching but I did want her to learn ways to understand and rethink her teacher/student interactions. With knowledge of some

discourse analysis approaches, she could be intentional about selecting which interactions to use to further substantial engagement and knowledge-building. Even though her fourth grade students did not resist her to the extent that the middle school students did, her discursive patterns could be expanded to allow a wider range of discursive engagement and learning for her students. I wanted her to understand ways she could balance teaching students to follow directions with teaching something substantive about reading or writing.

To that end, I created three transcripts that would begin the conference. The first transcript was her fourth grade class and a day when the lesson appeared to be a success. I wanted to work from her perceived strengths. She viewed herself as far more successful with elementary students than with middle school students. By starting there, I intended to get off to a positive start. I also intended to position her as a competent teacher to offset issues that would come up later in the conference that would likely create discomfort for her; issues such as talking with middle school students in ways that generate opposition, selecting lessons students view as beneath them, recognizing when students grasp a concept and adjusting instruction appropriately rather than continuing to teach and re-teach the same idea. By starting with a positive teaching experience, I could gradually introduce more complex issues. The second transcript was a day when a student took over the class in order to be recognized and accepted by her peers. Ms. East was so disappointed with her summer instruction that I wanted to show her that she cannot control everything that happens in a classroom. The transcript shows Ms. East trying to teach the class while a student attempted to gain the attention of her peers. The rowdiness that resulted was not the teacher's fault or lack of control. It was more important for the

student to fit in with the group than to please the teacher or suffer consequences for her actions. The third transcript included multiple issues: teacher talk, a test prep curriculum, how students saw themselves in relation to others, and how tension can escalate. That transcript offered a range of issues, making it possible to discuss any one issue or all of them depending on what happens during the coaching conversation. IMovies could be selected if time permitted after the transcripts.

Thus, the discursive constructs I planned to address came from the patterns of each teacher's classroom discourse, the curriculum they enacted, and the reaction of their students to both discourse and curriculum. I knew I would address IRE patterns with Ms. West and the length and repetition of directions with Ms. East. I knew I would share moments of success with both teachers to illustrate their capacity for productive interactions. I knew I wanted to address the weaknesses in the content of the literacy instruction. And I knew I wanted both teachers to begin to analyze classroom interactions using the language and theory of discourse analysis as a way to take action to improve their teaching and student learning.

Conclusion

In a field where the definition of a literacy coach's role and procedures are yet to be agreed upon, identifying the complexities of a coach's interactional work remains a work in progress. However, my self-study has revealed several preconference tasks that other coaches are likely to find useful. First of all, recognizing the need to analyze data in preparation for the coaching conversation is important for literacy coaches. While many coaches analyze student data, such as test scores and informal assessments to determine instructional needs, I argue that analyzing classroom discourse affords a robust way to

154

understand what constitutes learning, who is learning, how they are learning, and what is being learned.

Rereading observation notes to identify the cultural routines of a classroom and then noting ways language is used during those routine practices is a first step towards recognizing productive and unproductive discursive interactions. Even in the daily press of a school-based job, coaches can focus on the ways in which talk is used to build knowledge. The time coaches spend in teachers' classrooms provides opportunities to note discrepant events. Where are there moments of discomfort that clash with expectations? A literacy coach can ask herself if there are times when one form of interaction was expected and something unexpected occurred instead. Were there patterns of interaction that recurred over time? If so, both discrepant events and patterns of interaction afford a coach a window into a teacher's practice.

In this section of the study, I have described what I discerned was a purposeful approach to preparing for a coaching conversation focused on classroom discourse: study the data to note recurring themes and patterns of interaction during classroom routines; and, plan in advance for ways to show consideration for teachers whose work is being analyzed and who know they are expected to improve in some way. What I have come to realize is that the reality is not nearly so straightforward and is far messier. My preparation for the coaching conversations focused on identifying thematic statements that could frame the conversation. What areas were strengths and in what areas could the teachers improve? How did discursive interaction contribute to either situation? What insight could teachers gain from a close look at the ways they talked with their students?

155

In hindsight, I realized that my preoccupation with patterns of discourse and interaction focused on how but not why. I will explain.

When I identified discursive areas of concern, I immediately thought of ways to share those concerns with the teachers. I considered ways to help teachers reimagine their classroom interactions. This is a move borne from years of working in schools when time is pressing and demands are immediate. Identify the problem and find a solution. What I did not spend as much time thinking about in advance of the coaching conferences was why the teachers interacted with students the way they did. I believe I expected insight to come out of the coaching conversations—which, in fact, it did, as will be seen in the next chapter. However, how much better prepared as a coach I might have been if I'd spent more time considering why these two teachers spoke the way they did. Had I looked for clues in their discourse that might have provided some guidance toward understanding talk from their vantage point, perhaps I would have approached some fraught interactions differently, particularly with Ms. East whose patterns of talk might echo her church experiences.

This leaves me with several unanswered questions. Coaching always involves people who have different backgrounds, beliefs, values, and histories. How can a coach anticipate differences that may not be apparent? How can we set aside our own histories and expectations to become more open to others? From this part of the study, I have learned to ask why as well as how. Even if I cannot be sure, by asking why a teacher interacts with students in particular ways I have shifted the focus from my need to help the teacher improve to understanding another person. If I have given thought ahead of time to asking why, I may be more aware and responsive to moments during the coaching

156

conference when opportunities present themselves for greater understanding. Potentially both teacher and coach could benefit.

All this said, preplanning does not ensure that the coaching conversation will go smoothly. As will be seen in the results chapter for the coaching conversations, anticipating possible fraught conversations and preplanning ways to offset face threats and social disequilibrium is challenged as soon as the teacher engages in the conversation. Response is in-the-moment, tactical (see Erickson, 2004) and intuitive, unconscious acts that co-construct local, situated conversation. As a result, preplanning only goes so far toward a productive coaching conference.

CHAPTER VI RESULTS: DURING THE COACHING CONFERENCE

Coaching has been viewed as an individual endeavor, where a coach shares approaches with a teacher intended to improve her practice. Such cognitive coaching assumes that telling, showing, and then having a teacher practice what to do is sufficient for improving teaching and learning. An assumption of one-to-one correspondence holds that the coach advises and the teacher adopts. Teachers who are reluctant to collaborate with a coach, or teachers who do not revise their instruction as a result of coaching, are often referred to as resistant. In practice, most coaches prefer to work with more accessible and willing colleagues and tend to avoid the challenges posed by resistant teachers. The dilemma is that problematic teachers, from a coach's perspective, who might benefit from collaboration with a literacy coach have fewer opportunities to experience coaching than their more amenable peers. Would coaches be encouraged to work with a wider range of teachers, including those teachers who are sometimes labeled reluctant or resistant if coaches understood more about teacher/coach interactions? Would coaches and teachers find their conferences more beneficial if they shared a deeper understanding of social interaction that could occur during coaching conversations?

Based on the assumption that they would, this chapter does not directly address these questions. However, it does offer examples, through two case studies of coaching conversations, which have the potential to inform coaching interactions. Through samples taken from my coaching with Ms. East and Ms. West, this chapter makes visible the

complexities of teacher/coach interactions and the limitations of pre-planning as conversations unfold and interactions co-construct meaning. Cognitive and individualistic conceptions of coaching are complicated by the tactical, local, in-the-moment interactions (Erickson, 2004) between two people engaged in co-constructing meaning. By making visible the discursive complications and resolutions that comprised the two coaching conferences, coaches, teachers, and researchers are afforded a more nuanced understanding of literacy coaching than has previously been available in the literature. Possible ways to apply the insights gained from these conversations will be addressed in the Discussion Chapter.

Anticipating the Coaching Conversation: Building on the Preplanning Preparation

To understand the coaching conferences in this study, I found it useful to think in terms of a beginning, middle, and end. I focused the early part of the conference on building rapport to set the stage for more complex issues to come. The middle of the conference raised the stakes for complicated issues of practice. The end of the conference was an opportunity to repair the relationship if needed and to plan for next steps with the teacher. I approached the beginning of the conference as an opportunity for the coach and teacher to build common understandings and to establish ways of talking together. As coach, I aimed to learn from each teacher's response to the data. Teacher responses to data early in the conference would inform my decisions about how best to address more difficult issues of practice. As in Aristotle's classic description of how dramatic action builds tension (Baxter & Atherton, 1997), I expected complicating actions and rising tension when I gradually raised the stakes over the course of the coaching conference as previously planned. I intended that earlier comfort levels would support increasingly

159

difficult conversations that could compromise the teachers' sense of professionalism. How I handled fraught issues through successive interactions could determine whether the teachers would be receptive to change and whether or not they would be receptive to building a plan for revising practice. Through samples taken from my coaching with Ms. West and Ms. East, the rest of this chapter makes visible the complexities of teacher/coach interactions that challenge even well-targeted planning.

Setting the Stage

Two considerations shaped the early minutes of the coaching conversation. First, I wanted to establish a comfortable and easy conversational tone. I wanted to pay close attention to face wants and to position each teacher in positive ways to bolster her sense of professional competence. Second, I wanted to gauge the ways in which the teachers interpreted the data as a starting point for possible coaching. I asked the teachers to teach me. What will make sense for you? What will be useful in your practice? I attempted to lower the stakes at the outset to offset critique later, implied or explicit. I was aware of my status as a researcher and coach and wanted to downplay any perceived disparities in power by positioning the teachers as my teachers and at times, being self-deprecating or recognizing my shortcomings. In addition to establishing an informal tone for the conversation, I wanted to introduce the teachers to the data format. In the case of Ms. East, that meant introducing the transcripts and how to interpret them and in the case of Ms. West, it meant watching a video clip to become familiar with seeing herself on tape, anticipating that she might feel awkward or self-conscious seeing herself on camera.

Responding to Self-critique

From the outset, I was faced with multiple decisions that could not have been fully anticipated in the preparation stage when the teachers were not present. Based on previous coaching experiences, I assumed from the start that I would want to draw the teachers' attention to new ways of interpreting their data. I assumed I would replay some video clips or reread some transcript sections so teachers could re-see their interactions from different lenses. I also assumed, from prior experience of watching video with teachers, that they might be critical of their appearance or their speech. Often, teachers unused to watching themselves on video will notice something in their teaching that disappoints them. With both teachers, my assumption regarding their initial reaction to their teaching was accurate. Ms. West shared how nervous she was being videotaped all summer. While viewing the first clip, she said she needed to go on a diet and went on to criticize herself for not engaging one of her students. However, Ms. East's response to the transcript of her fourth grade lesson, though self-critical, was unexpected. As if anticipating my comments, she acknowledged that she was a "little too long winded" and that concerned her because it limited the time students could practice.

I was prepared to share this issue with Ms. East, but as soon as she saw the length of the transcript she anticipated the talk issue, brought it up herself, and went on to defend why she talks at length with the students. "Students don't spend a lot of time practicing because maybe I'm going over the instructions. But I want them to get it, you know? I spend a lot of time talking because I want them to get it. If there's a story to tell or something I need to share, if it is a teachable moment, then I will go on."

A Literacy Coach's Response: Reassurance, Alignment, and Assessment

My reaction was to attempt to reassure both teachers, support their competence as educators, and assess possible next moves on my part. It was too early in the coaching conference, long before more fraught issues would be raised, for either teacher to feel judged or to judge themselves in ways that might not lead to productive action to redress some areas of need. However, the teachers' comments led to very different responses. In the case of Ms. West, I apologized for making her so nervous all summer. Then I asked her if she would like to view the clip again. When we watched the clip a second time, I was able to show her how caring she was to a student who did not feel well. I explained this was representative of the ways she built relationships with her students. I also introduced the term alignment and showed her how she aligned with her students and honored them by recognizing the personas they wanted to project. My interest was in re-establishing her confidence and helping her see what was previously invisible to her in the film. I considered this initial part of the conversation successful because it led Ms. West to explain her theory of treating children with respect. By sharing her philosophy of engaging with children, she was able to validate her approach to teaching and minimize her previous self-critique. I believed this to be important because we were able to keep the conversation open between us so we could continue to learn from her classroom data.

While I shared the term alignment with Ms. West, as one knowledgeable about politeness, and positioning, I invoked both as I sought to reassure Ms. West. My politeness move of apologizing for her nervousness caused by my videotaping all summer created a moment of mutual support as Ms. West reached over, touched my arm, and said, "No. Stop that," so I would not blame myself for her uneasiness. I intentionally

showed her the video of caring for Amar when he felt ill so she would recognize ways she built rapport with students. I did so to position Ms. West as a competent and caring teacher. These discursive moves kept the power circulating between us and helped to move the coaching conversation forward.

Where Ms. East was concerned, an entirely different scenario ensued. I had intentionally started the conference with a transcript of her strongest teaching lesson showing the students who made her feel most successful as a teacher. However, from the beginning, Ms. East assumed a dominant role and had me responding to her and not the other way around. By this I mean she took the upper hand almost at the start, describing her failings and justifying them, leaving me to decide how best to respond to her recognition of her talk time and her strong rebuttal to any challenge questioning her decision to talk to students at length. I was unexpectedly placed in the position of responder, not initiator. The coaching conference had barely started and at this point, I wanted to establish alignment and rapport with Ms. East. My response was to downplay her shortcomings and leave it to her to decide how much talk time is appropriate in different situations. I did not want a direct confrontation this early in the conference.

> LC: Okay
>   That's
>   Kind of a typical teacher thing=
> Ms E: =Okay
>   [giggles]
> LC: I think we all do it
> Ms E: yeah [smiling widely and looking at me]

Notice how I identify her talk time as "a typical teacher thing." I also try to soften her self-critique by identifying myself as a teacher who also has the same problem.

Rather than directly confront Ms. East with something she should do, I tell how I

addressed the issue for myself with a timer on my desk to limit my talk time.

> LC: I always used to keep a timer on my desk
> Ms E: [nodding and smiling] right yeah
> LC: it was
>   It was not for the kids=
> Ms E: exactly exactly
>   I'll try that too

In the moment I was faced with a dilemma. This is a teacher who appeared to be

set in her views. She was well aware of her lengthy talk time but chose to justify it. She

did not appear open to modifications of her behavior. I emphasized how I would move on

when the timer rang to reinforce the idea of taking action to change my teacher talk time.

Even though she said she would try the timer, her subsequent statement shed doubt on

future actions. Laughing, Ms. East said, "I haven't learned what to do when it dings. I'm

still talking." Faced with what I viewed as a form of resistance, her immediate

acknowledgement of talking too long and her justification for her talk time, along with an

indication that she would probably ignore the timer and continue talking to her students

despite its use, I chose to align with rather than challenge Ms. East. "Tell me about it," I

replied, implying "I know just what you mean." I saw no value in continuing to challenge

a practice, teacher talk time, that she believed was for a good purpose. I continued to

downplay her use of talk time as we added up the minutes she talked for each lesson

section, giving directions, student practice time, checking answers and so on. I said, "It's

not as bad as you think. I mean, you can decide the balance." Ms. East said, "So I spent

about thirteen minutes where they're actually doing the work." I reply, "But then there's

other things going on, too." Ms. East explains, "If it took me twenty-three minutes going

164

over, modeling for my students, that's fine. As long as they get it." To her reasoning I reply, "There. There's your decision-making. So that's fine."

My response was solicitous. I made less of one of the key issues in her teaching I had planned to address for two reasons. One reason had to do with wanting her to make decisions about her practice rather than making a change because someone in authority told her to do so. If she were going to revise her teaching in sustainable ways, it would have to be because she decided it was in her and her students' best interests. I would not be there to monitor her practice. The change would have to come from her. The other reason I did not make more of her talk time is because she recognized the problem and made clear that she had a reason for doing what she did. I knew the conference was in its early stages and the transcripts were designed to illustrate different teaching points. If I could not make progress here, perhaps I could impact her thinking on some other issue.

Addressing Fraught Issues—Teacher Talk

The complexity of coaching interactions can be seen in the ways each conference unfolded. With Ms. West I stayed with positive examples of her practice. Following her explanation of her respectful relationships with students I asked her to explain her non-traditional approach to the classroom arrangement of desks and giving students permission to bring blankets to class. Her desire was to make students feel comfortable and love school so they would want to stay in school. With Ms. East, some tension lingered for me. I was a bit frustrated at not being able to dig deeper into the issue of teacher talk. At the time, it was difficult for me to recognize that she used a form of stake inoculation (Potter, 1996) to prevent me from being first to criticize her. By raising the issue of her talk time before I did, she positioned me as respondent. I, in turn, was left

165

with the impression that I needed to save face for Ms. East, particularly this early in the conference, so I found myself minimizing the importance of her dominating talk. "That's kind of a typical teacher thing," and "I think we all do it" exemplify how I identified as a teacher along with Ms. East. She was no different from other teachers because many of us talk too long, I reasoned. I attempted to position Ms. East as a teacher among equals, not a single practitioner called out for defective practice. I was concerned with saving face for Ms. East to protect her professionalism. If she felt too threatened, I imagined she might reject learning during this conference so I tried to circulate power and level the status differential between us. Struggling to stress the positive because I was working against my own frustration with the situation and having difficulty finding positive teaching examples to explore, I complimented the way she affirmed her students at the end of class by calling them "all you smart people." But this was a brief comment that did little to offset the increasingly apparent fact that we did not interpret teaching actions in similar ways.

Reminded of the second theme I wanted to introduce, disciplinary rigor and intellectual challenge, I decided to offer my interpretation of her anticipation guide lesson that we had just skimmed through in transcript form. I was still frustrated at not being able to fully analyze the issue of talk time with Ms. East and I allowed my personal feelings to influence how I approached the issue of academic press. I characterized Ms. East's fourth grade anticipation guide lesson as having students fill in a graphic organizer to "match the answer to your thinking." Judging her lesson by defining it in a belittling way may have made me feel better given my frustration but it set up a bald face threat leading to a frame clash. Overlapping my speech, Ms. East countered with her own

definition of what was happening in the lesson. "They had to go through the book and then research." The transcript format shows the overlap of our words. We cut each other off. She reframed her lesson as research while I was saying it was a matching exercise. I did not want this lesson to be characterized as "research" because I believed the activity was too simplistic and devoid of intellectual rigor to qualify as research. The transcript shows that I began speaking over her at the moment she reframed the lesson as research.

```
LC:    This is when they were reading in their books
Ms E:  Umhum
LC:    They were in partnerships
       And you made the graphic organizer
       And they had to [match the answer to your thinking
Ms E:                  [they had to go through the book and [then research
LC:                                                         [and
```

Transcribed, this looks like a clash, with each of us assuming the power to name the lesson. However, viewing this interaction on tape raises questions about whether this tension was pronounced or not. On the tape, our voices are low and modulated. Our body language and smiles belie the test of wills the transcript implies. In hindsight, neither of us was right. The lesson was somewhere in the middle of research and matching. Students did have to reread their textbook to determine the correct answer. My calling the lesson matching was pejorative. Ms. East continued to explain the value of the anticipation lesson. When she came to the part of the transcript I had labeled, Choosing a Partner, I had another question I hoped she would clarify and we ended up agreeing to disagree on that question as well creating a third clash.

The third clash occurred when I asked Ms. East to explain the practice of having students select their partner by standing and pointing to someone. I wondered what happened when students were left out. For Ms. East, it was a matter of teaching students

to be independent and to learn to work with others, as they would have to do in the real

world. For me, the concern centered on children possibly feeling left out. Ms. East

explained,

> In life you must work with people that you don't particularly want
> to work with. And it just goes back to that. And you can't just sit there. So
> what are you going to do? Lose your job because you don't want to work
> with someone?....And often I will say, I'm watching. Your boss is watching
> you….I put you in a team of people to get a job done. Are you working
> together to get that job done? That's what I want them to understand. Get
> up. Find your partner. You have a choice.

Further, Ms. East provided evidence that her approach to choosing partners worked by

citing an end of year incident when the students were able to select partners and begin

working without a hitch. I accepted her explanation, satisfied that I raised the issue for

examination. Power circulated between us and I decided it was best to establish

equilibrium to move the coaching conversation forward.

However, I did not entirely abandon my desire to rein in her extensive teacher

talk. I pointed to the part of the transcript where the students become restless with

repeated directions and Ms. East found herself reprimanding her usually cooperative

fourth graders. I suggested that rather than stop the whole class for one or two students'

questions, she could allow the students to work independently while she responded to a

few students' questions.

> Ms E: =just go to that one student (nodding her head in agreement)
> LC: just go meet that one student and let everyone else get working
> Ms E: Umhm
> LC: That would give most of the kids instead of thirteen minutes they would
>   have had twenty-two minutes
> Ms E: Right
> LC: which would have been a big difference
> Ms E: Right
>   I agree

Disrupting a Downward Spiral: Creating Turning Points

Following the pattern I established at the start of the conference to offset

challenges to the teacher's practice, I pointed to a strength that was visible in the video or

transcript. In this case, I pointed Ms. East to part of the transcript where she shared her

confusion with the students and let them know she wanted them to understand. I used this

opportunity to explain to her that she was aligning with the students, letting them know

that teachers get confused, too, and that it is okay to make mistakes and not be perfect.

This marked a turning point because Ms. East agreed with this interpretation and spoke at

some length about her own schooling and how her teachers never gave up on her.

> I never thought I would go into teaching…I never thought I was
> smart enough to go into education….I can think back when I didn't get it,
> but the teacher either came and assisted me or sat me somewhere to get the
> help that I needed. They didn't just let me pass along.

When Ms. East shared her personal experience she also reflected on her talk time and

reconsidered my suggestion to answer questions in small groups or with individuals as

they arose rather than stop the whole class from working.

> It's very important that students get it. And if I have to spend that
> time. Even though I need. I want to catch myself. I don't want to be too
> longwinded with my students. In this case where I do see that I've gone
> over the instructions. They got it maybe as you mentioned and suggested.
> That maybe just go and talk with that one group of students. I definitely
> can see myself correcting that. Um. But it's important that they get it.

However, she reconfirmed that she was the final arbiter of how much talk was necessary

to be certain students understand. "But it's important that they get it."

Ms. East's independence and sense of what was best for her students created a

challenge for me as a coach. I came prepared to share examples of practice that I assumed

would lead to rich conversation about how to modify classroom teacher talk so students

could spend more time on learning and less time on understanding directions. My initial plans were co-opted by a teacher who had heard this before and made a conscious decision not to change. However, I modified my goals for our conversation by scaling back my suggestions and accepting that there were perspectives at work here that I simply could not understand in-the-moment. We were out of alignment more often than not. It appeared to me that our frames for what constituted effective teaching varied greatly. Ms. East's frame for classroom instruction appeared to have been influenced by her own learning experiences. Her teachers never gave up on her when it came to understanding schoolwork and that persistence enabled her to attain a teaching degree even though she did not think she was capable of becoming a teacher. In turn, she decided to model her teaching behavior after the teachers who helped her and never gave up on her. She decided she would not give up on her students and would continue to help them understand no matter how much explanation it took. In addition, it appeared to me that Ms. East identified with her students as working class African Americans. She referred to herself as the boss watching the students and making sure they do their jobs correctly. She talked about the students as needing to work cooperatively with one another because they were likely to have jobs that would require them to work with others productively. They could be fired if they did not get along with their co-workers.

Ms. East's frames for effective teaching and my frames for effective teaching were influenced by childhood upbringings that were shaped by race, class, educational opportunities, and religious values. The way we approached teaching reflected those past experiences. However, during the coaching conference, I did not have time, in-the-moment, to process all of our differences and take them into account as I responded to

170

Ms. East. As a literacy coach I was focused not on why Ms. East was firm in her beliefs but rather on the educational impact of those beliefs on her students. I believed my role as coach during the conference was to assist Ms. East to see her instructional practice in ways that would improve opportunities for student learning in her classroom. I believed that her focus on directions over substantive content narrowed possibilities for student learning. I interpreted her insistence on preparing students for jobs where a boss oversees their productivity as preparation for blue collar employment. My educational aim was to prepare students for a knowledge society where decision-making and independence would be key attributes and where higher education was a necessity. It seemed to me that Ms. East and I were living in two different worlds and neither of us at the time could step out of our personal frames to have a conversation that might have addressed our differences and explored deeper connections and understandings. In hindsight, we were mired in our own frames and locked into scripts that prevented us from asking a different set of questions or understanding one another from different perspectives. We appeared to be stalemated, both trying to be polite while holding on to beliefs about teaching and learning that were in sharp contrast.

Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE patterns)

Ms. West's conference was more comfortable for me. From the beginning, the conference went according to my preplanned expectations. I was not caught by surprise, as I had been with Ms. East when she addressed her excessive talking before I had a chance to bring it up. Ms. West appeared to be interested in what I had to share, evidenced by her nods, smiles, and repeated uh-huh's. With Ms. West, I was not on the defensive from the start as I was with Ms. East. Rather than judge Ms. West's grammar

lesson as I had judged Ms. East's anticipation guide lesson, I sought to learn more about

what Ms. West wanted to accomplish with her grammar lesson. After we viewed the first

clip I asked, "Tell me a little about what you were hoping to get them to do with that

grammar?" Ms. West explained the value of grammar for improving writing. I replayed

the same clip for the third time and we studied the questioning pattern. I did not respond

to her grammar explanation and went directly to replaying the video clip and explaining

an IRE pattern.

> LC: So its this idea that I'm going to ask a question.
> W: Uh-huh.
> LC: They're going to give me an answer
> W: Okay
> LC: And then we're going to evaluate it.
>   And it's called an IRE pattern.
> W: OK.

I explained that the IRE pattern had been widely studied and that she was in good

company, saving face for her and positioning her as a competent teacher. Then I

contrasted the IRE video clip with the iMovie I prepared that showed Ms. West in an

open-ended, sense-making conversation with her students. Her response made me feel

like what I was sharing made sense to her and was helpful. She said to me,

> You know what? I'm not paying attention to the things until you
> say it….A lot of things that I do are not intentional….The more you tell
> me, the more I'm learning, where I'm going to say, okay, let me continue
> to make sure I do this or I want to make sure I do that and do less of the
> question response.

Ms. West's positive response encouraged me to share another discursive

construct, the circulation of power. As we watched the tape I asked,

> Do you see what happened? The kids were not talking to each
> other. If we can create a dialogue that is exchanged around the room, it's
> sort of like you can think of it like the power is kind of circulating around
> the room. People speaking up who have answers…And people are trying

to question each other. Those kids, I mean, they're not shown on the screen but you can hear how they're talking to each other and you're listening in as a participant….You're not listening in here as an authority. Look how you're leaning into the kids. And how you're really trying to make sense and make meaning of it….they can see that. Wow.

Ms. West's response to me moved the conversation forward and encouraged me to be enthusiastic.[32]

> W: This is so amazing.
>   Cause I'm not paying attention to it.
>   Like I say it's not
> LC: You're doing it.
> W: It's not intentional
> LC: But now
> W: Now I will be.

Two different teachers, same coach, similar issues, yet the response was shaped by each teacher's reaction to and interaction with the coach. There was no way to predict with certainty prior to the conference that I would find myself at odds with Ms. East and intellectually engaged with Ms. West and the repercussions of those dynamics. Ms. West's interest and surprise at not previously noticing her discursive interactions generated a sense of togetherness in the conversation. We were both pleased that there was something of value in our conversation and that satisfaction moved the coaching conversation along. In the case of Ms. East, she knew her summer teaching was not up to her expectations. She felt bad about it and had expressed her concern during the summer. This may have influenced her reaction at the start of our conference, a reaction in which she justified her actions based on her beliefs about how to be a good teacher. By taking the lead in her self-critique, her statements served to ward off any criticism that I might make. That made it more difficult for me to discuss alternatives, as she did not appear

---

[32] See Appendix G for an extended transcript.

open to other possibilities. However, despite the difficulties of raising the issue, I still wanted to challenge her beliefs because I thought the way they played out in lengthy and repetitive directions limited student opportunities to learn.

Escalating Tension During a Coaching Conference

Nearly halfway through each conference, the issues of a rote literacy curriculum and classroom tension had yet to be addressed. With Ms. West, given the relaxed tone of the conference to this mid-way point, I assumed I would continue to share video clips and we would discuss what we saw. With Ms. East, I was relieved that some of the previous tension had ebbed and I saw this as an opportunity to raise questions related to learning as opposed to following directions. However, it was Ms. West who caught me off guard with her question, leaving me to grapple with an unexpected challenge: how to explain changing an IRE pattern to an open-ended conversation?

> Now how would you change this particular conversation about. I noticed the big contrast in this clip and the other clip. But, how do you change this topic? What I want them to know about this. To being like when we were doing the Venn Diagram. See the Venn Diagram to me was different because it was their ideas or they're able to tell me and there is no right or wrong answer. So how would you change this kind of conversation to that kind of conversation?

My response stumbled here more than at any other time during the coaching conference.[33] I was unprepared for this question and had not thought beforehand about how to change one form of question to another. Nor did I expect Ms. West to question me as she had continually aligned with me during our interactions by nodding, smiling, and saying, "Uh-huh." From a teaching perspective, asking questions is a form of power. Typically, classroom questions are the right of the teacher. Questions position the hearer

---

[33] See Appendix I for the extended transcript of this conversation.

as one who is expected to respond. Until now, the conference had followed my prepared

plan. I felt as though I was leading Ms. West toward new insights into her teaching. She

appeared to be following my lead and I interpreted her responses as encouragement to

continue my line of thought. It appeared to me that she understood what I was sharing

and that she agreed with my interpretations. However, my dilemma as coach was that I

had no way of knowing with certainty that we were in agreement or that Ms. West truly

understood the points I was attempting to make. Though at the time I thought we were in

alignment, Ms. West might have been holding back her thoughts, waiting until an

opportune moment presented itself when she could assert herself and question my

teachings. She might have been going along with me politely so as not to prolong the

conference and just get through it. Any number of possibilities could have been plausible.

But during the conference, my assumption was that we were in agreement and she was

responding positively to all I had to share. My interpretations of Ms. West's responses

were tenuous. I could not be positive I was interpreting her responses as she intended.

Therefore, when Ms. West asked me to explain how to change a specific example of a

closed question into a more open question that invited students to construct meaning with

the teacher and one another, I was caught by surprise.

> LC: It's the best question.
>   Alright.
>   First of all
>   You don't always want to.
> W: Okay.
> LC: There are times when you want to
>   And there are times when you don't want to
> W: Okay.
> LC: That's part of this whole intentionality.
>   But there's a whole different level of engagement here
>   And it's
>   So for me

One of the questions is
What are they really learning
W: Uh-huh.
LC: And I kept asking that all the way through.
Let me show you a different clip.
And let's see if that connects in some way.

As a coach, I wondered how I could have been so naïve in my preparation for this

conference? I assumed that contrasting the video clips would be sufficient to show a

teacher the difference between open and closed questions. I did not anticipate that Ms.

West would want me to show her how to change one specific example of discourse into

another questioning pattern. The problem I faced, though I did not realize it at time, was

that the IRE example illustrated a range of problematic teaching issues. Before I could

use that particular example to illustrate more open classroom conversation, I would have

to address the issue of what it meant to teach reading. To explain, from the way Ms. West

taught reading, it appeared that she thought teaching reading meant having students read

aloud decontextualized historical accounts or excerpts of classic texts with simplified

language followed by asking students literal questions about the vocabulary and the facts

presented in the texts. The issue of what constituted teaching reading was related to the

issue of IRE questions. But from a coach's perspective, trying to address two significant

issues simultaneously seemed as though it would be overwhelming for a special

education teacher who usually taught math to middle schoolers. When I preplanned for

the conference, I imagined addressing each issue separately, allowing one to build on the

other. Now, my plan was disrupted and I would have to figure out in-the-moment another

approach that might clarify and satisfy Ms. West's question.

I did not want to say I was not sure how to answer her question. If I could not

come up with an answer to Ms. West's question, I was concerned that she would think

the issue was not as important as I made it seem or that I was not a knowledgeable coach. How was it possible that the coach could not respond to an outwardly simple question about a practice the coach had raised in the first place? The problem was that in-the-moment I was unable to analyze the reasons why the answer was so difficult for me. My plan was to keep the conversation going and attempt to think on my feet. In the process of talking out loud, I intended to think my way through to an answer. Part of my thinking aloud led me to search for a video clip that might help me answer Ms. West's question. I was struggling for language to use to explain to Ms. West how to change an IRE discourse pattern into a dialogic discourse pattern. I recalled a clip that raised the question of what constitutes reading instruction that I thought might lead to a conversation about when and why a teacher might choose to use a dialogic approach. I intended to show that clip as a way to help me find words to express what I wanted to teach Ms. West and as a way to illustrate to Ms. West the point I wanted to make. While I searched for that particular clip I joked to Ms. West about her wearing the same outfit as in the previous video clip to help me recognize the lesson example I wanted to share at this point. This move lightened the moment, but I was still faced with answering a question I was not certain I could explain.

> LC: This one is the same day
>   Same thing
>   Oh, this is perfect.
>   Thank goodness you had that same outfit on.
> W: (laughs)
> LC: Um so here we are.
>   This is the same lesson on comprehension.
>   But it's toward the end.
> W: Okay.

Ms. West appeared patient and willing to bear with me as I stumbled toward a coherent answer. It took me one thousand lines of dialogue to finally think my way through to a credible answer. Finally I said,

> And so one of the things we probably want to do is if the questions were really deep and thoughtful where you didn't know the answer either, where we just try to figure something out, that's how you get to the other kind of discourse.

My interaction with Ms. West over an ostensibly straight forward question illustrates some complications of coaching. In the process of formulating a response, I was faced with my own knowledge and its limitations, considerations regarding the teacher and what approaches would most resonate for her, what was behind her question in the first place, how to scaffold new learning for her in ways that will make sense for her, and how to set up the response so that we, teacher and coach, remain in conversation with one another. A further complication is that these considerations happen simultaneously, in-the-moment. A coach has limited reflective time to consider options. And even with options and time for considering alternative scenarios, a coach may have to rethink a carefully constructed answer in response to a teacher's statements. The tenuous nature of interaction where one speaker can only assume she understands the hearer further complicates coaching conversations. We can know what is said on the surface. What lies behind what is said is conjecture and leaves both coach and teacher vulnerable to miscommunication during a conference.

One way miscommunication can occur is when coach or teacher misread verbal or nonverbal cues and continue talking assuming each person is following the other's line of reasoning. That was the case when I presented the video clip of

Ms. West turning away from Rae, who asked to read the chapter book in her bookbag. I recount that episode here as an illustration of how easy it can be to miss cues that if recognized, have the potential to create more responsive interactions.

The video clip I selected to help answer Ms. West's question about shifting an IRE pattern to an open-ended discussion, showed Ms. West responding to Rae, a child who had finished her reading worksheet and held up a novel. Rae asked if she could read her book. Ms. West said, "Sure. But we're about to start another assignment in about two minutes." The conversation that ensued questioned what Ms. West's response signaled as most valued: the worksheet assignment or student selected reading of whole texts? I believed that if Ms. West privileged the workbook readings followed by literal, in the text questions, over the student selected novel reading, then there was no purpose in turning an IRE pattern into a more open-ended form of question. Ms. West may as well stay with the literal questions and continue to follow her established IRE pattern. However, if I could help Ms. West see another way to teach reading, through student selected books, then show Ms. West how to ask questions that generate discussion and co-construct thought, I could lead her to an alternative to IRE patterns of classroom talk. If Ms. West did not change her reading instructional practices, then open-ended responses would have little place in her lessons. Thus, in order to answer her question about how to turn IRE questions into open-ended questions that promote teacher-to-student-to-student-to-teacher extended talk, I shared the video clip of Ms. West discounting a student's request to read a novel during reading time. I had a particular line of reasoning in mind.

However, Ms. West had her own interpretation and line of reasoning that I did not expect. She equated IRE patterns to "scary classrooms" where children weren't allowed to breathe. Ms. West said,

> So I really want to get away from that IRE thing.
> Unless it's necessary cause to me at some points like you said there are times when you do have to use it. But it puts me more in the mind of that classroom of when I was a child in school then. We got the ditto sheets and you sit like this (clasped hands tucked on knees—stiff position) And you listen and that's it. All you do is sit and listen. And when she says it's time to do this ditto sheet you shut up and do the ditto sheet, you know. And I don't think that's the way learning should take place.

Passionate in her response, Ms. West went on to share stories of how her favorite teachers related to her and how her friend's special needs children influenced her decision to become a special education teacher. What I, as coach, approached analytically, Ms. West took up emotionally. I was truly surprised; never imagining something like an IRE pattern could stir up such strong memories and feelings. I said to Ms. West, "And I'm struck by the story of the kids that are afraid in some classrooms. And you associate the IRE with that." She replied, "Cause I watched it. Just watching it and how you showed me the difference in this other interaction versus the IRE way and I just thought about how, yeah, to me it kinda relates….I just liked the difference of everybody participating."

As coach, I was pleased with Ms. West's positive response toward taking up discursive interactions that would generate extended classroom discussion and meaning-making. I thought at the time that the conversation was moving forward. When I was unsure how to respond, Ms. West picked up the conversation and built on previous ideas. Her strong reaction to and rejection of IRE patterns made me think I was successful at

getting my teaching point across. As a result, I felt less uncomfortable about the difficulty I had answering her earlier question. What I did not notice was that Ms. West never actually responded to the video clip showing her moving away from Rae who asked if she could read her novel. Instead, Ms. West shared her childhood connection to IRE patterns and why she did not want to talk that way. Focused on my personal relief at having successfully conveyed an idea, I decided to continue my line of reasoning regarding the teaching of reading and returned to the video clip at hand—Ms. West eschewing Rae's request to read her book. In retrospect, I was unable to simultaneously act as analyst and still be fully present in the conversation. At the time, it seemed logical to continue my previous line of thinking. I suggested that we replay the video clip of Rae asking to read a book and look at it from another angle to "think about what are our options as teachers." It was only in retrospect that I became aware that Ms. West did not comment on the book incident. Later in the conversation, after replaying the video three times, Ms. West made me aware of how uncomfortable that clip made her feel.

For a coach, the need for discursive self-awareness of the effect her words might have on the teacher and the simultaneous awareness of not just what the teacher says in response but also, what she does not say, is a challenge complicated by the tactical nature of coaching. A coach has to be in the conversation while at the same time, be above the conversation as well, conscious of what she is trying to teach, how it is being received, and deciding where to take the conversation next to best meet the teacher's needs. The cognitive load for the coach is significant and contributes to the challenges of coaching.

Risking the Relationship to Raise Difficult Issues

Up to this point in the coaching conference, Ms. West and I had examined the issue of teacher talk patterns. A second thematic issue I hoped to address related to curriculum and what counts as reading. However, each time a new area of concern is raised, the potential for face threats increases, power shifts to the coach and away from the teacher, and a teacher's sense of competence is at stake. Ms. West and I appeared to be aligned and circulating power at this point. However, social equilibrium is at risk when teaching practice is questioned. My concern for student learning opportunities over rode my concern for Ms West's feelings at this time. My need to help Ms. West recognize reading as more than questions following a worksheet story compelled me to push forward with the conversation.

The video clip of Rae asking to read a book in between worksheets was a telling moment, emblematic of the tension around "what is reading." I played the clip. Ms. West and I agreed that Rae had not been an engaged or socially connected student during summer school. I suggested that the moment with Rae asking to read a book was an opportunity to reposition the child as a learner. This time, I spoke as if I was the teacher and demonstrated how I might have responded to Rae's book request. "You have a book, Rae? In your bookbag? What are you reading? Oh my goodness. Tell me about it. Is it a series? Have you been reading this a lot? You guys, I've got to interrupt you. I do not believe this. This is the most wonderful thing. Rae has…"

Ms. West interrupted, "Okay." Her face was uncharacteristically solemn. I worried that she looked that way and had just cut me off because by imitating a teacher voice, though demonstrating how one might respond to the situation, she felt that I was

talking down to her. I was torn. I wanted to lighten the moment, save face for Ms. West and re-establish social equilibrium yet still move to the notion of a rich, authentic literacy curriculum. In the interaction that followed (see below), my hesitation was evident in my use of "Well" and awkward phrasing, "Well, that was, they did a lot with that, the hair." On the one hand, I wanted to credit Ms. West with building warm rapport with her students, to offset any offense she may have felt at my teacher voice imitation and to show her she often positioned students in positive ways. On the other hand, the rapport usually had to do with talk about the style of hair or clothing. I wondered if the rapport could have been built around something more academically substantive—such as reading a book.

I went on to explain, "So there's a lot going on around the physical appearance and you…. But now there's another thing we can think about, and that is when is a kid doing something that's really literate and how can we make that part of the conversation?" I suggested that if we recognize the real reading students do for their own purposes and make that a priority, we might be able to shift the balance from worksheets to authentic work. I asked, "What would happen for kids?" Ms. West responded, "Right. They'd like to read and would practice reading and comprehending." I then tried to bring some loose ends together by implicitly referring back to IRE questions, "And they do it, maybe not giving you a definition. But they do it." Ms. West agreed, "Uh-huh."

Verbal Blunders, Offenses, and Terse Exchanges Mar the Interactions

Throughout this exchange about how to change IRE patterns into more open-ended discussions and how more open-ended discussions depend on richer literacy tasks such as reading a book, there were exchanges of tension, verbal missteps on the part of

the coach, and interactions that may have been unnecessary had I, as coach, been able to be more analytical about the conversation in the moment. The purpose in bringing forth these interactional complications is to demonstrate how, despite clashes, when both participants want to have a successful conference, many inopportune exchanges can be resolved or ignored to move the conference forward. Further, illustrating how, in detail, such complications occur provides discursive ways to unpack the interactions for the purpose of considering alternative actions in future encounters.

Twice after viewing the iMovie showing Rae asking to read a book and being discouraged, I directly challenged Ms. West's professional competence. I made a harsh judgment about Ms. West's practice when I said, "To me what's valued is collecting the papers and going on to the next assignment." To which Ms. West replied, "Okay." Then she waited for me to explain further. A second time I critiqued her practice when I said, "I'm not sure what's being taught. I'd have to work at it." These were direct challenges to her professionalism, face-threatening acts. I did not know how Ms. West felt about my statements. Her response remained neutral. However, I know that if I were in her place, statements that called into question my effectiveness as an educator would offend me.

As Ms. West did not evidence displeasure or complaint, I interpreted her silence as a sign that I could replay the Rae iMovie a third time to view it from a different angle. My idea was to demonstrate to Ms. West that her physical response, in addition to her words, sent the message to Rae that reading her book was not a valued practice in the classroom. Playing the video clip three times was in keeping with the pattern established earlier in the conference. I played and replayed several clips asking Ms. West to share what she noticed and then replayed the clip so I could point out additional aspects of the

interactions shown on tape. We did this right from the beginning of the conference when I played a clip once to familiarize Ms. West with the format and seeing herself on tape and then again to notice how she interacted with a sick child and how that was representative of her respectful interactions with students throughout the summer. To me, it appeared that I was following a pre-established pattern of video viewing. After viewing the clip once, Ms. West made no mention of it in the ensuing conversation. I considered Rae's video clip to be central to the argument that reading can be more than workbook pages and that Rae was one of several children who brought books to class but were not encouraged to read them. Therefore, I wanted to revisit the clip as a way to generate discussion about what counts as reading. Only in retrospect did I come to believe that showing the same video clip three times may not have been the best coaching decision.

In hindsight I recognized from prior statements that one of Ms. West's paramount priorities was to build relationships with students based on mutual respect so students would like school and want to learn. Three times during the coaching conference, Ms. West elaborated on this point. Her longest and most impassioned statement was in response to our conversation that wondered why students acted differently in different classrooms. Ms. West said,

> When the child doesn't respect the teacher because they don't feel respected or because they feel like they can run over the teacher, you get less productivity from them…I see one extreme where I feel like the kids are frightened in this one class. So they [administrators] think this teacher has this wonderful classroom management, that these kids are actually learning, but they are scared….So when they get out of that room they just vent, you know. They breathe and they go tell anybody who will listen what has happened to them, you know. But, I think that's where the difference comes in, in learning too, is you relate with the children. How you relate to them….I don't want them to feel this fear that they feel…So I just think children are people and a lot of time people, adults, don't remember to treat them like people, like they deserve your respect and you

185

deserve theirs….I feel so bad some days that the kids have me in tears some days cause I feel like why are they being treated like this…you're pushing them to be dropouts cause school is not a pleasant experience….Just be comfortable here. Just learn.

By playing the clip a third time, particularly interpreting Ms. West's body language as rejecting a student's desire to read, I may, unwittingly, have placed Ms. West in the company of those teachers who did not respect students, teachers whose actions she decried. However, without any objection from Ms. West, I continued to play and discuss the Rae incident. Given the critique embedded in my coaching and the retrospective analysis illustrating how Ms. West might have felt as a result of my interpretation of classroom events, how did we arrive at a positive ending to the coaching conversation? How can teacher and coach overcome face threats, intended or not, and the sting of critique that is likely to accompany a close look at teacher practice?

Moving Toward a Productive Close: Repositioning the Teacher

Following our "real" reading conversation, Ms. West and I viewed fourteen more brief clips. Almost all were responses to IRE patterned questions. The focus was on the students and their reactions. In most cases, students were disinterested and distracted by blankets, desks, and pencils. We moved through these quickly. I offered a few suggestions for ways to improve the interactions, such as having partners discuss questions, or ask each other questions and then stop to jot a brief answer. Another suggestion I offered was to tell the students what you, the teacher, want them to learn, such as how to predict while reading, and then let them practice rather than trying to guess the definition of the word predict. Ms. West did stand up for herself at one point, reminding me, "I think about teaching language arts. That's not my favorite."

186

Having addressed the topics I was most concerned about in Ms. West's teaching, moving toward dialogic teaching, improving instructional rigor when it comes to reading, and observing how students responded when they were focused on making meaning and intellectually challenged, I felt it was time to bring the coaching conference to a close. I wanted to end with Ms. West's strengths to re-establish her professional competence and my respect for her as an educator. I wanted to maintain a relationship with Ms. West to hold open the possibility for future coaching conversations. To do so, I suggested we look at the writing conference clips of Ms. West with her students that I had selected. There were only two days during the summer that students were asked to write. However, those two days were entirely different from the days when workbook pages dominated. Ms. West invited students to choose their own topics for writing and then she spoke individually to students as they were writing at their desks. Her talk was responsive and students sustained their writing for the entire class period. IRE patterns were not in evidence.

We were full circle back to the beginning of the coaching conference where my intent as a coach was to establish rapport and to build on the teacher's strengths. At one point I complimented Ms. West, "Your coaching is really, really wonderful. You're saying to her, does this make sense? You're focused on meaning. It's a whole different level of conversation and teaching than when we went to the single word questions….The writing really gives you an opportunity to get at the kinds of teaching you were trying to do the other way around." A short while later I said, "Letting the work come from the kids seems to get a whole different reaction and level of buy in and effort than when they're given the worksheet and now they've gotta deal with it." Ms. West said, "I

agree." I agree seemed a different, more affirmative statement than when she replied,

"Okay," which was her most frequent response.

An interesting move occurred near the end of the conference. I asked Ms. West

for her thoughts or questions. She indicated she had none. Rather than draw the

conference to an abrupt end, I reminded Ms. West of some of her strengths as a teacher,

all the while cognizant of wanting to re-establish a positive relationship that we could

build on in the future.

> Such rapport, and you're teasing her and that made them feel comfortable. It was very relaxed and very easy, very friendly. And the fact that Pam could come back to you. Your patience with Pam was great. You kept going back and back and back, giving her a little bit, going back again. And uh you gave her an opportunity to be successful. That was really nice.

It appeared, given what she said next, that she had been mulling over some of our

conversation because she connected reading to her life and from there, made plans for

ways to improve her teaching.

> I'm already thinking about this. I like to read. I read at home. I'm in a book club. But the stuff I read is interesting to me so what can I find for them that's interesting for them?.... Maybe I'll do a book club with them…. And I'll figure out how to grade based on that then. Cause I look forward to every fourth Saturday.

We ended our conference smiling, though I realized that it would take more than a single

conversation to support substantive changes in practice.

Ms. West and I negotiated our way through tension and face threats. During the

coaching session, even when I was uncomfortable trying to figure out a helpful response

to Ms. West's concern about how to change an IRE question to dialogic discourse, I felt

the conversation was productive and moving in a positive direction. I did not detect any

outright rejection of the ideas I put forth. As a result, I continued my line of reasoning

and followed through with my intended conference plan assuming that Ms. West was a willing participant in the conversation. In the retrospective analysis, however, the conference did not appear as smooth and unchallenged as it seemed to me during the conference. I noticed that Ms. West did not always follow my lead when discussing video clips. Post-analysis showed times she defended herself and times when my critique of her practice appeared to me to be overly harsh both in the moment and in retrospect. However, the conference drew to a constructive close. How is it possible that when I worried that my critique was too pointed or my answer unfocused and drawn out, or when I did not recognize that Ms. West and I were not responding to the same issue, that I appeared able, based on her response, to influence Ms. West's thinking in constructive ways? How can coaches know what words or actions affect the teachers with whom we work? During our conversation, Ms. West reached into her emotional reservoirs connecting childhood memories and deep feelings about children and learning. In the end, she generated a plan for bringing books into her classroom and encouraging authentic reading of whole texts. Based on Ms. West's instructional plan, the conference could be called successful. But it was unpredictable, messy, and marked by moments of discomfort. Communication did not go easy. Therefore, what do coaches need to know in order to facilitate teacher learning?

A second case study of a coaching conversation will raise and complicate the question of what constitutes a successful conference. Unlike the case of Ms. West, if the teacher does not make a plan for improved future instruction, if the coach and teacher appear at odds throughout the conference, can the conversation still be considered a success? How does a coach respond to what appears to be resistance? How might a coach

189

find ways to continue to consult with a teacher who appears to reject most of what a coach has to share? What if a teacher and coach see the world from such different perspectives that common ground is illusive? These questions are explored through the data from Ms. East's coaching conference.

Challenge, Reflection, and an Uncertain Ending

The three themes I wanted to address with Ms. East involved the length and repetition of teacher discourse and the effect on student learning, the low level test prep curriculum, and the tension generated between teacher and students as a result of one or both of these issues. Anticipating fraught conversations given Ms. East's expressed disappointment with her summer school teaching, I started Ms. East's conference with a transcript of her strongest lesson from her fourth grade advanced class that took place during the school year. I thought by beginning with her most comfortable and successful lesson and with students she enjoyed teaching, I could develop rapport with Ms. East before we eased into less comfortable summer school interactions. However, the length of the lesson transcript suggested to Ms. East that she talked too long. Before I had an opportunity to address the positive aspects of her lesson, Ms. East raised the issue of her lengthy talk time. She was familiar with this critique of her teaching and she proactively initiated the issue and limited that area of inquiry with a rationale for her decisions regarding when to talk and when to limit her talk.

My plan for building rapport was disrupted by her self-critique. However, I thought I could address talk time and curriculum if I pointed out the difference between directions and learning. When Ms. East said she wanted "her students to get it", "it" repeatedly referred to understanding directions. I decided that if I could show Ms. East

those lines in the transcript when she taught students lessons about reading, I could show

her that the balance between directions and what we want students to learn could be

recalibrated. My intent was to address a difficult issue from a positive perspective.

> Here, for example, when you said, 'You need to be very careful as you're reading. Did I say the exact same thing or did I say almost the exact same thing?' So, here's some good teaching, you know. You're teaching them when you read you've got to be careful because small changes in a word here or there change meaning. That's an important teaching piece. But look how little time it gets.

I pointed to three lines on the transcript. Four times during the coaching conference, I

pointed out teaching points tucked into the directions. In response, Ms. East indicated she

could have made changes.

> Well, this particular activity is more of an introduction to the lesson. So in this case, we were going to then read. So because of that time now, I'm looking at it. Now I'm assessing myself as I'm looking at this. Certainly the talk time, the thing I've always known that the talk time, it's way too much. The checking could have, even though the kids are interacting, you know, they're engaged here, certainly that could have, should have been a shorter time. We should have, this point, as I'm looking at this now, we should have gotten into the reading by now. Gotten really into the lesson. Then, maybe at the end of that particular chapter, then we have an assessment or a review with questions at the end. It could have, should have been more independent work. It was too much of me as I look at this now. It was too much of my talking. I have no problem engaging with the kids. That's wonderful. Those things could have been shorter. Okay. And more reading. More discussion of the actual lesson. And that's probably where I fell short.

As a coach, I should have been pleased with Ms. East's intentions. She indicated

one way she could review after the reading to move the timing along. However, I was not

certain how she would accomplish her goals. Ms. East made it clear that she recognized

she should be concerned about her talk time, yet she continued to talk at length to justify

this practice. I was not convinced actions would follow words because of her

justifications. The issue of student learning versus giving directions seemed sidelined. In

her explanation she focused more on the necessity of monitoring the time she spent talking and much less on the lesson and what was to be learned. Her solution of getting into the reading quicker, I thought, implied that she believed learning would be found in students procuring information from the text. However, at this point in the conference, it did not occur to me to bring up for discussion the weighty subject of how students learn and make sense of what they read. We were at an impasse when it came to teacher talk time, something Ms. East was familiar with but appeared to resist changing. The difference between kinds of talk for different purposes seemed to be overlooked and I could not imagine how I could raise an even more complicated issue relating to how students learn and construct meaning with text. Given what I interpreted as Ms. East's resistance, I was not sure how to clarify the difference between talking to give directions and talking to teach content beyond what I had already done.

Missed Opportunities, Nuanced Interpretations

In the course of our conversation, I recognized a new issue with Ms. East's teaching that I had not anticipated when preparing for the conference. As Ms. East and I interacted during the conference, I noticed that she did not appear to recognize when students understood a concept she was trying to teach. Twice she missed noting student understanding. First, during her summer school teaching, she did not appear to recognize and respond to evidence of student understanding. The transcripts I had prepared for the coaching conference showed Ms. East repeating teaching points and drawing out lessons even when student answers indicated they understood the lesson and could move on to

new learning. Second, Ms. East did not notice students demonstrating understanding of her teaching when she read through the transcripts with me.[34]

During my conference planning, I, too, missed the fact that students indicated understanding but Ms. East did not acknowledge their readiness to move on to another concept. This was important to my aim of redirecting her excessive teacher talk and repetition of directions and teaching points because she made clear that as long as students did not "get it" she would keep talking. If she recognized more easily when students understood, perhaps she would be more willing to limit her talk time. In preparation for the coaching conference, my analytical focus was on more obvious instructional difficulties such as time spent on giving directions. For our first extended coaching conversation, I intended to initiate topics that I thought would be recognizable and reasonably easy to modify. I wanted to ensure the likelihood of a productive conference in which Ms. East could make relatively small changes to her practice that would result in student learning improvements. If Ms. East made changes to her discourse that supported student learning, perhaps she would be willing to continue our coaching sessions. This was of concern to me because she started off the conference on the defensive and I worried that we would have difficulty continuing to interact in constructive ways.

Noticing when students understand a lesson as a cue to initiate new teaching seemed to me to be a more sophisticated and less obvious instructional shift than limiting the amount of time the teacher spent talking to the whole class. In preparation for this first conference, I was not looking for subtle interactions to share with Ms. East.

---

[34] See Appendix H for an illustrative extended transcript.

However, as I believed I was unsuccessful at helping Ms. East re-see her teaching in light of the complications of lengthy teacher discourse, assisting her to recognize when students understood a topic so she could move on with her instruction could be an alternative way to address her reasons for wanting to explain to students "until they get it." Though I recognized and raised this issue once with Ms. East during the coaching conference, I was unable to strategize a way to leverage this concept while the conversation was ongoing, similar to Ms. West's conference when in-the-moment tactical response made it difficult for me to respond to an unexpected question. Instead, helping Ms. East become aware of ways to interpret formative assessment during classroom instruction as a means of knowing when to reteach and when to move to a new concept did not occur to me until the retrospective analysis of the coaching conference. Had I recognized this possible cause of Ms. East's talk time, I might have been able to alter the conversational trajectory. Rather than a test of wills about how long Ms. East talked to give directions, the coaching conversation could have been about ways to recognize when students understand so the lesson can move forward, satisfying Ms. East's need to be sure her students understand. Also, shifting the focus away from what Ms. East said to what her students responded, might remove a more direct criticism of her practice. The locus of attention would be on students, not the teacher. Perhaps, in that situation, Ms. East would be more receptive to revising her practice.

Another distinct, but related new issue arose for me during the coaching conference as Ms. East and I read through the prepared transcripts. When students acted in ways that furthered their own interests, such as seeking peer approval, Ms. East attributed the student behavior to her loss of control as the teacher in charge of the class.

She did not appear to recognize that students could have reasons for their actions that might have little to do with the teacher and more to do with their own needs. Ms. East appeared to interpret student classroom behaviors solely in light of her teaching. Similar to how she did not seem to recognize when students understood a lesson, she also did not appear to recognize when students had their own reasons for particular actions beyond student interactions with the teacher. How could I help Ms. East view classroom dynamics from more than her perspective? How could I assist Ms. East to interpret interactions as more than one-sided and give consideration to how others respond? This was the focus of our discussion of the second transcript.

The second transcript involved a student who commandeered the class to tell about a scary movie. She started out politely answering Ms. East's question. But when other students in class showed an interest in the movie she was talking about, she continued to hold the floor and put on an extended performance for the students. Ms. East did her best to negotiate the interaction by reminding the students of the lesson's point— the difference between details and a summary. However, students were far more interested in the gory details of a horror movie than returning to a workbook page on the overhead projector.

Ms. East interpreted this incident as one in which she lost control of the class with the result that the students did not understand the lesson. I intended to help her see it was not about her at all, but rather about the student trying to gain acceptance from her peers. Ms. East reflected on the lesson and concluded that she, as the teacher, was trying to fit in. This was middle school and she was not used to working with this age student. That was a significant admission from a teacher and I wanted to respect it. However, Ms. East

also said the students did not understand the lesson as a result of her losing control of the class. I did not challenge that statement. It completely slipped by me. Yet, the transcript showed that most students seemed to recognize a summary from details. In hindsight, this was a moment when I could have probed her for evidence of her assertion that students continued to need help on details and summaries. Studying the evidence, I could have demonstrated to her that students provide teachers with clues to their understanding and by paying attention to those clues we can be more responsive to student learning needs. As we progressed into the conference, the issues I thought most pressing during the preparation phase, appeared less pressing than other issues raised during the conference.

Ms. East's second transcript and her comments about it also raised another key issue in considering her classroom practices. She discussed whether students "get it or not" in terms of control and the teacher's role in maintaining order in her classroom. In the case of the middle schooler who performed part of a horror movie in class, Ms. East interpreted that as losing control, focusing on her own performance when a more complicated view of the situation would have served her in improving her practices. I know from ethnomethodological studies of classroom interactions (Baker, 1997, 2002) that classroom events such as this one, comprised of many actions, reactions, and interactions complicate one another, but also follow culturally held social structures. Managing the actions of students in a classroom is not as simple as one person maintaining control (Cothran & Ennis, 1997; Crawford, 2008; Pace, 2003; Pace & Hemmings, 2007).

I assumed in the pre-planning that both Ms. West and Ms. East would easily see the affects of their actions—their talk. I had not considered that if one's notion of

teaching is about control, understanding discursive interactions might be more difficult for that person. In the case of Ms. West, she wanted to build caring relationships with students and valued interactions where everyone was involved, even if that meant teaching in non-traditional ways. Ms. East, on the other hand, had a different educational background. She wanted students to be prepared to work together to accomplish a job. She assumed a boss who monitored output. Both teachers valued relationships with their students. However, as had become evident, how they enacted those values varied consequentially for their and my teaching and suggested significant differences in how they perceived classroom interaction.

Looking back upon the assumptions and decisions I made, I wonder whether power could have circulated more evenly between us if we had not focused on talk time. Could I have saved face for Ms. East and positioned her as a more competent teacher working on a more sophisticated issue had I realized her need to have students understand and how challenging recognizing student understanding was for her? As with Ms. West, where her unexpected question left me struggling for a response, or where her silence left me assuming alignment, once again I wonder how a coach can read or interpret the principles, values, and beliefs about key aspects of educating students in their subject matters embedded in what teachers say in their classrooms and during coaching conversations? How are we, as coaches, to read between the lines, to recognize what is left unsaid as well as respond to what is said, and all of that while being fully present in the coaching conversation?

Coaching Implications

Comparable to the social balancing act in classroom interactions, maintaining social equilibrium during a coaching conference is not something a coach can do unilaterally. Power will circulate among participants when they both recognize each others' face wants and needs as they position one another during the conversation. It is not only the teacher's professionalism that is at stake in a coaching conversation. As coach, I, too, wanted to believe I was able to make a difference for both teachers and their students. When the conversation moved in a direction I could not account for at the time, I became as defensive or frustrated as the teacher I was trying to support. Resistance does not belong solely to the teacher. Depending on the ways in which the coaching conference unfolds, the coach may become resistant as well.

Coaching conversations by nature are fraught. They are built around perceived needs for growth and the relationship between a coach and teacher implies a status differential from the outset. I have learned from both teachers that what I, as coach, chose to say or avoid, what topics I selected for discussion, what data I used to inform our conversation, and what background I brought to the conference, could influence how the teacher might respond. The same can be said of the teacher. She, too, brings a wealth of experience and history as a learner and teacher of learners that could influence how she reacts and interacts with the coach. It is rarely as simple as labeling someone resistant or disinterested. I learned from Ms. East that had I selected different topics, I might have repositioned myself differently in relation to her. The fact that unknowingly I targeted a previously recognized fault limited the options for a successful interaction around that

concern. I had to develop awareness of the concern beneath the concern and during the conference I was unable to discern the shift I needed to make.

Throughout the coaching conferences, I wanted to protect both teachers' sense of professional competence. But what does it mean for a coach to be professional? When I tried to explain to Ms. West the link between IRE questions and reading for meaning, I invoked my own passions about what it means to teach. Ms. West drew upon her personal resources and experiences during our coaching conversation, but I did as well. When it appeared that Ms. East co-opted my intended teaching and resisted my suggestions, I responded with a negative characterization of her fourth grade lesson. When a literacy coach steps into a conference she does not automatically abandon her feelings and previous experiences and knowledge. I have come to believe it is an unrealistic expectation to assume that a literacy coach can engage in a meaningful conversation with a teacher, one in which both parties are sincere about finding ways to communicate about teaching, without invoking her own personal beliefs, values, and dispositions. A coach is not a neutral broker. The transcripts or video clips selected to share, the topics identified for discussion, the language used to describe interactions, all influence how the conversation will unfold. The coach may attempt to be dispassionate, but the reality I experienced in both coaching cases, leaves me wondering what matters most when literacy coaches interact with teachers—the coach's objectivity and close adherence to a preplanned agenda or a coach's social interaction that calls upon the coach to fully engage in the conversation in the moment, bringing with her her values, beliefs, and knowledge to inform unanticipated interactions?

Ms. East's coaching conference did not end with exciting plans for future work. Ms. West imagined book clubs. Ms. East acknowledged that she aligned with students and would continue to do that. As a literacy coach, I am comforted to know that coaching involves further contact. It is likely that future interactions with Ms. West will discuss ways to enact her book club plans. With Ms. East, I imagine future interactions could involve ways to know whether students understand what the teacher is teaching. On the surface, one conference appears more productive that the other. Ms. West's rethinking her curriculum appears to be a move in a constructive direction. However, by recognizing the need behind Ms. East's extensive classroom talk and a possible new approach for helping her focus on learning, I would say that both conferences were different, but productive. With both teachers I was able to find a way to build on the coaching conversation in future interactions. Perhaps this is a marker of a successful coaching conference.

Conclusion

The coaching literature frequently admonishes the coach to build a trusting relationship with teachers. However, the nature of a coaching conversation is such that no sooner does the coach establish a safe context, than face threats emerge as the teacher's practice becomes the subject of discussion. Thus, the coaching conversation risks the very relationship the coach works so hard to establish. Sustaining the relationship while engaging in reflective practice requires a coach's full attention. Power and politeness moves are exchanged while teacher and coach position themselves and one another. Even when one understands the discursive constructs of power, politeness, and positioning invoked in high stakes interactions, coaching is a complicated social endeavor. Relying

on discourse analysis constructs as though they are strategic principles: for example, always help the teacher save face, is insufficient for successful coaching. When Ms. East prevented me from critiquing her excessive talk time, I tried to help her save face. But that was not necessarily good coaching for every time I invoked face saving moves, I avoided or delayed discussing a fraught but important issue in her practice.

Using discourse analysis to improve coaching outcomes is not as simple as learn Discourse Analysis constructs, follow these basic principles, and you will be a perfect coach. Feeling good about one's practice when student learning is at stake makes employing face saving moves more complicated than awareness of Discourse Analysis constructs. Knowing discourse analysts refer to power, politeness, and positioning when investigating some interactions does not mean invoking them consciously during a fast-paced conversation. As Ericson (2004) reminds us, conversations are comprised of tactical decisions, made unconsciously, in-the-moment, in response to another's talk. With Ms. East, I had to realize there was a reason why we remained out of alignment for so much of the conference. But it was not until a post-conference analysis that I was fully able to understand her need to be certain students understood and that she kept her talking because she did not recognize when students did understand. That might be where I could start for her to be comfortable moving forward in her instruction.

I am left grappling with questions about trust building. For what purpose? When? How? If I am trying to gain access to a teacher's classroom and help her realize that my intentions are to support her and her students, that signals a particular kind of interaction. I imagine it could involve a kind of social camaraderie through opportunities to express interest in a teacher's classroom, family, health, friends. The kinds of topics that are

socially safe but friendly (L'Allier, et al., 2010). But what does it mean to build trust for the purpose of problematizing a teacher's practice? That is a far riskier proposition. And how is that trust built in ways that make it possible for a coach to work with a teacher to improve her instruction? What happens when the conversation about practice becomes threatening to a classroom teacher who takes her work seriously? There is no reciprocity here. The coach is not being critiqued, just the teacher. This one-sided arrangement places both the coach and the teacher in precarious positions with regard to one another. What advice can be offered to coaches and teachers alike when their roles bring them together?

The coaching literature repeatedly refers to resistant teachers, those who are difficult to work with or unwilling to collaborate with a coach. From a Discourse Analysis perspective, resistance may be a catch phrase that conflates many different behaviors, perspectives, and beliefs that create clashes between teachers and coaches. In the case of Ms. East, it's not that she was a bad teacher, or that she didn't relate well to students, or that she wasn't good at what she did. The dilemma I faced in terms of her coaching was that she was effective with middle grades students in a particular style of teaching, what could be termed transmissive. She was highly regarded in her district. "Students would do anything for her," said her superintendent.

Some students feel comfortable with a transmissive style because it is what they believe school should be about. Some students are happy to do what is asked of them without question when the teacher gives directions. The difficulty with Ms. East's teaching style lies in the assumptions about teaching that narrow the substance of the curriculum and the learning that students can do. How does a coach engage a teacher who

receives positive feedback from administration and students in a situation where

opportunities for student learning are constrained by the teacher's style? Further, in the

case of Ms. East, she was so immersed in a transmission model, she had great difficulty

seeing an interaction as more than what she said to students. She was not taking into

account their reaction and subsequent interactions which complicated coaching her in two

ways. First, her straight-forward interpretation of what it means to teach: I tell you what

to do, you try it, if you do not understand what I want you to do, I will tell it to you over

again, made it challenging for her to assess students in the moment. She was not

cognizant of their responses to her statements that indicated understanding of curricular

content. Therefore, she continued to explain to students beyond what was reasonable.

Second, she saw most interactions from her own perspective. That accounted for her

insistence that she had lost control of her class when what was occurring in her classroom

was far more complicated than losing control. She assumed the interactions in the

classroom depended entirely on her even when students were jockeying for acceptance by

their peers in ways that had nothing to do with their teacher. Considering the case of Ms.

East, notions of what it means to resist coaching become far more complicated than

previously addressed in the literature.

  The case of Ms. East makes me wonder if resistant teachers are misunderstood

teachers? While it may be true that some teachers are easier to engage and more open to

trying new ideas or approaches, labeling someone resistant is a personal flaw that may

give the literacy coach permission to work with some teachers but not with others. It took

me months to analyze my interaction with Ms. East, time a literacy coach does not have

when working in a fast paced job. Our coaching conference was out of sync almost from

the beginning. Yet, it was not until I studied her responses that I came to see another way to meet both of our needs. Is it possible for a literacy coach to shortcut my laborious analysis and learn to more quickly see the backstory, the reasons behind classroom patterns and interactions? Can literacy coaches learn from cases like Ms. East to hone in on underlying issues that are difficult to recognize?

These two contrastive cases represent the challenging work of coaching. Ms. West saw her role as interacting in caring ways with her students. She was able to focus on her interactions and assess the extent of her effectiveness by student responses and her responses to students. Ms. East was partly aware of what was holding her back in the classroom but as a coach, in order to be effective, I had to figure out what the issues were that remained unspoken and invisible. As will be taken up in the Discussion, we cannot reimagine our *habitus*, the principles underlying our beliefs and values, until they become visible. Making those principles visible while negotiating a high stakes conversation filled with face wants, power, and issues of competency and professional respect, is the complicated work of coaching.

CHAPTER VII RESULTS: POST-COACHING ANALYSIS

The coaching literature suggests that conversations that challenge teacher practice are fraught, at times avoided, and involve high stakes, often threatening teacher professionalism. Despite this awareness, the literature is mostly silent on how to handle the complications of interactions that are intended to promote teacher change. By reanalyzing my coaching discourse, I aimed to accomplish two goals. First, I wanted to re-see my own language-in-use patterns to increase my self-awareness and create more options for productive discourse when I interact with teachers. In the process, I asked, how do coaches and teachers co-construct meaning? Why is that difficult? Further, what does a coach need to know about herself in order to facilitate coaching interactions? Second, I aspired to offer coaches and researchers insight into the complexities of engaging in and understanding coaching in-the-moment. Given that coaching has the potential to threaten teacher competency, how can we learn more about ways to alleviate tension and build relationships?

Is there more to learn about my own naturalized interactions that will improve future coaching? Further, how can that learning inform the scant coaching literature regarding the complexities of coaching? These questions inspire the organization of this chapter in which I present further elaborated analyses of my interactions. Analytical hindsight that draws upon additional discourse analysis approaches enabled me to derive richer understandings of my coaching decisions, patterns, and outcomes. There was much

to see when I was not caught up in the high stakes managing of status, power and politeness.

THE COACH'S DISCOURSE

As a starting point for a retrospective analysis of my language-in-use during the coaching conversations, I decided to revisit one interaction in particular that created tension for me as a coach. I interpreted this fraught sequence of talk as discrepant data that could become a productive site for investigation. I theorized that in unexpected or discordant moments, insight can be gained into ways power is circulated and speakers are positioned. It is through such interactions that meaning either breaks down or is co-constructed. I selected the coaching conference with Ms. West for further analysis largely because it involved a situation I was unprepared for and because it raised the possibility that coaches may not know when they are or are not in alignment with the teacher during a coaching conversation. In addition, the segment of talk raises the issue of the coach as vulnerable, fallible, and subject to emotions that influence the course of the coaching conversation. Through my re-analysis of the data, I came to understand that a coach can only assume alignment on the part of the teacher. In the example I selected to re-analyze, I assumed, at the time, I was in alignment with Ms. West based on her responses. However, when she asked a question I did not expect, in hindsight, I was able to recognize that my assumption of alignment and shared understanding was not mutual. By re-analyzing that fraught sequence of talk within an otherwise seemingly constructive conference, I aimed to understand why we were out of sync.

Ms. West's Example

The example I revisit here is one that was addressed at some length in the previous chapter. However, my focus will be different. Rather than on the unfolding of the interaction between the coach and teacher, the focus will be on the coach's discourse. How did I respond to Ms. West's question? How did my assumptions and personal vulnerabilities inform my discursive choices? What contributed to my struggle to respond?

To recap, I had just showed Ms. West the video clip of an Initiation-Response-Evaluation type of teacher-student interaction. Then I contrasted that clip with an instance when Ms. West genuinely tried to make meaning with her students. Referring to the clip we had just watched, Ms. West asked how to change that particular IRE pattern to an open-ended conversation. As explained previously, in preplanning for the conference I thought contrasting both clips would be sufficient to demonstrate for Ms. West how to create the kind of dialogic discourse in which all participants worked together to understand and learn from one another. My dilemma was that I could not perceive the possibility of making that particular conversation open-ended. The nine year-old students were answering workbook, test-like questions about stories that were condensed, decontextualized versions of classics such as Tom Sawyer, far removed from the students lived experiences in both language and plot. My internal conversation told me that whether a teacher asked IRE questions or not, if the content was insubstantial, it made little difference whether the children understood or not. In order to explain how to shift an IRE question to an open-ended question, I thought I had to raise the issue of what was worth talking about in the first place.

In retrospect, I can recognize and articulate that part of my hesitation resulted from my concern that the cognitive load of linking dialogic discourse to substantive curricular issues seemed too demanding for Ms. West, who was just beginning to recognize the shift from a didactic classroom discourse to a more dialogic classroom discourse. To support her learning, I wanted to address one issue at a time as I had anticipated in my preplanning for the coaching conference. But Ms. West's question put me in a position of having to consider how to connect these two challenging issues.

Until the moment of Ms. West's question, I thought she and I were in alignment. She nodded or said, "Uh-huh," throughout the conversation. I was flustered by her question not only because I did not have a ready answer but also, because her question indicated that my teaching was not as clear as I might have wished. Had I been able to easily respond to Ms. West, my sense of competence as a coach might not have felt challenged. As it was, I worked to formulate a response over many turns of talk and the more I struggled to explain my reasoning, the more I believed my professionalism was compromised. My semi-conscious awareness of what was occurring further complicated my ability to speak. I was sorting out the problem while trying to solve it, speaking as much to give me time to think as to say something useful, and rendering face threats and emotional appeals along the way. Much to my chagrin in retrospect, in the process, I actually employed the same IRE discursive approach I wanted Ms. West to modify.

Alignment: In the Moment and in Retrospect

During the coaching conference, I decided to explain my reasoning to Ms. West by sharing a video clip of the single, most fraught example in all of her data corpus. The

clip shows Rae asking to read a book and Ms. West, in the midst of collecting papers and preparing for the next assignment, verbally and physically dismissing Rae's request.

W: Yes?
R: Can I read a book from this book bag?
W: Can you do what?
R: Read a book? (holds up her book)
W: Sure. (turning to other students)
     But we're about to start another
     assignment in about two minutes.

Now I had compounded Ms. West's face threats. Earlier in the video share, we had established that Ms. West was a caring teacher who tried to make her students feel comfortable and love learning and school. But at this point, a competing aim and my personal emotions overcame my concern for saving face for Ms. West. I wanted students to receive a rigorous education. My focus was on making the point that if the curriculum is watered down, then no matter what we say or how we say it makes much difference. Rather than thinking of Ms. West's face wants and rather than setting up the clip by reminding Ms. West that she established caring relationships with her students and this was one of only a few times when she missed an opportunity to connect with her students, I focused on making my point. What is "real" reading? How can we honor the "real" reading students choose to do? What should language arts teachers be teaching?

Three more times I pointed to Rae's book clip as a site of Ms. West's mistaken practice. "Rae was one of the least connected kids and she had a book. But the response to the book was, "we've got another worksheet to do." Then I reminded Ms. West the same thing happened when Angel brought a book to school. The book and the child's literacy were not recognized. In the transcript excerpt below, I struggled with how to approach my concern regarding the curriculum and what constitutes reading. I began by

speaking as if I were a teacher addressing the class, "Guys." My hesitation at how to

explain my concerns showed in my false start. I had intended to continue in a teacher

voice modeling how to speak to students about Rae's book but decided in-the-moment to

shift to another, more personal and philosophical approach. My sense of teaching as a

calling and education as a civil right, filtered through my words. In the following excerpt,

notice the repetition of "if not" and "not" as a form of oratory. I ask and answer my own

question, "Why are we doing any of this if not to have a reading life?" Notice the

connection to "life." Education is about more than worksheets and tests. "What really

matters?" alludes to a broader, philosophical question. What is schooling all about if not

to create literate lives?

> W: Okay.
> LC: Guys
>   They're reading
>   This is what we're
>   Why are we doing any of this
>   If not to be readers
>   If not to have a reading life
>   Not to use reading for our purposes
> W: Uh-huh.
> LC: beyond the test.
>   So it raised real questions for me
>   About where
>   Alright
>   One of the questions it raised is
>   What really matters?

I did not connect this information back to Ms. West's question about how to

change an IRE to an open-ended question. In retrospective analysis, it appeared to me

that I was talking to myself to satisfy my personal frustration at a curriculum that does

not serve these students well. While I attended more to my own interests at this moment

in this conversation, Ms. West became more directly involved in the conversation, the

antithesis of what I might have expected her reaction to be. I might have expected Ms.

West to withdraw from the conversation given my passionate appeal, or I might have

expected Ms. West to become angry that I was disparaging her curricular choices or that I

selected her most negative video example to make my point. Instead, Ms. West explained

at length how the IRE pattern reminded her of her scary teachers. She talked about the

teachers she loved best and how they built relationships with her. She equated IRE

patterns with talk that interfered with relationships and she explained why she became a

special education teacher. I was surprised by her personal connection to the IRE pattern. I

viewed her response as an indication that we understood one another. Her words seemed

to affirm that my teaching was received positively. I was so pleased with Ms. West's

personal response to my comments, particularly because I had worried that I may have

overstepped my bounds when I invoked such a passionate appeal, that I did not notice she

did not make any remark about the video clip, a possible indication that the video clip

made her uncomfortable and she wanted to avoid it. I only became aware of her omission

in retrospect. However, at the time, her comments led me to believe that my statements

had had a productive effect on her thinking. As a result, at the time, I interpreted Ms.

West's statements as encouragement to continue along my same line of reasoning.

Therefore, in the moment, it made sense to me to replay for yet a third time, Ms. West's

discouraging comments to Rae's reading request. After all, she told me, "Just watching

it…showed me the difference in this other interaction versus the IRE."

In retrospect, it appears that Ms. West may have been more in alignment with me

than I was with her. When I waxed philosophical about having a reading life and what

really matters in our teaching, Ms. West aligned with my philosophical turn and

responded in kind, reaching back to her childhood schooling and its influence on her as a teacher. As a coach and teacher, I was more concerned with my own face threat, given that I was unable to respond to Ms. West's question. At stake was my sense of my competence as a coach. Feeling uncomfortable and threatened, I drew upon my beliefs and passion to persuade her to see her teaching from my perspective. Ms. West, on the other hand, did align with me, just not in the way I thought at the time. I thought she was aligning with my desire to replay the video clip of Rae's reading interaction and that she agreed with me regarding the importance of authentic reading in class. In hindsight, the transcript suggests that Ms. West followed my emotional and philosophical lead and responded to me in kind, perhaps in ways she had not anticipated. Who was the coach and who was the teacher in this moment?

Complicating Alignment

Not only did Ms. West align with me, she also established boundaries between us to offset threats to her face and competence as an educator. Twice in subsequent lines, Ms. West politely and with deference, let me know I'd stepped over an invisible line of what should and should not be said. As a way to soften my continued critique of her practice, Ms. West reminded me that she did not enjoy teaching language arts as much as she enjoyed teaching math. "Th-en I think about teaching language arts. That's not my favorite." A second time Ms. West politely set boundaries when she intimated I would critique her whether the subject was math or language arts.

In this instance, I sensed I had positioned Ms. West as an uncaring teacher, one who did not respond to Rae's request to read a book. I tried to lessen the face threat by acknowledging that if this were math, I'd have nothing to say, implying that she knows

212

mathematics and I would turn to her for help in that discipline. However, Ms. West

gently suggested that I would critique her in that discipline as well, indicating that I had

been judgmental. Ms. West's jibe at my continuing critique was clear but was said in

such a warm and friendly tone with no edge to her voice or underlying hostility that I

passed right by her assertion.

> LC: Now I know you're a math person
>   And if I were doing this in math
>   I wouldn't have a thing to say to you
>   So
> W: You probably would still (smiling)

Re-analyzing the transcript, I see that I did not recognize her critique or take it seriously

enough, perhaps because she was smiling when she made her comment.

What is significant here is that though as a coach, I put myself and my own

interests and passions before my concerns for the teacher, the result still favored Ms.

West's interests. It appears in retrospect that I was out of alignment with Ms. West, while

she may have been attempting to stay in alignment with me while protecting her own

stake. She omitted any reference to Rae's video clip while I replayed it for analysis three

times. I interpreted her words as encouragement for further video analysis but in

hindsight, she may have preferred to avoid that particular clip as she chose not to mention

it when she talked at length about her connections to IRE patterns and her own

educational experiences. She may have spoken about her experiences because my

philosophizing diverted her there as well as to divert attention from the video. Further,

she rebuked my assertion that if this were math, I would not offer any critique, a subtle

but definite comment about me as a coach, which, once again I had opened the door to by

referring to myself. Ms. West seemed to be more adept at following my discursive moves

213

than I was. My discursive moves were influenced more by my own views and sense of what was important than by reading what Ms. West was saying. I was not aware of any of these possibilities at this point during the conversation.

When I attempted to answer Ms. West's question about changing an IRE pattern into a dialogic pattern, I might have jeopardized the teacher-coach relationship by speaking from my emotions and not taking into account Ms. West's need to save face. My response was unplanned and tactical, occurring within the flow of the conversation. From a common sense perspective, it seems as though it would benefit a coaching conversation to have the coach and teacher work toward aligning with one another. That does not appear to be the case here. Ms. West appears to have been listening carefully and attempting in good faith to do what I, the coach, was asking. In other words, she followed my discourse and in so doing, set off in an unintended, though potentially useful, direction—her personal connection to IRE patterns. In this situation, the teacher was in alignment with the coach but the coach, feeling threatened, reverted to an emotional appeal to persuade the teacher and did not work toward alignment.

What role then, does alignment play in a coaching conversation? Is it the coach's responsibility to remain in alignment with the teacher throughout the conference? Is alignment necessary in order to have a productive conversation? Is it reasonable to expect that a coach will refrain from voicing deeply held beliefs in order to attend to a teacher's needs throughout a coaching conversation? Further, whether or not one is in alignment with another is an assumption, at best. In the case of Ms. West, the coach assumed alignment, but the post-analysis suggested alternate interpretations, including the teacher

working toward alignment while the coach addressed her own needs, disregarding issues of alignment.

During the coaching conversation, I was torn between remaining neutral and nonjudgmental versus expressing my feelings and beliefs. As a coach, how does one draw the line between dispassionate observation and emotional appeal? Is it possible for a coach to effectively engage a teacher in a coaching conversation if the coach believes she has to downplay her stake in the conversation? Like Ms. West, I, too, was a teacher with a strong emotional investment in the outcome of our coaching interaction. At stake was my desire to improve student learning for economically disadvantaged students as well as my desire to protect my notion of myself as an effective coach. Beyond stake, can a coach and a teacher build a meaningful relationship if the coach remains analytical or once-removed from the coaching conversation?

The Coach's Questioning Patterns

An assumption I made as coach throughout the conversation with Ms. West was that IRE patterns of classroom discourse tended to limit opportunities for extended reasoning and co-constructed meaning-making. I believed this was of concern in Ms. West's case because when she taught reading, her primary pattern of interaction with her students was to ask literal questions from text that was too difficult for most of the class to understand. Ms. West knew the answers she wanted to hear from the students and sometimes the IRE pattern turned into a guessing game with students trying to guess the right answer their teacher had in mind. While I was aware that IRE patterns could serve an instructional purpose, such as checking to see what students understood in order to adjust instruction, or modifying IRE patterns to IRF (Cazden, 2001; Wells, 1993) patterns

where students could offer feedback and explore a question in greater depth, I was sure the patterns Ms. West used while teaching reading were not productive for learning. What the post-analysis revealed and what I least expected to find, was that I reverted to IRE patterns in order to explain to Ms. West how to change her reading instruction from IRE patterns to dialogic patterns of discourse. This section will provide evidence for this claim. In addition, it will challenge my original assumption regarding IRE patterns. When else might they be useful? Further, the question of awareness when it comes to one's own discourse patterns will be raised. Coaches may be able to recognize teacher discourse that inhibits learning, but are they able to be cognizant of their own discursive patterns when working with a teacher? We may hear others, but do we hear ourselves? What might this imply for coaches' perceptions of resistant or reluctant teachers? What do we know and what do we assume?

The Coach Invokes IRE Discourse Patterns

Not stopping to consider the implications of Ms. West's statement that I would critique her work whether the subject was math or language arts, I continued to raise questions about the book IMovie. I asked Ms. West to notice opportunities to reposition students like Rae, who are not invested in school. "What are the moments, so we don't lose them, that we can build upon that can reposition a student so they see themselves differently in the school?" I followed with, "What's valued there? What are the values we're placing on that interaction? For example, to me what's valued is collecting the papers and going on to the next assignment." In retrospect, I notice the use of "we." I wonder if we are both in agreement here or if I am superimposing my values and interpretation onto Ms. West? In this case, once again, I not only asked, but answered my

216

own question with a judgment that I thought, in hindsight, might have been hurtful for Ms. West given the value she placed on her students' feelings. However, I can only surmise that she might have been hurt based on my own interpretation. Ms. West never indicated how my statement made her feel. I can now see that I did not stop there but continued to instruct Ms. West on how she could have responded to Rae by role playing a "better" version of what she could have, by that I meant what she should have, said.

> LC: But here we have a kid who has a book in her bookbag
>   And wants to read it
>   That's a moment of opportunity for me.
> W: Okay.
> LC: For a moment where
>   I can reposition that child
>   You have a book, Rae?
>   In your bookbag?
>   What are you reading?
>   Oh my goodness.
>   Tell me about it.
>   Is it a series?
>   Have you been reading this a lot?
>   You guys, I've got to interrupt you.
>   I do not believe this
>   This is the most wonderful thing
>   Rae has
> W: Okay. (serious look)

The look on Ms. West's face, the seriousness with which she interrupted my aggressive correction of her practice to say, "Okay," should have been enough to stop the direction of my coaching. But, my awareness was focused not on Ms. West, but on the disembodied deconstruction of a missed teaching moment and all its implications. Not only did I mimic teacher language to demonstrate what could have been said to Rae in that moment, I went on to note disparagingly that Ms. West does watch for teachable moments to reposition students. But those moments address clothing and hair, not academic or intellectual achievements.

217

The transcript indicates that I did realize I was piling on face threats as I did try to soften my last backhanded compliment about teachable moments related to personal appearance. I reminded Ms. West of her repartee with one of the students and how effective it was at building a relationship with that student and others.

> LC: She's playing with your hair to the point where you say, 'Now you
>   stop that girl. Go sit your butt in the chair.
>   You know.
> W: (smiles)
> LC: Which was just hysterical. And
>   It was such good repartee between you two.
>   And so there's a lot going on around the physical appearance and you
>   know
>   who we are
>   And I see now that some of that just goes back to your own schooling at
>   that age.
>   It's a natural fit.
>   But now there's another thing we can think about
>   And that is
>   When is a kid doing something that's really literate?
>   And how can we make that part of the conversation?

This attempt to repair any damage I felt I may have done also bore the seeds of further detriment with the final questions I asked. The first, "When is a kid doing something that's really literate?" I meant it as a statement with an implied judgment embedded in the message. This I followed with another question that was meant to operate as something else. "And so if we could get kids to think about choosing to read as something they'd rather do than other things and if we could shift the balance of instruction from the worksheets which is what we got here to the authentic work, what would happen for kids?" I crafted the question in a way that called for a particular response. Five turns later, I asked another question, "Isn't that what we really want for kids?" referring to students choosing to read on their own. The reanalysis suggests that once again, the use of "we" conflates my values with Ms. West's, an assumption that may

or may not be accurate. Further, the question leaves no doubt as to what the "correct" answer should be.

These were not the "authentic" questions I had earlier contrasted with the IRE questions. My questions had predetermined answers each building upon the one before to produce a desired response. "What would happen for kids?" Based on my explanation, who would think that filling out worksheets would be a better alternative that choosing a book to read? I do not see this question or others like it that I asked previously and continue to ask, as open-ended. This type of question is not an invitation for discussion. It is a judgment with a moral twist to it framed as a question.

A Coach's Discourse Pattern Emerges

As I re-analyzed the transcript my discourse pattern of asking questions that appeared open-ended but functioned to reinforce judgments and pointed toward a particular way of thinking, became visible. In many ways, my questions were similar to the proscribed IRE patterns that restricted student responses to trying to figure out the answer the teacher wanted. This discovery raises an interesting issue. It appears that I, as coach, was susceptible to invoking IRE patterns similar to those teachers often default to—sometimes with an unexpectedly good response and sometimes with a response that is not something I had hoped would occur. One IRE occurrence does not constitute a pattern. I looked to see if there were other occurrences of a similar pattern, and there were.

My reanalysis revealed that the questions continued. Immediately following, "And what would happen for kids?" I did, in fact, continue the same questioning pattern. Two false starts appear to indicate I was searching for a way to express my thoughts,

"And Angel" and "No one was" are followed by a lengthy question with an embedded answer. "So if we could get kids to think about choosing to read as something they'd rather do than other things and if we could shift the balance of instruction from the worksheets which is, you know, what we got here, to the authentic work, what would happen for kids?" This time, Ms. West responded with the answer I had set up through the entire series of questions. "Right. They'd like to read and would practice reading and comprehending."

> W: Hmm
> LC: And Angel
>   No one was
>   They were choosing to read
>   And so if we could get kids to think about choosing to read as
>   something they'd rather do
> W: um-hm
> LC: than other things
>   and if we could shift the balance of instruction
>   from the worksheets
>   Which is
>   You know
>   What we got here
> W: um-hm
> LC: to the authentic work
>   What would happen for kids?
> W: right
>   They'd like to read and would practice reading and comprehending.

Four turns later, after acknowledging that even though the students do not have much materially, they still have books, and as part of the prelude to replaying Rae's book clip a third time, I asked another lengthy question that contained two parts: a bald face threat, "I'm not sure what's being taught" and a question with the answer contained within it, "couldn't we get our kids to be better readers by doing real reading?" The bald face threat, telling a teacher that what she is teaching, referring in this case to the workbook stories and questions, does not seem to be worthwhile, is a direct threat to her

competence as an educator. In the second part of the question, in addition to embedding the answer, the use of "we" once again, three times now, assumes Ms. West and I are in agreement. Again, I conflate my values with hers. She had been agreeing with me all along by saying, "um-hm" but is that sufficient response to assure me that we are of one mind on this issue?

> LC: And so
>   Couldn't we teach the same
>   Well
>   I'm not sure what's being taught
>   I'd have to work at it
>   But
>   We could look at a few of those things
>   But couldn't we get our kids to be better readers by doing real reading?
> W: Yes.
> LC: where they're making some choices
> W: (Nods)

In the next turn I ask yet another question just prior to replaying the Rae clip. "What's being privileged here?" I go on to ask and answer the next question. "When I read the video, what do I see? Well, I see what's most important. Watch the body language." Ms. West is shown on the clip turning away from Rae as she answers Rae's question. As I have done previously, in the excerpt below, I am telling Ms. West what to think—this is what she should be saying to herself. Notice how, once again, I invoke a reading life. Learning is more than doing school and teaching is more than assigning schoolwork. I remind Ms. West of how worksheets in her own school experiences made her feel, implying that surely, she would not want her students to feel that way about school. From her previous comments and her caring ethos, I knew she wanted her students to love school. I was appealing here to her emotions and what she valued about teaching. However, I was also appealing to my own educational values: wanting

underserved children to have a rigorous education that would prepare them to fully

participate in society, thus I raised the issue of higher levels of comprehension. In so

doing, I set Ms. West up for yet another face threat—that of teaching basic skills or literal

thinking instead of more sophisticated reasoning. Again, her teaching was characterized

as lacking in substance.

> LC: Here's been
>   One of my most disaffected kids
>   She's got a book
>   And so I want to privilege
>   How do I get a reading life
>   And how does that become
>   Part of who I am
>   And part of my identity
> W: Okay
> LC: So
>   And you know how you talked earlier about the worksheets.
> W: Uh-huh
> LC: And how they made you feel
>   Like just be quiet and do what you gotta do
>   So there are holdovers from that
> W: Uh-huh
> LC: here
> W: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.
> LC: And so the question is so how else can we think about teaching reading
>   And getting to higher levels of thinking too?

The setup to the question, "How else can we think about teaching reading and

getting to higher levels of thinking, too?" is an appeal to what motivates Ms. West. The

question itself anticipates new learning for the teacher. Implicitly the question says, we

can teach reading at high levels of comprehension. I'll show you how. The question

marks a transition where I showed Ms. West how to raise the level of her instruction in

reading to get at higher levels of thinking. It was not intended to be an open-ended

question. The second question in the same turn, "What would have been your intention

222

with the teaching here?" continued to lead toward new learning about teaching

comprehension.

> LC: The IRE doesn't get you very high levels
>   It gets you just what's the answer
>   And you probably don't remember
>   But just looking at this
>   What would have been your intention with the teaching here?
> W: Probably comprehension

However, that question about her intention is yet a different kind. It is asking Ms.

West for an answer that she knows and I may not know, but it set her up for yet another

face threat. One turn later she acknowledged that the questions she asked were "lower

order" because what she asked students to do involved literal comprehension and not

inferential comprehension. Literal comprehension does not require higher order thinking,

merely reciting what the text says. Inferential comprehension requires more thinking on

the reader's part to understand the text well enough to be able to read between the lines

and form an interpretation of the text. As Ms. West's questions were all literal, students

did not have opportunities to learn to reason with text. Again, the implication is that the

content of the teaching is insubstantial and I marked the slight by adding, "And so it just

kept going that way," meaning the literal questions were all that Ms. West asked during

class and Ms. West acknowledged that the students did not respond well to those

questions. They were disinterested.

> LC: Okay
>   So there's literal comprehension and there's inferential comprehension
>   There's lower order comprehension and there's higher order
>   comprehension
> W: It looks like lower order to me
>   Comprehension
>   Just did you understand what you read?
> LC: Yeah.

And so it just kept going that way.
W: Uh-huh.
LC: [So
W: [And they didn't care about that
        Uh-uh.

This entire exchange had been prompted by my being unable to answer Ms. West when she asked how to change one particular known answer question sequence into a more open-ended discussion like the one she had with students around football. I now see this moment as a bald faced threat to me and my abilities as a coach. In-the-moment, I was unaware of my questions as a discourse pattern, neither was I aware that I attributed my values to Ms. West as seen in the repeated us of "we" or that I invoked teaching as a calling with social justice overtones. I turned the conversation toward myself and attempted to relate to Ms. West as one teacher to another. In-the-moment I forged ahead under the assumption Ms. West and I were in alignment and I took that sense of alignment as license to push Ms. West's thinking without worrying too much about face threats or about how I may have been positioning Ms. West. It was not until a retrospective analysis of the transcript that I was able to see my questioning pattern, realize how challenging it was for me to respond to her original question, and understand that my coaching shifted when I felt threatened.

Similarities in Teacher and Coach Responses to Face Threats

It appears my response under duress to Ms. West may share some of the same qualities as the response Ms. East invoked when I questioned her teaching practice. She may have viewed my questioning as an implied critique and felt threatened as a result. During Ms. East's coaching conference, she appeared resistant to my coaching regarding her lengthy talk time, her approach to placing students in work groups, the content of her

curriculum, and the ways in which I characterized her interaction with students. Repeatedly, she justified her actions, asserting that her students needed to be prepared for a competitive world of work in which a boss could hire or fire an employee based on how well s/he collaborated with others. Ms. East expressed her caring and concern for her students by talking until they understood. She justified her talk time by citing her own teachers who would not give up on her. She, in turn, would not let her students down. Ms. East's emotional appeal and determination to explain her instructional rationale echoed my emotional appeal to Ms. West. Just as Ms. East was under duress during her coaching conference, challenged to explain practices the coach either did not understand or did not support, during Ms. West's conference, as coach, I was under duress to justify why a dialogic classroom increased learning opportunities. When I felt threatened, I, too, made an emotional appeal to teach what really matters, and I did so employing IRE patterns and framing my questions in ways that led to predetermined answers. In IRE patterns it is clear who has the knowledge and there is power in knowledge. By reverting to IRE questions, I was asserting my right to name and correct Ms. West's discourse patterns. IRE questions tend to control the discourse. That is exactly what I was doing while lecturing Ms. West.

In retrospect, similarities in the ways teacher and coach responded to challenge on different occasions became visible. When face threats occurred that held the potential to damage our expertise and sense of professionalism, by philosophizing and justifying our beliefs we both attempted to gain the discursive advantage, to get the upper hand in the conversation. We raised personal connections as rationales for the issues at hand and expressed our feelings with intensity. Neither of us appeared to be open to reinterpreting

225

our views. We held the floor, making it difficult for our conversational partner to intercede or offer a contrasting viewpoint. Under threat, both coach and teacher worked to regain power; the coach primarily through her IRE discourse pattern in which she held knowledge which gave her the power to critique and the teacher when she placed herself in opposition to the coach's views and repeatedly justified her actions. Both held the floor. Neither gave ground to the other.

The realization that both the teacher and the coach in this study responded similarly when confronted with face threats informs the coaching literature in ways that have yet to be explored. The majority of coaches are classroom teachers. When a teacher assumes the role of coach she does not abandon her previous classroom-based knowledge. Her prior experience is a resource that informs her coaching practice. She is a coach first, but also a teacher. To view coaches as teachers and to recognize that they may respond similarly to teachers when threatened, has the potential to inform coaching conversations. With this knowledge, coaches may recognize how a teacher feels when threatened and may relate to a teacher's need to justify her practice, invoke her prior experiences as reasons for her classroom decisions, or appear to be entrenched in her perspective by holding the floor and seeming to ward off challenges to her teaching. Labeling a teacher resistant or a coach ineffective, as reflected in much of the coaching literature, presents a barrier to investigating the range of meanings and interactions those terms convey. Once labeled resistant, the coach avoids a particular teacher. Once labeled ineffective, teachers and administrators devalue a coach's contribution.

Further, as seen previously with Ms. West, at times, the teacher assumed the responsibility for leading the conversation in a productive direction. When I passionately

argued my case, Ms. West listened carefully, responded in kind, and worked to build alignment and shared understandings to move the conversation forward. Within these two coaching conversations, the roles between coach and teacher appear fluid. The coach did not always lead, the teacher did not always follow. Conversations and meaning were co-constructed. The notion of one's role, such as coach or staff developer or teacher, becomes less fixed than the term "role" might imply when the coaching conversation is viewed from the perspective of interaction. Where, then, does the responsibility lie for productive coaching conversations? What is the significance for discursive understandings related to improving coaching interactions?

The Limits of Self-awareness

During the retrospective analysis I became increasingly aware that Ms. East did not appear to know when students understood what she was teaching. That was important to me as a coach because I believed that in future conversations I might be able to approach her extended talk time indirectly by helping her recognize when students understood the lesson so she could move to new material. However, as the data shows, self-awareness has its limits. During my coaching conversation with Ms. West, I was unaware that I may have been out of alignment with her during our conversation. I was also unaware of my discourse patterns that defaulted to the very pattern I was trying to encourage Ms. West to change. The limits of my self-awareness extended, also, to moments during the coaching conversation when I could have repositioned Ms. West as a competent professional to assuage some of the damage to her self-esteem my critical comments may have produced. During the coaching conversation with Ms. West she contrasted her enthusiasm about math with her feelings about language arts. But rather

than offer her lack of enthusiasm for language arts as an excuse for ineffective teaching, she stated, "But it's for me to learn how to be excited so they [the students] can be excited." Not all teachers would have asserted that they needed to learn to be excited about a discipline they disliked so their students would be excited about it. That was a commendable assertion and reflected Ms. West's strong desire to be an effective teacher. During the coaching conversation, I doubt I was thinking about what she was really saying because I passed right by her statement. I did not recognize the expressed commitment to her students and the admission that she was responsible for her actions so children could learn. This was a missed opportunity to acknowledge her professional commitment and competence. Instead, I challenged her competence by calling out her lack of awareness when she responded to Rae's request to read a book. I advocated that Ms. West should become more aware of classroom moments when she could reposition a reluctant student with regards to reading. Yet it appears that I was critiquing a teacher for the very same weakness I exhibited as a coach.

As a coach, I am reminded that during fast-paced conversations, not all moments will be built upon. Cues will be missed during literacy coaching as well as in the classroom, perhaps with greater frequency due to the numbers of students involved in interactions and with so many classroom events happening simultaneously. This realization has the potential to constructively inform coaching. By viewing coaching as analogous to classroom teaching, what it means to respond in-the-moment, tactically, affords a sense of shared vulnerability between coach and teacher that might otherwise be lost in the coach's press to improve a teacher's instructional practice. Such recognition has

the potential to promote a less judgmental, more forgiving, and more inquiring stance on the part of the coach than might otherwise be the case.

Here I was as coach, critiquing both Ms. West and Ms. East for a lack of awareness of student learning while I was unaware of my coaching discourse, patterns, effects, alignments--all subsumed in the moment by my focus on a teaching point I was determined to make. In their classrooms, were these teachers any different? They, too, were determined to get across their teaching points. They, too, cared deeply about their students. We all missed aspects of our interactions in our teaching. With coaching as in classroom teaching, it is difficult to know how to respond to each and every interaction. Teachers and coaches as teachers are aware of many aspects of teaching in real time but not all. As coach, it was my role to focus on improving both teachers' instruction. Yet I was not fully cognizant of my own interactions. I was critiquing them for omissions similar to my own. I am left wondering, who coaches the coach? How do we recognize our own vulnerabilities and approach coaching with humility and an understanding that we cannot see all the aspects of our work or know how to respond with surety at all times?

Discourse as Tactical and Intuitive

The reanalysis illustrates in real time how a coach can respond to a teacher by negotiating face threats and differences in status, to move the teacher forward in her instruction, without being aware of her own discursive moves or all the reasons behind them. When reanalyzing Ms. West's coaching conversation, I discovered question after question in my IRE patterned sequence of talk that positioned Ms. West as an ineffective teacher. During the conference, I was not fully aware of the effects of my discursive

229

moves. My moves were tactical in the sense that Fredrick Ericson (2004) suggests--intuitive and outside of consciousness. Tactical discursive moves emerge ahead of thought, from habitual practices and the experiences that built them. Each move is an intuitive response informed by earlier conditions and responses recognized in memory as similar to those in the present situation. As a discursive move is made it directs the interaction by providing a range of possible opportunities for response. In turn, the respondent makes a tactical discursive move, and the sequences of discursive moves shape the conversation into meaningful threads, forming a logic and direction that may or may not have been consciously intended. Participants may have had a purpose in mind when they began talking, but how they achieve that end as they talk is not predetermined nor wholly visible during the give and take of conversation. What became apparent in a reanalysis of the conversation between Ms. West and myself is that both coach and teacher were working together, though the interactions were fraught, to figure out ways to improve teaching. Given the questionable alignment and the repeated face threats, power defined as positively circulating does not appear to have been operating during the interaction surrounding Rae's request to read a book. Instead, the power of the coach was in jeopardy, and the conversation appears to have been a means by which the coach prevented the toppling of her status by exerting power over the teacher.

Summary and Conclusion

With the spread of literacy coaching across the country's schools comes the assumption that because many coaches were respected teachers with knowledge of current literacy practices they ought to be able to step into a coaching role. Most coaches receive little guidance when it comes to working with adult learners and many request

training about how to work with resistant teachers. This chapter explored face threats encountered by both teachers and coach during conversations, finding similarities in the ways coaches and teachers responded to challenges of practice. What is the significance of this recognition, particularly for coaches? Are there implications for understanding resistant teachers?

Resistance has become a generic term used to describe a broad range of negative teacher responses to coaching. Resistance is ill-defined and applied to teachers, not coaches. Its usage may be counterproductive because the tendency is for coaches to avoid those teachers who have been judged to be resistant. The term itself becomes a justification for working with more willing teachers and writing off those teachers who have exhibited resistant behaviors. But what if the term resistance was no longer applied solely to teachers? What if coaches were resistant or co-contributors to teacher resistance? This study showed that when the coach held strong beliefs or when the coach felt her professionalism was threatened during the coaching conversation, she, too, exhibited discursive behaviors that could be labeled resistant. What might happen if resistance was considered part of the coaching interaction, something to be expected on the part of either party given the fraught nature of coaching encounters?

This interactional study of teacher/coach conversations suggests that some common sense assumptions regarding coaching may turn out to be counterintuitive. For example, on the surface, it may appear that the coach would want to align with the teacher to promote shared understanding and a feeling of trust. It might also be assumed that the coach would be likely to lead the coaching conversation, guiding the teacher toward revising her practice. Another common sense approach to coaching might be to

expect the coach to anticipate issues to raise with the teacher and consider ahead of time how to initiate those issues in order to support a teacher's learning. Yet all three of these examples came into question as a result of the data analysis.

The study illustrated that the coach could only assume alignment with the teacher. The coach could not know with certainty that she and the teacher were, in fact, aligned. In more than one instance, the coach assumed alignment while the retrospective analysis suggested that may not have been the case. Further, there were moments when the coach was not in alignment with a teacher but the teacher worked to remain in alignment with the coach. When it came to the coach leading the conversation toward a predetermined teaching point, it, too, came into question as a result of the post-conference analysis. One teacher led the coaching conversation almost from the start of the conference with the effect of putting the coach on the defensive when her preplanned strategy for how the conference might unfold was co-opted. Third, the data illustrated how coaching conversations are tactical. Strategy only goes so far. Once the conversation begins, the coach and teacher respond to one another in the moment. Conscious deliberation on the part of the coach was difficult to sustain when the coach felt threatened. The fast pace of conversation left little time for reflection. In this study, the coach defaulted to deeply ingrained discourse patterns that may or may not have been productive.

The case study coaching conversations demonstrated that assumptions about coaching interactions may apply as much to coaches as to teachers. In the give and take of interaction, roles reverse, alignment falters, and strategies are trumped by tactics. Resistance is not so much a fixed state but rather a fluid, interactional response to a range of discursive circumstances. If coaches see themselves as also being teachers and if

coaches can recognize that they may respond to pressure in some of the same ways

teachers may respond to pressure, there is the possibility that coaches will have more

realistic expectations for their own skills. It is also possible that coaches will come to see

themselves in the teachers they coach. Could such understanding lead to notions of

coaching as interactive and co-constructed? If that were the case, cognitive instantiations

of coaching that imply that a coach instructs and a teacher learns might benefit from more

of an inquiry stance toward practice, shared with greater humility and respect for one's

conversational partner.

CHAPTER VIII: DISCUSSION

In her book, *The Literacy Coach's Survival Guide* (2005), Cathy Toll asks, "What are the qualities of an effective literacy coach?" Her response, "It's hardly ever about knowledge," (p.51). "A literacy coach who knows a great deal about literacy instruction but cannot develop relationships, build trust, and work with the non-knowledge related issues of teaching will fail," (p. 53). The lessons learned in the results chapters, particularly where the coach was concerned, afford alternate conceptions of "non-knowledge related issues of teaching." What it means to build trust, confront resistance, and reflect on practice have come under scrutiny in this study. Is it possible that a coach's deep understanding of herself and the ways in which her personal values, beliefs, and dispositions are enacted through social interactions with teachers may precede other considerations, such as teacher needs, when it comes to coaching? Is the study of one's own discourse a valuable asset for coaches, worth the time and effort necessary to analyze one's interactions?

I am appreciative of Ms. East and Ms. West's willingness to let me examine our work together. Tentative answers to the questions posed above were derived from that examination which produced a set of conceptual points of view, which combine to form a perspective for observing coaching. Five constructs constitute this perspective. The first of these is that coaching is an act of teaching. When seen from this viewpoint, coaches can draw upon their prior experiences to anticipate, understand, and relate to teachers'

234

responses to coaching. Second, alignment has demonstrated it is a robust point of reference from which to investigate coaching. Questions of alignment go to the heart of issues surrounding teacher-coach interaction. Third, coaching is both strategic and tactical. Understanding how in-the-moment tactical interactions complicate strategic planning has implications for reconceptualizing resistance and trust. Fourth, adopting an interactional discursive point of view enables resistance to be reconceptualized in ways that are productive for positive coaching outcomes. The fifth construct observes coaching as building relationships to establish trust. In the coaching literature, building trusting relationships is considered a first and necessary step prior to working alongside teachers in their classrooms. This five-dimension perspective on coaching as a co-constructed discursive interaction between people with different life experiences, beliefs, and values complicates what it means to build trust and establish relationships and challenges some current recommendations for coaches.

In the discussion, I will address each of these five constructs, relating them back to my theoretical framework, the extant literature on coaching, and their implications for further research. Following my explication of these coaching constructs, I will consider ways my coaching has changed as a result of this study and the implications, as I see them, for other coaches; and, finally, I will qualify the results of this study.

Coaching as Teaching

Conceptualizing coaching as an act of teaching and coaches as teachers affords new perspectives, both positive and negative, on this relatively recent phenomenon. As is true of many coaches, I was a teacher before I became a coach. It was that knowledge of teaching developed over years of practice that was my primary qualification for the

position. During coaching conversations, I invoked my teacher experience to position myself as similar to the teachers I coached, to be one of them. I sought alignment through our shared experiences as teachers. At times, I buttressed my teaching point by referring back to my previous classrooms, giving added credibility to my interpretations. My position at the time of the study was coach. However, my former position as classroom teacher informed, and will continue to inform, my coaching.

Those previous classroom experiences were a part of me. I drew upon my prior knowledge flexibly and easily, almost without thinking. That knowledge and experience freed my attention to focus on the teacher's learning. This is similar to classroom routines that become second nature for both teacher and students and are established as a way to facilitate learning and free the experienced teacher's attention to focus on student learning. As coaches are hired for their knowledge of classroom practice, it is likely that many would recognize and utilize their prior experiences to inform their coaching. It is also likely that many coaches would easily refer to their accumulated teaching knowledge during coaching encounters. Such knowledge built upon years of experience and employed to identify with and teach teachers is a positive side of many coaches coming from the ranks of teachers.

One of the advantages of approaching coaching as teaching and coaches as teachers is that coaches can put themselves in the teacher's place and imagine how the teacher might be feeling in a given situation. Often, coaches have more status than teachers due to their job descriptions. It is the coach's job to improve teacher practice. Therefore, coaches are placed in a role that sanctions teacher critique while challenging long established teacher norms of autonomy. If coaches can draw upon their own

experience as a teacher, they can imagine how a teacher might feel threatened by a coach's critique even when couched in polite language. That identification can help a coach recognize why a teacher might resist coaching. By recognizing how difficult it may be for a teacher to accept direct criticism, the coach may soften her language, examples, or change her presentation style to inquire about why a teacher made particular decisions to aid the teacher in reflection rather than judgment.

However, just as there are positive benefits to framing coaching as teaching and coaches as teachers, there are downsides as well to coaches bringing their teacher experiences and knowledge with them into coaching conversations. For example, those experiences may be very different from the experiences of the teachers coaches work alongside. The contexts in which teachers work, the school culture, the resources, the principal's leadership, federal, state, and local policies may all have an effect on the decisions a teacher makes regarding her practice. Unless the coach was hired from within a school, she may not fully grasp the unique and complex circumstances that comprise a given context. Even then, at times there are vast differences in expectations and collegial culture within schools between lower and upper grades and within grades, teams, or departments. The coach may come from the primary grades with little experience working with upper grades teachers or vice versa. Thus, hiring from within a school is no guarantee a coach will understand the nuances of social interaction and circumscribed practices that comprise a teacher's school world. As a result of relying on different teaching experiences to inform their work with teachers, coaches may find themselves making assumptions about what teachers need to learn that may or may not be productive.

As the study demonstrated, initially I approached coaching from what I now think of as "the uncomplicated view." I drew upon my knowledge of effective practice based on my own experience and study of research and held that lens up to two teachers' practice. Where they fell short of the mark for current standards, I set out to illustrate their shortcomings through documentation of their practice with the intention of providing alternative teaching scenarios. Many of these scenarios were drawn from other aspects of their teaching in order to show them that they already do these productive practices and it was a question of developing awareness that would guide them toward more effective instruction. I selected positive examples from their teaching to demonstrate my respect for their professional knowledge and to offset my critique. I wanted the teachers to know that though I noted some concerns, there were other ways in which their teaching was effective that would provide us with positive examples. Based on prior readings and experiences I was confident that I was focused on areas that would greatly improve teaching and learning. I approached coaching with faith in my analysis. I was the coach and my job was to improve teaching by helping teachers enact research-based practices.

Unfortunately, my confidence in my knowledge of teaching and classroom experience made it more difficult for me to interact productively with the teachers I was coaching. In their classrooms at times I observed directed rather than dialogic discourse and set out to "fix" the problem. I observed narrow enactments of what it meant to read and write and set out to address those concerns as well. Finally, I observed tensions between teachers and students in the classrooms that appeared to arise from teacher discourse patterns that reinforced narrow constructions of curriculum. I was confident I

238

could make these invisible issues tangible for the teachers and together we could imagine ways to improve teaching and learning given these concerns. My confidence, however, limited the questions I thought to ask and reinforced assumptions that may not have been accurate.

Relying on my prior teaching experience as a guide, I proceeded as if I was back in the classroom where teachers are faced with fast-paced decision-making, attention to a room full of students, and meeting the assessment and record-keeping demands that require time and attention and cannot be put off. Bells ring, students change classes, staffs attend meetings and professional learning opportunities, grades are turned in and parent phone calls returned. In this context, there is little time for reflection. If a problem arises it must be dealt with as soon as possible because another problem, lesson plan, or assessment will be right behind. Given the exigencies of classroom teaching and approaching the teachers' practice as if I, too, were a teacher, I set out to efficiently "correct" the weaknesses I saw in the teachers' instructional and curricular approaches. My teacher mindset was focused on outcomes. I forgot to step out of my brisk teacher pace and ask why. Why were the teachers making decisions that ran counter to what I interpreted as effective teaching? Why was the curriculum narrow or their discourse patterns telling rather than dialogic?

I have come to realize the importance of coaches stepping outside of their prior role as a teacher in order to slow down and reflect, to ask why before attempting to name and solve a dilemma. Had I asked why before deciding on a plan of action, I might have realized sooner that there were underlying reasons that accounted for one teacher's discourse pattern. Then, rather than addressing the obvious, I might have approached the

need to know when students understand, which, in this case, appeared to be the reason behind one teacher's discursive choices. In retrospect, I now believe this would have been a circuitous route but perhaps a more productive alternative. Coaching is similar to but not identical to teaching. Coaches and teachers will benefit from slowing down to reflect and explore the reasons behind an action, a feat that is difficult to do when one is in teacher mode (Stover, Kissel, Haag, & Shoniker, 2011).

Another related coaching complication resulted from my previous career as a classroom teacher. When a teacher spends years in a classroom, she becomes accustomed to leading the learning that takes place. It is often the teacher who determines who can say what, when, and to whom. It is usually the teacher who is responsible for managing the classroom so that routines proceed smoothly to facilitate the focus on student learning. This gives the teacher a great deal of power where her students are concerned. As coach, I reverted to a powerful teacher stance. I assumed the right to name the problem I saw with each teacher's practice. Further, believing I was operating with the best of intentions, I assumed the right, given my background and knowledge that legitimized me as a coach, to suggest solutions for the problems I observed. I positioned the teachers in this study in much the same way that the teachers positioned their students. The teacher had the power to judge and decide how to proceed. As coach, I asserted the power to judge and decide how to rectify a teaching situation. It is one thing to take such a powerful stance in a classroom, it is quite another to adopt such a stance with adult learners. In the classroom, student expectation is that the teacher will lead. In coaching, in adult to adult situations, adults expect to be treated with respect that acknowledges their status and professionalism. If the coach adopts a telling stance, the

240

teachers may take up the new learning as the next new thing, with little ownership or input of their own (Nowak, 2003; Rainville, 2007) along with the greater likelihood that the approach will be abandoned as soon as a new initiative comes along. In hindsight, did I implicitly assume the teachers would simply accept my critique and then take up whatever suggestions I made to correct their teaching?

I only came to the realization that I was approaching coaching from a top down perspective much later in the post hoc analysis. My coaching approach was similar to the directive discourse the case study teachers invoked at times in their classrooms. I am reminded of Perkin's (1998) study in which teachers were unaware of their discourse while coaching their peers. It seems that even a discourse analyst can be unaware of her discursive interactions when focused on coaching outcomes for teachers. Being unaware of one's coaching perspective as enacted through language-in-use was yet another complication of coaching as teaching. However, it was not the only way in which I was unaware of my discourse during coaching.

The teachers I coached brought their own values, beliefs, and experiences to the coaching conversation. In the same way, I, too, brought my own values, beliefs, and experiences regarding education to our coaching conferences. During one coaching conversation, frustrated and feeling vulnerable by my inability to answer a teacher's question, I resorted to an emotional plea designed to convince the teacher that she should accept my view of education. I was so involved in my persuasive discourse that I defaulted to the initiation-response-evaluation patterns so common in classroom teaching. This was the same pattern I was trying to get the teacher to use less often. I was unaware that I invoked the I-R-E pattern as a way to exert power and persuade the teacher to see

241

things my way until the retrospective analysis. Similarly, Ms. East expressed her strong emotions and opinions about the need for lengthy explanations in much the same way that I tried to convince Ms. West that my perspective should be adopted. Ms. East held to her point and repeated her reasoning several times just as I held to my point and repeated my reasoning several times.

During the conversation I was not aware of why Ms. East and I were at odds with one another. I assumed we perceived teaching from different perspectives that were incommensurate. But I did not know what to do about it in-the-moment. I felt frustrated and tended to find fault with the teacher rather than appreciate that she cared about her students and their learning at least as much as I did. I did not realize that when we wanted to convince one another of our point of view we resorted to similar discursive approaches. Ms. East may have been feeling threatened and vulnerable when confronted by my critique just as I felt threatened with a loss of face when an ostensibly straightforward answer eluded me during coaching.

Perhaps coaches can remember to recognize the teachers they once were and realize they bring those experiences into coaching as one way to put themselves in the teachers' shoes. Perhaps coaches can remember that when it comes to face threats, coaches are vulnerable in many of the same ways as teachers. Such an understanding may afford insight into why a teacher responded in-the-moment the way she did and may position the coach as a person who is also subject to face threats and emotional responses in-the-moment in ways similar to the teacher being coached. Being a coach does not exempt one from feeling and emoting. The idea that we bring imperfect selves to the coaching conversation implies that the coach is far from omniscient.

242

Such awareness increases the likelihood that coach and teacher will work together to sustain social cohesion, a necessary condition for dialoguing toward achieving a common purpose—insight into and improvement of the teacher's practice. As this study illustrates, such cohesion is challenged by continual threats to one's experience of status and power in the situation. When both coach and teacher speak and respond in ways that position the other to experience status and power, they maintain social cohesion. Such cohesive power interchange can be observed, for example, in an interaction that begins when a teacher asserts her point of view, holding the floor while she adamantly repeats her reasoning, thus assuming a status and power position. Rather than ignoring or attacking the teacher's stance, the coach responds by asking a question related to the teacher's position or by raising an alternate perspective on events, both moves that acknowledge its worth. If the teacher takes up the question or considers the alternative perspective, her action both reinforces her original stance and the status and power of the coach. In this hypothetical interchange is observed an interchange of status and power, wherein each move is hinged on the one that came before and on the one that follows. This discursive interanimation sustains separate, coexistent status and can be usefully described in lay terms as a circulation of power. Each turn of talk implicates a response that triggers another response with both parties experiencing and acknowledging power in relation to their stake in the conversation. Through this interpersonal discursive give and take, for as long as the conversation continues, for as long as both speaker and hearer agree to cooperate, they are working as partners to build professional cohesion—their version of coaching.

Alignment: A Robust But Elusive Construct

Alignment is also in play during conversations as a construct that may indicate professional cohesion. A key construct in my theoretical framework, I viewed alignment as a highly desirable discursive interaction. As coach, I wanted to align with the teacher so she would be receptive to my teaching points. I also wanted to note whether or not the teacher was aligning with me as a cue to indicate agreement or the desire to learn with me. What I came to understand is that alignment on the part of the other person can only be assumed. I knew when I was trying to align with the teacher, but I could not be certain that the teacher meant to align with me. All I could do was take at face value what the teacher said but I could never be absolutely certain of whether or not her statement indicated alignment. For example, as I was explaining the I-R-E teacher discourse pattern to Ms. West, she continuously nodded. I interpreted her nodding as encouragement to continue my explanation. However, when Ms. West asked me how to change an I-R-E pattern to a dialogic pattern of discourse, I realized that perhaps we were not in alignment after all. What I assumed was Ms. West's indication of agreement may have been time for her to process the information and formulate her question. Conversely, when I thought Ms. West and I were not in alignment, the retrospective analysis indicated that Ms. West was, in fact, attempting to align with me even though I was not aligning with her. When I invoked deeply held beliefs about what matters in education Ms. West responded in kind, revisiting her childhood and connecting her beliefs about teaching and learning to her own educational experiences. My emotional and philosophical entreaties were followed by Ms. West's emotional and personal response indicating that she was attempting to align with me.

The same could be said of Ms. East. Throughout our coaching conference I felt as if we were out of alignment. Repeatedly we viewed situations from different perspectives, and repeatedly we each held to our own interpretation of events. However, once the study was over, I re-visited Ms. East's classroom. Her teaching approach now included a children's book which led to a class conversation about meaning and her teaching included opportunities for students to collaborate in ways that promoted reasoning in contrast to the teaching I observed throughout the study. She was much less repetitive and she kept her teacher talk time to a minimum in favor of student participation both individually and in small groups. Should I have interpreted her responses during our coaching conversation as indicators of a lack of alignment? Perhaps she was processing what she learned and needed time to consider what changes would look like in her classroom. Perhaps her changes in practice were unique to the day I observed or the result of subsequent professional learning.

However, I take away from both teachers' conferences the viewpoint that alignment, while important toward building social cohesion, can only be assumed. As a discourse analyst I can turn to conversation analysis methods to study adjacency pairs to note indicators of alignment. But I have come to believe that perhaps what is most important is not whether or not we align with one another. What is most important is that we remain in conversation with one another such that both teacher and coach are somewhat changed in the process.

Tactical and Strategic Interaction

To understand the complicated work of a coaching conversation that enables coach and teacher to sustain conversation even when stakes are high, status is

245

asymmetrical, and alignment is elusive, I differentiated between strategy and tactics. The study made visible the work of strategic planning and ways in which preplanning shaped the coaching conversations. In addition, the study made visible the tactical decisions made in-the-moment throughout coaching conversations. To understand the significance of tactical decisions, in the retrospective analysis, I turned to the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 1990)[35] and Frederick Ericson (2004)[36]. Together, Bourdieu's conception of *habitus* and Ericson's micro analysis of tactical decisions made during the flow of conversation, provided a theoretical, explanatory lens.

Before the coaching conference, I preplanned how to make the invisible visible for the teachers. What did their practice demonstrate? What were their strengths? Where might I help them grow as practitioners? After careful observation and documentation of their classrooms over time, I analyzed their data to determine what support was called for and how I would approach the teachers' during their coaching conferences. I considered what I knew about each teacher and anticipated how she might respond to viewing her

---

[35] Habitus is a seminal concept in French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu's, intellectual enterprise, the conceptualization of power in the context of a theory of society. Bourdieu's theories attempted to explain how agency, an individual accomplishment, and structure, the institutional organization or objective conditions of society, accounted for mutual reproduction and transformation. Habitus is described as an embodiment of a naturalized social world, the values, beliefs, and predispositions (ways of perceiving, thinking, and acting) that are held unconsciously by individuals resulting from their experiences. Bourdieu asserts that individuals come to desire that which is available to them, unconsciously reproducing the structures of society. However, an individual's habitus is not rigid and in the process of being involved in the "game," an individual may exert agency and modify the rules, thereby accounting for institutional or social change.
[36] I have written more about Erickson in the Theoretical Chapter. Here I would add that Erickson critiques Bourdieu's post-structuralist explanation of social reproduction and change stating that Bourdieu's theories account for stasis but not change. Bourdieu, according to Erickson, does not show how, in everyday talk, transformation occurs. Erickson asserts that change occurs in-the-moment during conversations. If we are to bridge the local and global, then the study of discursive interaction is the locus of change.

teaching in new ways. This preplanning, the initial stage of a coaching conversation, was strategic. I objectively, analytically predetermined the issues I wanted to coach, planned how I would approach each teacher, and tried to anticipate ways to save face for teachers when questions about their teaching competence came to the fore.

During the coaching conference, the strategic plans I had prepared were confounded by tactical, in-the-moment interaction. Frederick Ericson (2004) asserts that the local actor experiences the situation, the frame or the "game" one is in, such as teaching, or boating, or walking, and subtly changes that activity in the doing of it. As a literacy coach, I preplanned strategically for the coaching conference. But those plans were reconstructed as the teacher and coach responded tactically to one another during the coaching conference. At times, responses to one another's comments during the give and take of conversation redirected strategic intentions.

When I began this study, I theorized a literacy coaching conference as having three stages: preplanning before the conference, the conversation during the conference, and the retrospective analysis of the conference. Seen from this altitude, it is possible to assume a linearity from intention to outcome. The coach determines ways to assist the teacher; the teacher hears what the coach has to say; together they make sense of the advice and implications; and, the teacher agrees to adjust instruction. Then the coach, and at times, the coach and the teacher, decide next steps. The problem with this scenario is that it omits the tactical discursive decisions made during the coaching conversation that reconstruct the game in play.

Tactical moves happen quickly. One utterance leads to another in an uninterrupted flow of conversation. The teacher and the coach have an intuitive sense of how the game

is played. In other words, they implicitly know the social expectations for a coaching conversation. What is less available to both teacher and coach during the flow of conversation is their *habitus*, their personal backgrounds of family upbringing, schooling, their values, and beliefs, their predispositions that influence their responses (Bourdieu, 1977, 1990). Given time for reflexivity, some of the influences that shape dispositions may become visible. However, in the fast-paced interaction of conversations, speakers and hearers do not slow down enough to analyze every utterance in the moment. Each utterance shapes and is shaped by subsequent speech. At the same time, each utterance reflects the speaker's *habitus*, all she brings with her into the conversation at a semi-conscious level. What is said has more meaning than the interactants recognize in the moment.

Tactics complicated strategy. For example, as a literacy coach in-the-moment, I was not fully conscious of my face-saving moves toward Ms. East. I was not completely aware that Ms. East had taken an offensive position that put us at odds with one another. The coaching conversation may have been the "field" but the tactics employed by the local actors reconstituted previously imagined strategic planning. From a distance, the phenomenon of coaching may look strategic, but if the order of magnitude is changed, coaching can be viewed as tactical (Erickson, 2004).

What are the implications of viewing literacy coaching from both strategic and tactical perspectives? From a strategic perspective, coaching has a linearity to it that implicates a series of actions: the coach identifies areas of concern she wants to take up with the teacher, then the coach raises those concerns with the teacher and helps her imagine alternatives, and finally, the coach plans for further interactions to support the

teacher. This is an acknowledged pattern to coaching found throughout the literature. It assumes the coach will take the time to investigate the teacher's practice and identify approaches that will improve learning in that teacher's classroom. This study challenges this sequential, cause and effect assumption. Most research to date, from a discursive perspective, has taken a bird's eye view of literacy coaching. Until this study, what happens during the teacher/coach interactions that either furthers or complicates intended coaching outcomes has received little attention.

Seen from a tactical perspective, literacy coaching is far more complicated than strategic perspectives might indicate. Literacy coaching is founded on social interactions that are subject to tactical discursive moves informed by the *habitus* of both speakers and hearers in ways that are not fully visible to interactants in the moment. While the literacy coach could anticipate her own moves in preplanning, she could never fully anticipate the response the teachers offered that subsequently altered intentions. Even when the coach approached fraught teaching issues with both teachers in similar ways, teacher reaction and subsequent interactions co-constructed very different outcomes.

Re-imagining Resistance

Given this point of view—that interaction is tactical, that conversations are informed by a speaker's and listener's habitus, and that alignment can only be assumed—what can be said about resistance, an under-theorized label found throughout the coaching literature? The coaching literature assumes resistance, but I have yet to find a definition of the term. Resistant is the catch-all term used to describe teachers who reject coaching. This study explores and questions that over-generalization. Is the use of the term resistance counterproductive? The literature asserts that coaches avoid resistant

teachers. It appears that identifying a teacher as resistant positions some teachers, rightly or wrongly, as difficult to engage in learning to improve their instructional practice. Such assumptions would benefit from a closer look.

This study has demonstrated that approaching coaching from an interactive discursive perspective complicates cognitive understandings of coaching. Assigning a label to a teacher's outward behaviors avoids asking why a teacher is expressing herself in a particular way. The coaching literature assumes that teachers are the resistant party. This study suggests that when face threats occur, the coach is vulnerable as well as the teacher. Resistance may occur on the part of the coach or the teacher as a means of re-establishing a sense of self and the right to assert deeply held beliefs. Both teachers and coach in the study attempted to regain power to give them the authority to justify their claims when their sense of competence or professionalism was challenged.

When I analyzed the coach's discourse to understand how the teacher and coach worked toward social equilibrium I discovered that just as the teacher was not always conscious of the discourse she used with her students, the same could be said of the coach. The coach was not always conscious of the discourse she used with the teacher. Further, the coach's discourse invoked dispositions, values, and beliefs just as the data showed was true for the teachers in the coaching conversations. The coach was not an objective facilitator of conversation, removed from the interactions. In the course of the coaching conference, both teacher and coach spoke from experience and emotion that was not always evident to the speakers in-the-moment. Tactical, unplanned and unanticipated, discursive decisions made in response to one another during the coaching conversation shifted intentions and made it necessary for coach and teacher to draw upon

conventions of politeness, positioning, and power in order for the conversation to go forward.

Viewing coaches as teachers and recognizing that resistance in response to face threats is not unique to those being coached, creates new opportunities for coaches to understand how teachers might feel and respond under duress. This is important information for coaches of coaches. It repositions notions of resistance away from particular people and toward particular situations. Recognizing that coaches, too, may become resistant under certain circumstances and noting their discursive interactions as they negotiate face threats may help coaches understand, recognize, and adjust to ways in which teachers respond when threatened. It may also help coaches become aware of ways in which their discourse may shift when they experience distress during coaching. Such awareness affords coaches discursive choices that have the potential to reframe an assertion, reposition a teacher, or rethink a judgment.

In addition to recognizing that coaches as well as teachers can be resistant, coaches, through their language-in-use, can also contribute to resistant behaviors on the part of teachers without being aware of the effects of their interactions. To illustrate coach resistance as well as teacher resistance, and to demonstrate how a coach might contribute to teacher resistance, I return to the transcript excerpt found in Rainville and Jones (2008). The interaction is framed as an example of resistance. I argue that resistance may not be the most useful way to conceptualize this interaction.

Kate was the literacy coach and Mr. Blue was portrayed as the resistant teacher. While it was true that the teacher resisted the coach's efforts to teach him about one-on-one assessment of students' reading levels, the coach was also resistant in the situation

described. In her commentary, Kate put the blame on the teacher. She acknowledged she had to do a better job of building a relationship with Mr. Blue before working alongside him in his classroom. Kate also reflected that Mr. Blue needed to understand her role was to teach him about a new assessment method. However, Kate appeared to miss her contribution to what she labeled Mr. Blue's resistance—his intentional misinterpretation of her meaning, when she said, "Do you want to go back and look at the scores?" Her indirect question provided Mr. Blue with a way to reassert power that she did not want asserted. Her choice of implicature was intended as a deferential politeness move to communicate what she meant: "I want you to go back and look at the scores."

Mr. Blue chose to read her question literally, as a way out of a lengthy required procedure. He replied that he wanted the coach to help him complete all these lengthy assessments that she was making him do, "What I really want to do is have you do some over on the other table," (Rainville and Jones, 2008, p. 441). At this testy moment, Kate's response to Mr. Blue said she understood, relinquishing power and status to the teacher. It appears Kate set herself up for resistance in the way she indirectly phrased her request and in the way she chose to name and position herself in relation to Mr. Blue. This example reinforces the claim that resistance, when viewed from the perspective of social interaction, is a co-constructed phenomenon. Thus, labeling a teacher resistant obscures a more nuanced and complicated social view of how teachers and coaches jointly contribute to notions of resistance. If resistance is a co-constructed phenomenon, is there a more useful way to approach resistance?

This study asserts the importance of the coach and teacher negotiating ways to continue their conversation, even when interaction is fraught. Growth for both teachers

252

and coaches is unlikely to happen if the parties involved stop talking with one another. Thus, finding ways to sustain professional cohesion is of primary concern for coaches. With this assertion in mind, Kate and Mr. Blue's exchange offers insight into ways alignment and tactics can be reimagined to provide coaches with productive discursive options.

Kate and Mr. Blue are out of alignment, in part because Mr. Blue has shifted power and status to himself and partly because Kate has framed her request in a hesitant manner, contributing to Mr. Blue's forceful reply. Mr. Blue, the teacher, appears unwilling to spend the time to learn more about the reading assessment with Kate. Kate, as the coach, appears unsure of how to respond to Mr. Blue. In the moment, her tactical response is to acquiesce, saying, "I understand," and moving to the other table, away from Mr. Blue. In the moment, Kate's tactical response resolved the tension. She moved to the other table and helped Mr. Blue complete the reading assessments faster than if he had to do them by himself. The dilemma is that Kate's response to Mr. Blue leaves them without a reason to engage in learning together in the future. Assuming professional social cohesion is an important goal of coaching, alternative responses become more readily available. If Kate was aware of the importance of staying in the conversation, she could reflect and though uncomfortable with the result of her previous interaction, she could return to Mr. Blue to set a time they could talk further. Or, in-the-moment, Kate could acknowledge Mr. Blue's need for expedience in a way that leaves the possibility of future conversations open. An alternate utterance for Kate, in lieu of saying, "I understand," might have been, "I see your point. Speeding up the assessment process is desirable. We'll meet during lunch (or break or after/before school) tomorrow to talk

253

about what we both learned from the assessments." Kate's language would be assertive and direct. Her words would indicate that she recognized Mr. Blue's needs, therefore aligning with him, but indicating that she is intent on following through with subsequent interaction around assessment. As utterances produce responses, it is possible that Mr. Blue would again usurp power and position himself as unavailable to speak with Kate. However, as a coach, if Kate becomes more aware of her contribution to Mr. Blue's reluctance to collaborate, she will have more options than were previously available to her when resistance was the dominant interpretation. Alternative scenarios become available when there is recognition that coaches and teachers need to find ways to continue talking over time despite difficulties or differences. Difficulties and differences are endemic to coaching conversations and coaches will benefit by expecting clashes to occur rather than being caught off guard by counterproductive interactions. By keeping the end goal in mind, professional social cohesion over time so that all involved grow in the process, a broader array of discursive possibilities in which tensions are resolved or differences negotiated become available.

Further Exploration

With regard to resistance, the coaching conversations' analysis raised three issues that would benefit from further exploration. The first issue has to do with alignment. Is it necessary for a teacher and coach to align in order to engage in meaningful interaction? Is part of coaching the skill of managing social discomfort, the coach's as well as the teacher's? How much agreement on the part of the coach and teacher is necessary for a productive conversation to ensue? Can productive coaching occur despite resistance?

The second issue is one of discursive self-awareness. Is it possible for a coach to be fully conscious of her discursive patterns during a coaching interaction? If not, could the coach bear some responsibility through the discursive choices she makes for exacerbating teacher resistance? Perhaps resistance is a more co-constructed phenomenon than previously thought.

The third issue related to teacher resistance to coaching has to do with what constitutes a successful coaching interaction and the value of conference post-analysis. A conversation that appeared to be out of alignment, in which both parties seemed at odds with one another, could turn out to provide unexpected guidance for future interactions. As happened with one of the case study teachers, the conference was tense and the teacher appeared resistant to changing her practice. However, the retrospective analysis demonstrated an alternative approach that would change the teaching topic and address the teacher's pedagogical knowledge from a different perspective that neither coach nor teacher was able to envision during the coaching conversation. The conference involved resistance but could be said to be successful because the post-analysis offered an alternate approach for engaging the teacher. If coaches are not deterred by difficult or resistant teacher encounters, through retrospective analysis, the possibility exists for uncovering alternate paths for engagement. The question then becomes, what does it mean to be successful as a coach? Can resistance be viewed as opportunity instead of avoidance?

When I examine the ways in which resistance occurred during the coaching conversations in this study, it appeared that an alternate way to conceptualize resistance was afforded by returning to the theoretical construct of frame clash (Goffman, 1974). Rather than label teachers resistant, given that it appears to be a co-constructed construct,

255

perhaps it would be better to think of both coach and teacher as operating from different frames, both thinking they are in the conversation for a different purpose and speaking across one another rather than engaging with one another. From a coach's perspective, if resistance was reconceptualized as a frame clash, it would signal the coach to investigate further. Why did the coach perceive the teacher as resistant? This question shifts the focus to the coach so that the coach will begin to interrogate her own potentially naturalized assumptions. As the literature now stands, when resistance is suspected, the teacher is assumed to be the cause, not the coach. Once the coach has engaged in personal reflection, then a follow up question could be, why is the teacher resisting coaching? Seen as an opportunity, this question could lead to insights that were not at first available. Such insights could offer alternative approaches for working with teachers who were once written off as resistant.

Race and Resistance

This study illustrates the importance of the coach examining her own presuppositions about teachers to minimize unwarranted assumptions. However, there are times when presuppositions are naturalized to the point of invisibility. In my case, racial difference complicated my recognition of some discursive phenomena. I was a white, middle class researcher studying the discursive interactions of two African American teachers in a low income urban district. After analyzing the data from both classrooms, I knew I wanted to address issues of talk, particularly how to open up conversation for more student thinking and to co-construct ways to limit teacher talk so students could practice new learning independently. Limiting extended student talk to make sense of classroom content is not unique to the two teachers in this study. My experience in many

256

classrooms finds teachers of all races and ethnicities seldom make space for extended student talk that elaborates on thinking. As a result of my prior experiences and my knowledge of classroom discourse, I assumed the initiation-response-evaluation discourse pattern was a correct interpretation for many of one teachers' classroom interactions. Was I unable to recognize other possible explanations because of my race and class experience?

In the case of Ms. East, it is possible that her use of language reflected her African American religious heritage. Call and response (Moss, 1989) has been widely recognized as an African American discourse pattern associated with the church. The pastor makes a statement that is echoed by the congregation. Ms. East invoked a similar pattern when she often asked her students, "and this is called a what?" The students in unison then filled in the missing term. I assumed Ms. East was invoking a common teacher discourse pattern, a form of initiation-response-evaluation. In retrospect, it is possible that Ms. East's discourse pattern of fill in the missing word, may have to do with religious discourse patterns. Seen from this angle, the use of the I-R-E discourse pattern becomes more complicated than simply a closed-ended form of teacher talk. Ms. East's use of the I-R-E points students toward information she, as the teacher, wanted to emphasize. If her classroom discourse pattern reflected her church experience, then perhaps she was employing a form of call and response that brings a community together. Building a classroom community is valued for creating a safe context in which everyone can learn and will be motivated to learn. All her students, with one exception, were African American. Perhaps her use of what appeared to be a closed form of teacher talk was not that at all, but merely appeared to a white researcher, unfamiliar with African American

church customs, to be an undesirable classroom discourse pattern. I cannot know with certainty that this was the case but the data holds additional information that could point toward that interpretation.

For example, evidence of church influence on Ms. East's discourse was found in the sermonic qualities of her lectures aimed at student work ethic. Consider the lecture related to the movie *Pride* and the dedication required to compete in a world beyond her African American students' neighborhood or her lecture on race and persecution for being different. Ms. East compared prejudice against her students to the persecution Anne Frank experienced during World War II for being Jewish. Should I, as both coach and discourse analyst, have considered the possibility that Ms. East's discourse patterns served functions beyond what I concluded? Does it matter if a coach considers some aspects of teacher interaction but not others? I raise this hypothetical possibility to open the question and to deconstruct my definitive interpretations.

I consider race in terms of its social and discursive construction after Lesley Rex (Rex, 2006a; Rex & Jordan, 2005; Rex & Schiller, 2009) who theorizes that race is enacted and structured in the social moment to sustain relationship, identity, and status. How race is constructed in discourse and how people position themselves in relation to one another bears consequences for both teachers and coaches. Through difference, the possibility exists for misunderstandings and frame clashes. However, while race complicates the interactions I studied, class may also have influenced ways in which the teachers and I talked together. Class as well as racial differences could complicate teacher/coach interpretations of their conversational purposes leading to frame clashes. In this study, I would characterize one teacher as middle class and the other as coming from

258

a working class background. It may be that there are moments between a coach and a teacher of different races where there's alignment that is class based and not necessarily race based. Because a teacher or coach is black when the other is white does not necessarily make conflict, resistance, or misunderstanding inevitable. Social disagreement and social differences can occur among people who identify within the same class, and disagreements between people of different classes can be negotiated to achieve equilibrium because of values, beliefs and dispositions they have in common. The intent here is to complicate popular notions of race or class as binary and fixed. Deconstructing these binaries is necessary for productive interactions to occur between coaches and teachers of different races, ethnicities, and classes. If coaches are to address issues of resistance or frame clashes, they will benefit from taking into account their own perceptions of difference, not just regarding race or class but also including gender, language, ethnicity and a host of other differences that complicate communicative understanding (Agar, 1994)[37].

I did not realize until much later in the retrospective analysis that there may have been alternate explanations that could account for the phenomena I observed. Given my understanding of habitus, I recognize that teachers' practices derive from more than educational experiences. In this case, church experiences were possible sources of discursive practices in the classroom. We all bring with us a range of personal and social histories that inform our classroom teaching. Difference is the norm. It is to be expected. I can no longer assume with certainty that my interpretation of an event is the only or best interpretation. There is simply too much that I may not know about another person's

---

[37] Refer to the Theoretical Chapter to note the differences between Goffman's sociolinguistic use of the term frame clash and Agar's cultural approach to a frame clash.

habitus and their motivations for instructional practices. My experience in this study now suggests to me that in the future, I will ask myself a series of questions that may lead to understandings I had yet to consider. What are my values, beliefs, and dispositions about this particular teaching issue? How is the teacher perceiving this issue given her values, beliefs, and dispositions? Is it possible to become conscious of my habitus with regards to this issue? Why am I reacting in this way? Why do I think the teacher is reacting in her way? What is significant about our differences in this particular situation? Is it possible to think together about how we perceive a given situation or topic? Why does the teacher think her approach is important? Can we surface our perceptions in ways that will allow thoughtful analysis and shared thinking? Such questions may give the coach a platform from which to stand back and assess the interaction from previously unrecognized perspectives.

Reconceptualizing Trust as Recognition Work

Just as resistance has become a catch-all, conflated term in the coaching lexicon, so, too, has trust. Coaches are admonished to build trusting relationships with teachers. As was the case with resistance, I was unable to find a theoretically informed definition of trust in the coaching literature. The implications of coaches working to establish trusting relationships with teachers are that when teachers believe the coach is trustworthy, that the coach has their best interests at heart, they are more likely to feel comfortable working alongside a coach and more willing to have a coach in their classroom. Permitting a coach to observe or teach in one's classroom counters long traditions of teacher isolation. Therefore, to counter such traditions and smooth the way for access to teachers' classrooms, coaches are advised to build trusting relationships.

The problem is that as soon as the coach and teacher begin to talk about practice, regardless of how safe or trusting a context the coach has created, face threats emerge as the teacher's practice becomes the subject of discussion. Inevitably, coaching conversations risk the very relationship the coach has worked to establish. This study suggests that notions of what it means to build trusting relationships could be reconsidered.

In a coaching context, where difference is to be expected based on one's habitus and frame clashes are inevitable, might it not make more sense to differentiate between building social relationships and building professional relationships? The coaching literature promotes the assumption that building trust often involves establishing a personal relationship with a teacher. A coach is advised to find out about teachers' family, friends, hobbies (Rainville & Jones, 2008) as a way to express interest in the teacher and find areas of commonality. Getting to know a teacher socially may or may not be a productive approach toward gaining access to a teacher's classroom and establishing a coaching relationship. There is something disingenuous about inquiring about a teacher or working to know a teacher when the goal is of a professional nature. To feign interest in a teacher's personal life fosters a pseudo-relationship. If both coach and teacher develop mutually shared social interests that enhance their coaching relationship it is value-added to the relationship. But given the asymmetrical status between coach and teacher and the fraught nature of the coaching experience, might it not be better advice to encourage a coach to work to establish a professional relationship with a teacher? A professional relationship would emphasize mutually beneficial job-related goals. It is a relationship built on shared respect and the assumption that both coach and teacher want

to be seen as effective in their respective work roles. A majority of teachers want to be respected and appreciated by their principals, colleagues, students, and parents. Most coaches share similar desires. Could recognizing the contributions each makes in their respective pursuits and recognizing the other person in ways they want to be recognized be constructive advice to offer coaches in lieu of advising them to build social relationships with teachers?

Beyond the kind of relationship a coach might foster, does a trusting relationship mean that the coach would never knowingly offend or evaluate the teacher? If so, as shown repeatedly in the transcripts of this study, that is almost impossible to do given the tactical discursive utterances that reflect the *habitus* of both coach and teacher. Here again, as with resistance, is a place where discourse analysis constructs may offer alternative frames of understanding. Rather than trust being the operative construct, here again, the literacy coach could work to identify how the teacher wants to be recognized. In the case of Ms. West, she told the coach she was upset by some teachers who were not treating students in respectful and caring ways. Her own childhood teachers were kind to her and they shaped her notion of what schooling should be. As her coach, I strategically recognized her caring ethos in the preplanning stages of the coaching conference. However, it took me most of the actual conference, through many tactical and strategic moves to link that ethos to caring about students choosing to read independently. I was not aiming for trust. I was aiming for *recognition*. Who was Ms. West as a teacher and how could I help her to connect her values with effective literacy practices?

Equally important, the coach also wants to be recognized as a particular kind of person. In Kate's case (Rainville and Jones, 2008) she wanted Mr. Blue to respect her

expertise. She wanted to be recognized as someone who deserved to be in the position of coach and who had something of value to share with teachers, even experienced and knowledgeable senior teachers like Mr. Blue. How the selves we desire to present are negotiated, through power and politeness moves that position and reposition interactants throughout a conversation and long after the conversation ends, may be a discursively productive way to view what it means to build trust. It is difficult to act on building trust or addressing resistance when one does not see how they play out through interaction. Building trust is a generic construct that masks complicated interaction. Rather than admonishing teachers to build trusting relationships, it may be more effective socially for coaches to develop a deeper understanding of how interactions co-construct meaning. Such discursive knowledge may permit a wider range of interactional choices and may afford possibilities for recognition work. If the goal of a coaching conversation is viewed, not in terms of success, but rather, in terms of staying in the game, keeping the conversation going over time with an eye toward evolving conceptions of practice, then connecting outward behaviors with underlying, often invisible, beliefs and values, and then finding ways to satisfy those predispositions to improve teaching, may offer support to literacy coaches.

How Have I Changed as a Coach? What Would I Advise Coaches?

As coaches often come from the ranks of highly respected, successful teachers, given the widespread concern coaches express about working with adult learners, it appears to come as a surprise to a large number of coaches that many teachers do not want their help. My case is different. Teachers and administrators have long sought my assistance. I have been considered a successful literacy coach for more than a decade,

working in a range of economically and racially diverse districts and schools. For me, the jolt came from studying my own discourse and uncovering ways in which my coaching was effective and ineffective during my interactions with two case study teachers. I now question some of the assumptions I made about the teachers' practices, particularly when, during the coaching conversations, I defaulted to some of the same practices I found problematic with the teachers, such as directive discourse or initiation-response-evaluation discourse patterns invoked to lend authority to my assertions. In particular, I judged both teachers without, at first, recognizing the limitations in my perspective.

The coaching literature repeatedly warns coaches not to evaluate teachers. That is a job best left to administrators. However, I learned that while I may not have been writing up formal job evaluations, I was evaluating the teachers in this study. I judged their practice based on my personal experiences with teaching and my professional reading in the field. I found it difficult to challenge my own, semi-conscious assumptions that shaped what I determined was important to teach the teachers. My coaching was implicitly and explicitly directive and evaluative. The question becomes, does it matter if coaching is directive and evaluative? Under what conditions? With whom?

The literature makes clear that teachers reject coaching when it becomes evaluative, therefore, coaches should not perform that formal administrative task. However, I believe most coaches do evaluate teachers' performance in the classroom implicitly. A coach brings with her a sense of appropriate and inappropriate pedagogy and content. The coaching act is designed to improve teacher instruction. It is the coach's job to assess a teacher's classroom performance to determine areas of need. Coaching is an act of judgment. Therefore, it is understandable why many teachers are uncomfortable

being coached. However, as happened with me in this study, a coach may not always recognize all the possible interpretations for what is occurring in the classroom. Thus, what is identified as a teacher area of need, may be based on partial understanding of the teacher who brings a wide range of experiences, beliefs, and values to her practice. Further, the coach's judgment is partial because of an incomplete awareness of her own values and beliefs and how they shape and are shaped in conversation with a teacher. As a result of this study, I will work harder and with greater consciousness to hold my assumptions in abeyance while I search for more complete understanding.

Rather than hold coaches to standards that may be unrealistic from a socially interactive perspective, I argue that we should recognize the discursive limitations of coaching and coaches. Just as teachers do not notice cues for every instance and nuance of classroom interaction, so, too, coaches do not notice every instance and nuance of coaching interaction. Perhaps what is most important is that coaches find ways to study their own discourse when coaching to gain a better understanding of themselves. Starting first with myself, as coach, I am now more likely to approach coaching with a humility and tenuousness that may create space for the teacher to express her reasoning and space for both teacher and coach to co-construct meaning.

While studying one's own discourse is a time-consuming and seemingly impractical act for coaches enmeshed in the immediate demands of their job, it may be possible to envision a way such analysis could occur without placing an unrealistic demand on a coach. What if a coach tape recorded one or two coaching conversations and then listened for those discrepant moments that indicate a possible frame clash? Brief transcriptions of frame clashes could yield insight if the coach focuses on her own

discourse. Too often, as coach, I focused on the teacher's discourse. In this study I argue for the benefit of studying the coach as much as the teacher. I have come to realize that both coach and teacher share in the construction of meaning as it is observed in the classroom and as it occurs during a coaching conversation.

Finally, some coaches are said to be more successful with some teachers and less successful with others. Rather than thinking in terms of success, what if coaches and those who evaluate coaches accept that strategic approaches to coaching are invariably subject to tactical considerations? That is the nature of coaching, a mutually constituted, *habitus* informed discursive phenomena that alters with the tactical utterances of the participants. Success is no longer the telos. The end, where coaching is concerned, is no end at all, but rather an ongoing conversation about teaching and learning embedded in practice.

Qualifications of the Study

While there are benefits to viewing coaching as socially constructed discursive interaction, no study of coaching can address everything. A study can only capture part of a phenomenon, one aspect depending upon the lens and approach. Thus there are caveats that qualify the results of this study. How does it fit within larger issues and context, both global and local?

To begin, there are benefits and drawbacks to a self-study presented as two coaching cases. The drawbacks include limitations on the generalizability of the results. With only one coach and two teachers, implications for literacy coaches and researchers of coaching are speculative. However, this micro study was never meant to be generalizable. Its intent was to explore at close range the landscape of literacy coaching

266

sessions to see what would emerge. Two conclusions to emerge are that the methods used to study the coaching conversations were viable, and it is worthwhile to look at how people talk to one another during coaching situations. Although generalizability is compromised in such a small study, trustworthiness in the results appears robust. This may be a study of only one coach and two teachers by the coach; nevertheless, the consistency of the results within and across the two teachers encourages the interpretation of valid implications for both coaches and researchers of coaching.

In addition to the small scale of this study, four other qualifications should be taken into consideration. First, the length of the study. The data analysis occurred primarily during a summer school session, limiting repeated opportunities to confer and observe long-term teacher/coach interactions. Second, the literacy coach/researcher was not hired by the school district, as would be the case in most coaching situations. I was an outside researcher hoping to study teacher/coach interactions related to teacher talk. Such a unique position is unlikely to be found in most school contexts. Third, the teachers were teaching out of their areas of expertise. One taught middle school students who were older than the students she taught during the regular school year. The other was a special education mathematics teacher at the middle school level. During the summer she was teaching language arts to incoming fourth graders. Thus, neither teacher was teaching within her field of expertise during the summer session. The reality is that many teachers are placed outside their area of expertise as long as they are "highly qualified" to fill a position. Given this common occurrence, it is difficult to say to what degree the study was impacted by teacher placement. Fourth, this is a self-study of one literacy coach. Perhaps another literacy coach would engage the teachers in ways that produced different

results. Perhaps my dispositions and discursive patterns angled the results in particular ways that would not have occurred with a different literacy coach.

Local and Global Context

One of the positive aspects of teacher certification is the assumption that teachers do continuously need to learn—teaching is a lifelong professional process of learning and growing just as is true in the professions of medicine or law. There is always more to learn if knowledge and skills are to remain current. If it is the case that teachers are enculturated in their teacher education programs and in the cultures in their schools to adopt a stance of a lifelong learner, then greater numbers of teachers will likely be more receptive to coaching and to exposing their practice to inquiry for the sake of learning and improvement. If enough teachers adopt a learner stance, then perhaps coaching will not appear to be as top down, an administrative directive requiring improvement.

However, even teachers who experience pre-teaching preparation that expects ongoing professional learning may find themselves enmeshed in school cultures that thwart notions of continuous growth. The study of teacher/student/coach interactions cannot take place in a vacuum. It is too easy to focus on teacher talk and give the impression that learning ways teachers can interact with students or coaches can interact with teachers would necessarily improve learning. In the national picture of Race to the Top accountability, schools across the country are being labeled underperforming. The pressure teachers and administrators feel for quick solutions works against coaches, particularly when a coach's effectiveness appears to increase over successive years (Coggins, 2004).

In contexts where teachers are confronted with years of school failure and placed in school cultures that do not reward initiative and professionalism, knowledge of social interaction alone may not be enough to make a decisive difference. For example, Ms. West feared she would be "written up" if she deviated from what she perceived as district curricular practice. Inquiry was not an option for her. She did not feel safe enough to begin a conversation about what counted as mandated practice. Instead, worried about securing her job and getting along with superiors and colleagues, she did her best to unquestioningly enact what she was told to do. In such contexts, asking teachers to create extended opportunities for students to question and reason is difficult if the same experiences are foreclosed to teachers. I am particularly concerned when teachers' interpretations of district curricular mandates lead to a rote curriculum, the antithesis of what is advocated in the recently developed Common Core State Standards. Logic, reasoning, and argument are at the heart of that document. If the voices of teachers in schools under stress are silenced, the implications for coaches are daunting. The coach will not only have to examine her own practice and the teacher's practice, the coach will also have to situate that practice in a particular context that may or may not be conducive to reflection and revision of teaching and learning.

Ms. East: Video Clips List Prepared for Coaching Conference

8th Grade

1. Getting an Education

2. Power

3. Face

4. Test prep curricula

5. Low expectations

6. Sickle cell-teacher world

7. What are we teaching?

8. Test prep curricula: why don't you teach us what we'll learn in 8th grade?

9. Discipline

10. Future careers, positioning, circulating power

11. Circulation of power

12. Saving face, positioning

13. Recognizing selves

14. Alignment with students: sharing self-portraits

15. Recognition: self-portraits

16. Negotiating academic versus social selves: self-portraits

6th grade

17. Alignment

18. Establishing norms

19. Groups, register, directions, discipline

20. Worlds & instruction

21. "hints" positioning, student co-constructing knowledge

22. extended discourse, recognition

23. authors purpose—music share

24. holocaust, slavery, circulation of power

25. POE groups, coaching

26. MEAP US President

4th grade

27. Oct. 5

28. Grammar lesson

29. Nov. 28

30. Class chant

31. Sharing and Alignment

32. Moving on/Sharing/coaching

33. Establishing Norms

34. Lorraine Monroe

35. Team Set Up

36. Team directions Subject Predicate

Jan. 18
Science lesson on plants: transcript only

Ms. West: Video Clips List Prepared for Coaching Conference

1. IRE Sequence-student/teacher alignment

2. Reading comprehension—positioning

3. "Real reading"

4. Compare-contrast

5. Are we teaching what we think we're teaching?

6. Round-robin reading: Tom Sawyer excerpt

7. Circulating power—negotiating meaning

8. Questioning sequence: "forensic scientist"

9. Complete vs incomplete sentences: rationale for partnerships

10. Caring—aligning

11. Reading, inference, positioning students

12. Reading aloud—revoicing

13. Explaining "draw"—setting norms, circulating power

14. 4th student teaching

15. Writing I

16. Midworkshop teaching pt

17. Writing conference—peers/teacher

18. Workshop Peers

19. Writing Conferences I

20. Writing Conferences with individual students

21. Impromptu speaking

22. Writing Conference Share

List of Transcripts Prepared to Share with Ms. East

1. Expectations Transcript
   8th Grade Summer School
   "You should have learned this in 4th grade."

2. Groupwork 8th summer
   "Let's see if we're going to stay on task."

3. Teaching a Summary: Joyce takes the floor

4. 4th Grade
   IRE; Are we teaching what we think we're teaching?
   Honoring confusion
   Grammar lesson at overhead

5. Groupwork Subject/Predicate

6. Science Lesson: reread textbook to prove statements true or false

7. 6th Grade
   Circulation of Power: Joyce and Ms. East
   Anne Frank example

8. 6th Grade
   Code Switching/Register
   Circulation of Power/Directions
   "What's up, Dawg?"

APPENDIX D

Identifying Interactions: Ms. East and Literacy Coach
During the Coaching Conference

1. 4th Grade Transcript: Seeking Alignment

2. 4th Grade Transcript: Politeness-Positioning

3. Naming a Lesson's Intent: Power, Positioning, and Risking Alignment

4. Describing the Lesson: Positioning and Recognition

5. Studying the Lesson Transcript: When Worlds Collide

6. Studying the Lesson Transcript--Rethinking Giving Directions: Alignment

7. Studying the Lesson Transcript: Worlds Shape Classroom Practice

8. Studying the Lesson Transcript: Relinquishing Power through Politeness Moves

9. Facilitates Teacher Self-assessment.

10. Transcript Study: Worlds Versus Classroom Control

11. Transcript Study: Eighth Grade Recognition, Face Threats, and Repair

12. Studying Classroom Video: Alignment Studying Classroom Video: Group Work and Teacher Reflection

**Identifying Interactions: Ms. West and Literacy Coach
During the Coaching Conference**

1. Introduction to Video: Teacher/Coach Alignment

2. Ms. West's Nervousness: Are students interested in learning?

3. Finding our Footing: Acknowledging Teaching Strengths

4. Coaching the IRE Sequence Versus Co-constructing Meaning with Students

5. Co-constructing Meaning Through Gestures: Football Example

6. It's Okay Not to Know: Ms. West Reflects on Her Practice

7. Circulating Power: Genuine Conversation

8. Another IRE Example

9. What are they really learning?: From Curriculum to Relationships

10. Teacher Background Relates to Instructional Priorities and Curricular Decisions

11. Valuing Home Literacies: Repositioning Readers at Home and in School.

12. Coaching Comprehension: Beyond Literal Comprehension to Co-construct Meaning

13. Meaning/Reasoning Versus Literal Questions

14. Coaching Talk Partnerships

15. Coaching Wait Time, Talk Partnerships, and Explicit Teaching

16. Making Curriculum Relevant

17. Response to Student Generated Writing Yields Meaning and Engagement

18. Writing Conferences: Coaching Toward and Acknowledging Effective Instruction

19. Coaching to Invite Reflection

20. In School and Out of School Literacies: Rethinking a Curriculum

Transcript of Ms. East's Fourth Grade Lesson[38]

1	T	Today
2		On the board
3		I'm just going to ask you the questions
4		Cause I don't have time to write the questions down on the board
5		So I'm just going to ask you the questions
6		And you're gonna put
7		true or false up on your paper
8		And matter of fact
9		You do not need your xxx
10		So just put your xx tablet away
11		Clear your desk
12		I'm gonna pass out the papers
13		Take one and pass down
14		Xx tablets should be PUT away
15		One two three four six at the table
16		Everything else
17		Just put away
18		Put your name on your paper and today's date
19		I see 2007
20		It's 2008
21		You should have 2008 on your paper
22		Alright
23		The lesson we're gonna talk about today
24		We're talking about
25		You've already been introduced to the spelling words the vocabulary
26		words you're going to encounter in this lesson
27		So we're going to look at plants
28		So write plants
29		The anticipation guide lesson is on plants
30		So you've already heard it spelled
31		You've already
32		Most of you have the vocabulary words written down
33		Now again

---

[38] T=Teacher (Ms. East)
S=Student
SS=Students
x=unintelligible

34		Instead of reading on the board today
35		I'm going to read the statement to you
36		And you're
37		On your paper
38		You're going to write what
39	S	two or xx
40	T	two in the me column if you agree with it and pause if you what=
41	S	=don't
42	T	agree with it
43		So again
44		This is only your second time doing this so
45		Pay attention
46		Gonna try this a second time
47		So
48		When I read this statement to you this time
49		I'm gonna read it so listen carefully
50		You're going to write F
51		You write the word out
52		Or you just write the letter
53		F or T for true or false under me
54		Cause that's what you think
55		It's not what your neighbor thinks
56		It's what you think
57		Then I'm gonna have you read the textbook pages related to the topic
58		And again you're gonna write true or false
59		Except in the place
60		Write except
61		Place it in the author column
62		So again
63		This time
64		Once you go to the book
65		You're gonna find the answer
66		I've just taken the information from the book
67		You're going to
68		This is gonna be kinda the difficult one
69		So I'm gonna make extra copies of it
70		And I didn't do that
71		So I need to run back down and do that
72		So you're going to read
73		You're going to find the statement in the book
74		What does the author say
75		You said it was false
76		Did the author also agree with you
77		Did the author say it was false or did the author say it was=
78	SS	=true=
79	T	=True

80		If the author said that statement was true
81		And you said false
82		You're gonna write the=
83	S	=xxx=
84	SS	=xxxxx=
85	T	true statement
86		You're gonna write the statement in there
87		So you're gonna write down the page and the paragraph number where
88		you found the information
89		You're gonna compare your opinions with those of the author
90		Any questions so far
91		So if you said if it if it was a wrong statement
92		That I made
93		That I stated
94		You're gonna write
95		You're gonna check it out
96		You're gonna verify it
97		You're gonna verify whether I was right or I was wrong on this
98		You're gonna work with group members
99		You and your group members you're gonna talk it out
100		Or you partner
101		You're gonna talk it out and you're gonna come up with the correct
102		information
103		and then you must tell me what page you found the information on
104		and the paragraph
105		and again
106		I'm going to have to give you
107		Actually
108		The words
109		I took it down to the
110		I did not make a copy of this
111		Jus
112		Alright
113		Just listen carefully and I'll give you this sheet
114		True or false
115		Plants need only water to grow
116		Please write down under me
117		True or false
118		Tryin to get you thinking about this lesson
119		What is this lesson going to be about
120		Plants need only water to grow
121		True or false
122		Number 2
123		Seed plants contain
124		Seed plants contain a developed plant
125		Stored food and protective covering

126		I'll say that again
127		Seed plants contain a developed plant
128		Stored food and protective covering
129		True or false
130		You don't have anything on your paper
131		You need to put true or false
132		You're taking a guess
133		You must put something
134		It's not a right or wrong answer
135		We're gonna check it out
136		We're gonna search it out
137		Do I need to read that question again=
138	S	=no=
139	SS	=yes=
140	T	One more time
141		Seed plants contain a developed plant
142		Stored food and protective covering
143		Three
144		A root is the part of a plant
145		That absorbs water
146		And minerals
147		Stores food
148		And anchors the plant
149		True or false
150		You don't know
151		You may not know this
152		That's okay
153		True or false
154		A root is the part of a plant
155		That absorbs water
156		And minerals
157		Stores food
158		And anchors the plant
159		Number four
160		The stem of a tree
161		Must support the weight
162		Of the entire tree
163		The stem of a tree
164		Must support the weight
165		Of the entire tree
166		The stem of a tree
167		Must support the weight
168		Of the entire tree
169		And the last one
170	S	There's two more=
171	T	=No

172		I have one more
173		To perform photosynthesis
174		Leaves need two raw materials
175		Sunlight and water
176		To perform photosynthesis
177		Leaves need two raw materials
178		Sunlight and water
179		True or false
180		Now
181		You should have written true or false under me
182		The word me
183		You are then going to read your book
184		You're now going to check
185		Gotta get with a partner
186		And you're going to check
187		Your answer
188		You're gonna verify whether you were right or not
189		Okay?
190		If you were
191		Did
192		Did the author agree with me?
193		If I said plants need only water to grow
194		Thank you
195		Listening
196		If plants need only water to grow
197		I said that's all plants need wa
198		Was water to grow
199		Plants need only water to grow
200		Am I right?
201		You're gonna prove whether I'm right or not by searching it out in the
202		lesson
203		Any questions

CHOOSING PARTNERS
18:49-23:00 = 4 minutes 51 seconds

204	S	No=
205	S	=No=
206	T	=Alright
207		You may get a carpet
208		You may sit on the floor
209		You may sit at your desk
210		No
211		Let's do this first
212		I would like you to sit
213		I would like for you to point to someone

214		You would like to have as a partner
215		That's two hands
216		That's two hands you must point to one person
217		You must select a partner or I will select someone for you
218		Once you have pointed out your partner
219		Please stand up near your partner
220	S	xxxx
221	T	I think Ara pointed at him first
222	SS	(low conversations)
223	T	Ohh let's see
224		You got your partner?
225		If you have your partner
226		You may get your carpet
227		Or you may stay at your desks
228		Who does not have a partner?
229		Who does not have a partner?
230		If you do not have a partner and you're still sitting there
231		You must get up and go find a partner now
232		You can't just sit there
233		Now you have to get up and find someone who does not have a partner
234	S	Gary Gary (whispered)
235	S	No
236		He already got a partner
237	T	Now
238		What I am going to have you to do
239		I would like for you to go to page
240		You're gonna go to page 40 uh 47
241		46 47
242		That is the lesson
243		Lesson three
244		Let's see
245		Who does not have a partner?
246		Please
247		I need
248		I need some people over there
249		Do not bunch up over here
250		I don't need everyone bunched in one spot
251		Let's go over there
252		Uh uh
253		Excuse me
254		Where you going?
255		That's fine
256		Sit
257		Stay over there
258		Where's your partner?
259		Come stay

260		You stay right over here
261		Where's your partner?
262		Okay
263		So come over here
264		Find your partner
265		Uh Giselle
266		Do you have a partner?
267		Do you have a partner?
268		You two are partners
269		Thank you
270		Alright
271	S	xxxx
272	T	Let's go
273		Come on
274		Dominick and Henry
275		Go over there
276		John and Ara
277		You're partners
278		You two are partners
279		Have a seat
280		Go over there
281		Don't get too close to someone
282		Please give yourself plenty of space
283		Ohhh
284		I like how you're working cooperatively
285		And I'm watching that again
286		I am watching those people
287		So
288		Are you all working together
289		What's going on?
290	S	xxxx
291	T	So what are we gonna do?
292	S	xxxx
293	T	So are you gonna do an [assignment?
294	S	[xxxxxxxx
295	T	Because I'm gonna write that down in my grade [book xxxxx partnership
296	S	[xxxxxxxx
297	T	No
298		No [no no no
299	S	[xxxxxxxx
300	T	[They're gonna work this out
301		What do you need to do?
302		You gonna work at the table or you gonna work on the floor?
303		Which one?
304	S	xxxxxxxxxxx
305	T	46 47 lesson three

306		What are you gonna do?
307		I'll let you decide
308		We're gonna spend about ten or fifteen minutes on this
309	S	xxxxxx
310	T	Yes
311		I'm gonna get you copies
312		I'm gonna get the questions for you
313		You're gonna have the questions
314		Please just go ahead and start
315		Go ahead and start reading
316		Just go ahead and start looking at your chapter
317		I'll get you the questions
318	SS	(work very quietly while teacher goes to make copies)
319		(during teacher's absence, some children say shhhhh)
320		(talk shifts away from text—still soft voices)

EXTENDED DIRECTIONS AND ANSWERING STUDENT QUESTIONS
26:55-35:36 = Approx. 9 minutes

321	T	Alright
322		Now
323		You are
324		Going to answer the questions
325		You made a statement
326		Under me
327		You made a statement
328		You stated whether the question that was read to you was true or false
329		You're now going to find the right answer
330		You and your partner
331		You're going to search and find the correct answer
332		Was I right
333		Was I wrong
334		True or false
335		If I
336		The statement that I made was incorrect
337		Write the correct answer in there
338		What did the author say
339		You may then write in the correct answer
340		If it's correct
341		Don't do anything with it
342		You just write true
343		My statement was true
344		Write true
345		And you don't have to do anything
346		But if my statement is wrong
347		You're going to write the correct statement

348		Any questions
349		Any questions
350	SS	No
351	T	Yes
352		What's your question
353	S	xx
354	T	Uh listen
355		There's a question over here
356		Listen carefully
357	S	Well xx answer was true=
358	T	=I'm sorry I'm sorry
359		Someone's talking over here
360		Someone is still talking
361		And this might be your question
362		Yes
363	S	So your first answer is like true
364		And the author says it was true
365		Xxxx
366	T	If your answer's true
367		And you guessed it was true
368		And the author's agree with you
369		You would say yeah what Ms. East said was true
370		Then you would leave it alone
371		You don't have to write anything
372		Cause my statement was true
373		You may have put false on yours
374	S	Yeah
375	T	You put false
376		Leave it
377		Put false
378		And it was a true statement
379		I made a true statement and the author said I made a true statement
380		Then your answer of course was wrong
381		It would have been true
382		You would leave it alone
383	S	Like that
384	T	You=
385	S	=So
386	T	You'll put author under author
387		Make sure you'll put true=
388	SS	=xxxxx
389	T	okay
390		You'll put true
391		Next to the state[ment
392	SS	[xxxxxxx
393	T	[(snaps fingers)

394		Talking over here
395	S	xxxxx
396	T	If the answer is
397		If you said it was false
398		If you said
399		For instance
400		Let's look at the first one
401		Plants need only water [to grow
402	S	[I found it
403	T	Plants need only water to grow
404		If you said
405		Well that's false
406		You said it was a false statement
407		You're going to search in your book to find that statement
408		When you look in your book and you find the statement
409		It may be part of my answer's right
410		Maybe my entire answer is correct
411		If my state
412		Maybe my statements wrong
413		Or maybe my statements wrong
414		And you look in the book and you say
415		Oh Ms. East was wrong
416	S	xxx
417	T	If the statement that I made was wrong
418		You're gonna put what?
419	S	False
420	T	False
421		You put false
422		Cause my statement was wrong
423		[You put
424	S	[x
425	S	If I put N and M and their's was false I put
426	T	If my statement was wrong
427	S	No
428		If my statement was right
429	T	If your statement is right
430		And my statement is wrong
431		My state
432		Their statement
433		You said it was true
434		You said it was true
435	S	xx
436	T	Okay
437		Hang on guys
438		Let me explain this cause I'm confusing myself right about now
439		So

440		Hang on a second
441		Let's just listen carefully and I'm confusing you and I don't want to
442		continue to
443		do that
444		Alright
445		So let's make sure we're clear on what we are doing
446		And you cannot know whether you're clear or not
447		Cause some people over here are talking
448		And I don't want you to make a mistake because you're not listening
449		Okay
450		Now
451		Let's go back up here under bullet number 2
452		Everybody look at your paper
453		Above and look at bullet number 2
454		Does everybody see that?
455	SS	Yeess
456	T	Okay
457		It says
458		Then
459		Read the textbook pages related to the topic
460		And again write true or false except place it in the author column
461		Okay?
462		So you're going to read your statement
463		You're going to read your statement
464		So you're gonna find that statement in the book
465		If the author
466		As you read that statement
467		And the statement is
468		Plants need only water to grow
469		And if the author said
470		There's more that's needed for that plant to grow
471		You're gonna put what in the author's place?
472	S	xx false=
473	S	=false=
474	T	=You're gonna put false cuz it says plants need [only water to grow
475	S	[xx
476	T	Well Ms. East was wrong
477		So you're gonna put
478		What was these
479		Wrong
480		So you're gonna put
481		That was false
482		That I said you're gonna put false
483		Then you
484		And where it says statement
485		You're gonna write the correct statement

486		The correct information
487	S	So so
488	S	So if in the me box you have F=
489	T	It doesn't matter about what you said in that moment
490		You just didn't agree
491		Whether you agreed or not
492		Right now we want to know what did the author say=
493	S	=x[x
494	T	[We want to understand
495		Really know what the author said about that
496		Someone's still talking
497		Someone is still talking
498		And in a moment I will ask you to explain
499		So if you're talking
500		Having a conversation
501		I will ask you to explain to the class
502		What you are to do
503		Cause apparently you understand
504	S	Excuse me (low voice)
505		xxxx
506	T	Okay
507		Let me finish answering this question over here
508		Okay
509		What was your statement?
510	S	I said xx
511		In the me box
512		If you got false
513		And the author knew that it was false
514		What do you put in the author's box?
515	T	If the author agrees that my statement was false
516		You're gonna put what?
517	S	xx
518	T	Class?
519	SS	False
520		True
521	S	Ohhh
522	T	If the author agrees with you
523		And said
524		Yeah
525		That
526		She didn't say the right thing
527		Then you're gonna put an F there for false
528		And then you're gonna write the correct answer
529		You're gonna correct my statement
530		Okay?
531		You're gonna correct my statement

532	S	xx
533	T	For my statement
534		And you're gonna tell me what was the page you found that on
535		And what was the paragraph you found that
536	S	(raises hand)
537	T	Yes
538	S	If both our answers are the same
539		Do you put
540		Do you put
541		They says
542		The book say xx statement?
543	T	If you said your answers
544		You said false
545		Wh wh is my statement false?
546	S	xx
547	T	Just say my statement was uh true
548		You said the statement that I gave you was true
549		The author says its true
550		Do I need to write anything on the statement?
551	S	No
552	T	No
553		Cause we agree
554		It's true
555		We're all in agreeance
556		It's true
557		I made a true statement
558		You said I made a true statement
559		Author said I made a true statement
560		We're gonna leave it alone
561		Only as you read my statement
562		And you compare to the book's statement
563		Authors statement
564		If the author does not agree with me
565		The author may agree with you
566		But if the author does not agree with me
567		You must write the correct statement in here
568		Okay?
569		The author may say it's false
570		You may say it was a false statement I made
571		And you're going to write the correct statement
572		Any further questions?
573	SS	No
574	T	Everybody understand?
575	SS	YES
576	T	Alright
577		Now

578		We're gonna take about 15 min
579		Bout um
580		Between 10 and 15 minutes to work this out
581		Alright?
582		And I'll walk around
583	T	(confers with two girls)
584		Oh
585		Let me just remind you
586		Let me have your attention real quick
587		They found an answer
588		Whenever you're reading guys
589		It may have all the words
590		You may say
591		Oh they have the exact same words
592		But you need to look at the words carefully
593		They might be a word or two that's not correct
594		Make sure you find it
595		Look at that carefully
596		You may say
597		Oh
598		They started off with the same word
599		Oh
600		The second word is the same
601		The third word's the same
602		It may be the fourth word that might be different
603		It may be a not word
604		It could be an un word
605		Something that's in there that will throw the whole sentence off
606		You need to be careful about that
607		Okay?
608		You need to be very careful as you're reading
609		Did I say the exact same thing
610		Or did I say almost the exact same thing?

PARTNERSHIP INDEPENDENT WORK
35:30-48:00 = Approx. 13 Minutes

611	T	(confers with partners)
612		Okay
613		But you have to tell me
614		I can't give you the answer
615		You tell me
616		Which one are you on?
617	S	x
618	T	Okay

619		I don't even see your sentences out
620		Where are your xx
621		It says what?
622	S	xxxxx
623	T	Is that what it says?
624	S	xx
625	T	So
626		Is that statement true?
627		Did the author
628		Okay
629		So
630		The author says my statement's false
631		You said x
632		So what is the right answer?
633		That's what you
634		And I want to correct what I said
635		I said that your answer did not matter
636		What you said
637		Your answer does matter
638		It determines whether
639		Did you agree with the author
640		Did the author agree
641		So that says yeah
642		You were on task
643		Xx absolutely wrong on that one
644		But you were on task
645		You knew your information
646	S	xxx
647	T	Okay
648		You're working
649	S	xxxxxxxx
650	T	So you're putting the page number and the paragraph
651		(continues to confer with partners)
652		I like how you now work together
653		I like that
654		Alright
655		You have about 4 minutes
656		4 minutes
657		About x minutes
658		1 minute
659		Alright
660		Stop whether you're finished or not
661		Please stop
662		Please stop

Chapter VI Results: During the Coaching Conference
Extended Transcript: Ms. West and Literacy Coach[39]

60	LC:	Now when you say traditional, that makes me think of the
61		lesson
62		and the grammar lesson.
63		Tell me a little about what you were hoping to get them to
64		do with that grammar?
65	Ms. West:	When they understand the parts of speech I think they are
66		better able to
67		write complete sentences or paragraphs, stories.
68		When they know there should be nouns and verbs and
69		action words and make it interesting. Don't just have just
70		the nouns and verbs.
71		Let's use some adjectives and adverbs and make it exciting.
72		Exciting to write. Exciting to read.
73	LC:	Now there's yet again something that I was able to draw
74		out of this
75		Let me go back and I'll show you something interesting.
76	Ms. West:	Okay.
77	*(plays clip)*	
78	*Ms. West:*	*Noun. Raise your hand if you can tell me what a noun is?*
79	LC:	That's an interesting teacher discourse pattern.
80		A lot of times we say to the kids
81		where we know the answer in our heads
82	Ms. West:	Ahh
83	LC:	And we want to make sure they know
84		so we'll ask a question
85	Ms. West:	Okay.
86	LC:	and wait for an answer
87		and then we'll say, 'very good.'
88		So here's what happened.
89		You said, So, who can tell me what a noun is?
90	Ms. West:	OK.

---

[39] LC=Literacy Coach
Italicized words refer to the video clip of Ms. West's teaching viewed during the coaching conversation by the LC and Ms. West.

91	LC:	And then it came to Amar. (trying to find the place to begin
92		replaying)
93		Let's skip past Amar for just a second and go right to the
		question part.
94		I can't get past Amar.
95		I guess we're just going to have to wade through there again.

| 96 | LC: replays tape. |

| 97 | | I wish I could have angled the camera down on Amar. |
| 98 | Ms. West: | Down on him. (laughs) |

99	(While rewatching Amar's interaction LC asked)
100	LC:	Were you nervous at this point?
101	Ms. West:	You know.
102		It wasn't a whole nervousness.
103		It was just the nervousness of knowing that you're being
104		watched.
105	LC:	Oh.
106		I'm so sorry.
107	Ms. West:	It's okay. It's okay.
108	LC:	So we're going to come back in a second
109		And you'll remember it
110		Who can tell me

111	*(continues to play clip of Amar and the grammar segment)*
112		*Yes, Ma'am?*
113	*Student:*	*A noun is a person, place, or thing.*
114	*Ms. West:*	*Can you say it louder please?*
115	*Student:*	*A noun*
116	*Ms. West:*	*Wait a moment.*
117		*We're waiting for one person to join us.*
118		*Thank you.*
119		*Okay.*
120	*Student:*	*A noun is a person, place, or thing.*
121	*Ms. West:*	*A noun is a person, place, or thing.*
122		*Is she right?*
123	*SS:*	*Yes.*
124	*Ms. West:*	*Let's give her a hand. (claps)*

125	LC:	So its this idea that I'm going to ask a question.
126	Ms. West:	Uh-huh.
127	LC:	They're going to give me an answer
128	Ms. West:	Okay
129	LC:	and then we're going to evaluate it.
130		And it's called an IRE pattern.

131	Ms. West:	OK.
132	LC:	Remember this summer you said to me what can I learn from
133		this?
134	Ms. West:	Okay.
135	LC:	The way that I'm looking at this,
136		my lens on it
137	Ms. West :	Okay.
138	LC:	is through talk.
139	Ms. West:	Okay.
140	LC:	And I'm looking at it as how is learning constructed through
141		that talk.
142		And what is getting constructed?
143		What is getting learned?
144		What's getting accomplished?
145		What does this talk do?
146	Ms. West:	OK.
147	LC:	Well one of the patterns that's been widely studied,
148	Ms. West:	Okay
149	LC:	you'll know you're in good company
150	Ms. West:	uh-huh
151	LC:	is that one of the teacher moves that is done over and over and
152		over again by most teachers
153	Ms. West:	Okay
154	LC:	is this idea of this IRE pattern.
155		You initiate or you ask a question,
156	Ms. West:	Okay.
157	LC:	you wait for the response,
158	Ms. West:	Okay.
159	LC:	and then you evaluate.
160		Oh, good job.
161	Ms. West:	(nods, smiles)
162	LC:	And then you go to the next one.
163	Ms. West:	Okay.
164	LC:	So here you are in the next one.
165	*(continues to replay clip)*	
166		*Okay. What is a verb?*
167		*Sharyl.*
168	*Sharyl:*	*An action.*
169	*Ms. West:*	*It's an action.*
170		*It's a word that shows action.*
171		*Good job.*
172		*Let's give her a hand. (claps)*
173	LC:	See?
174		(both are smiling)

175	Ms. West:	Okay. Yeah.
176	LC:	Isn't that a riot?
177		(both laugh)
178	LC:	You cannot
179		It's very hard to find a teacher who doesn't do that.
180		I mean it's just part of who we are
181	Ms. West:	Oh.
182	LC:	If we want to open up our discourse so we get a different level
183		of talk
184	Ms. West:	Okay.
185	LC:	And in this case that may not have been your intent.
186		It wasn't your intent.
187	Ms. West:	Um-hm
188	LC:	But in other kinds of ways when we want to have deeper
189		discussions
190		and draw from the kids more
191		you want to figure out how to extend that discourse.
192		How to get the kids talking
193		so we're really not.
194	Ms. West:	Um-hm
195	LC:	And so way to do that is to rethink how we do that IRE pattern.
196		And you've got a clip in here where you've done that very
197		successfully.
198	Ms. West:	Okay.
199	LC:	So I want to show that to you
200		so this becomes part of your instructional repertoire
201	Ms. West:	Okay (voice inflection is up. Indicates agreement)
202	LC:	So t hat you start to think
203		When I'm talking with kids
204		What kind of discourse structure I want to have
205	Ms. West:	Okay.
206	LC:	What kind of learning do I want to take place in this moment?
207	Ms. West:	Okay.
208	LC:	And what decision do I want to make about how I
209	Ms. West:	Okay.
210	LC:	initiate talk.
211	Ms. West:	Okay. (nods)
212	LC:	I think that's really helpful to other teachers
213		Mostly you were my teacher
214		You are my teacher in all of this
215		What I'm trying to do is learn from you
216		So I need to shut up
217	Ms. West:	No. I' very interested in this.
218	LC:	But what I'm doing with this is that
219	Ms. West:	Um-hm.
220	LC:	My hope is

221		I'm just going to be explicit about it
222	Ms. West:	Um-hm. Okay.
223	LC:	Is that this summer
224		Then we'll
225		When we do this again
226		Then we'll take some of these ideas that we've explored here
227	Ms. West:	Um-hm.
228	LC:	And then you can decide when you want it
229		When and if
230		And maybe not
231		I mean it really has to be up to you.
232	Ms. West:	Okay.
233	LC:	When you'd want to make a conscious decision
234		About how you engage kids
235		So that you can get different results
236		And become very intentional about it.
237	Ms. West:	Okay.
238	LC:	And that gives you a lot of control
239		Instead of
240		Control not in the sense of authority
241		But it allows you to be intentional in your practice
242		And how you draw the kids out in different ways.
243	Ms. West:	Okay.
244	LC:	Okay?
245	Ms. West:	Okay.
246	LC:	And I find it very helpful.
247		Let me try and find that clip.
248	Ms. West:	Okay.
249	LC:	I'm going to be sorry all day I didn't bring my glasses.
250	Ms. West:	(laughs)
251	LC:	There's some things I did right.
252		Here it is.
253		Alright
254		Now this is one where there isn't that IRE pattern
255	Ms. West:	Okay.
256	LC:	It could have gone that way
257		But because you had built at this point
258		A really lovely relationship with the kids
259	Ms. West:	Okay
260	LC:	For example
261		Remember in that first clip we just saw when Dani was
262		about to answer
263		And you said wait a minute
264		Somebody isn't ready.
265	Ms. West:	Okay.
266	LC:	You were establishing norms then

267		You do that exceptionally fairly and well
268		And the kids buy in
269	Ms. West:	Okay.
270	LC:	It's really nice.
271		And my guess is they buy into you during the year, too.
272	Ms. West:	Yeah they do. (laughs)
273	LC:	You're just consistent
274		And smooth
275		And easy
276		So I want to make you aware of why it is they're buying in
277	Ms. West:	Yeah. Cause I don't know
278	LC:	Well one way is that
279		Alignment for an example with Amar
280		When you treat one kid that way
281		Then they feel comfortable that it's safe
282		You're gonna treat others that way.
283	Ms. West:	Okay.
284	LC:	There's a lot of that respect that you have for kids shows
285		And it comes through in that alignment
286		What do you feel
287		What do you need
288		You asked him
289		You didn't
290		It wasn't about you
291		It was about him
292		What does he need
293		Here is now what I need
294		It was a negotiation.
295	Ms. West:	Okay.
296	LC:	It was a lovely moment actually.
297	Ms. West:	Oh. Okay. (laughs)
298	LC:	I'm now appreciating it more than I even did before
299		Now, here's a contrast to the IRE pattern.
300	Ms. West:	Okay.
301		*Both LC and Ms. West watch the classroom videotape.*
302	*Ms. West:*	*Angel?*
303	*A:*	*There's a quarterback*
304	*Ms. West:*	*There's a quarterback*
305		*So we have a different positions*
306		*(writes on board)*
307		*Students interrupt.*
308	*Ms. West:*	*Oh. Okay okay okay*
309		*You gotta all help me out.*
310	LC:	Now look.

311		Look what you just did.
312		This was not IRE.
313	Ms. West:	Okay
314	LC:	This time it could have been at the beginning
315		But you had established enough rapport with the kids prior
316	Ms. West:	nodds
317	LC:	that they said, "Oh no, oh no." You know how they all spoke
318		up.
319	Ms. West:	Uh huh.
320	LC:	Oh no it should be this and this and you invited them to do
321		that.
322		You said, well, help me out with this.
323	Ms. West:	Okay
324	LC:	and it was sincere.
325		It wasn't like you had an answer in your head where you were
326		quizzing them
327		which was what was happening with the parts of speech.
328	Ms. West:	Okay.
329	LC:	and so now, once you said that they built on it.
330	Ms. West:	Okay
331	LC:	they kept going.

332	*Ms. West:*	*And here we have the quar ter back*
333	*Okay.*	*Um. Kyree?*
334	*K:*	*There's a point guard.*
335	*Ms. West:*	*There's a point guard.*
336	*(Writes on chalk board)*	
337		*Okay.*
338		*Pam.*
339	*P:*	*(whispers) Can I say something the same?*
340	*Ms. West:*	*Pardon?*
341	*P:*	*Can I say something the same?*
342	*Ms. West:*	*Yes you can say something the same.*
343	*P:*	*(unintelligible)*

344	LC:	That was a beautiful move right there.
345		Pam's raising her hand.
346		She's not always the most
347	Ms. West:	(nods)
348		Sharpest kid in the room.
349	Ms. West:	Um-hum. Um-hum.
350	LC:	And she said, Can I say something the same?
351		Now I guess she meant the same on the same
352		Where the two
353		I misinterpreted it for a second

354		I thought she said she was going to repeat what someone else
355		said
356	Ms. West:	Okay.
357	LC:	And now I realize it's the Venn Diagram
358	Ms. West:	Right. Right.
359	LC:	When she said, Can I say something that's on the same side?
360		Your response to her was
361		Well, yes you can do that
362		So she's initiated a different tact
363		and instead of you saying to her, "No. We're doing this side
364		right now."
365	Ms. West:	Okay
366	LC:	You said, "Well, sure you can." And you invited her
367		and when you invite one
368		you're inviting others too
369		cuz they feel part of that[of that community
370	Ms. West:	well good (chuckles)
371	LC:	I told you you were my teacher all summer.
372		Remember I told you that.
373	Ms. West:	You told me that.
374	LC:	But now I'm showing you.
375		But isn't that a lovely way to go?
376		And when you move when you make those conscious moves
377		see
378		This is what a lot of new teachers would benefit dramatically
379		from seeing
380	Ms. West:	Okay.
381	LC:	Because a lot of veterans
382		They're not aware they're doing these things.
383		But we're doing is pulling it out
384		And saying well here's what's going on here
385		Here's why it's different.
386	Ms. West:	And you know what.
387		I'm not
388		I'm not paying attention to the things until you say it.
389		It's like oh, okay. I don't
390		A lot of things that I do are not intentional
391		So it's um
392		I'm learning right now that okay then I want to do that more
393		often.
394	LC:	And that's exactly
395	Ms. West:	Okay.
396	LC:	That's exactly what this is about.
397		So let me just take it another step further.
398		And so here's what my hopes are
399		I see that this kind of understanding about teaching

400		Is critical to being successful with kids.
401		Instead of having some teachers be successful this way
402		Let's make it visible so more teachers can take it up.
403	Ms. West:	Right.
404	LC:	Intentionally,
405		But if nobody helps you see it
406		It's something that we haven't focused on.
	Ms. West:	You're right
407		Cause I'm really not
408		Not that you say
409		Well really okay well
410		I don't know how often I do it
411		But okay this is something I want to do frequently
412		You know
413		This
414		Okay
415		It's not just this way if this child is giving this answer
416		And I'm thinking I do it
417		Like more than I know
418		But it's really not a
419		An effort to do it.
420		And so I do want to put forth more of an effort
421		The more you tell me
422		The more I'm learning
423		Where I'm going to say okay
424		Let me continue to make sure I do this
425		Or I want to make sure I do that
426		And do less of the question response
427		Okay.
428	LC:	Yeah
429		Isn't this fun?
430	Ms. West:	It is.
431	LC:	I think it's so
432		That's why I've spent years with this
433		Cause I just see it's so powerful for teachers.
434	Ms. West:	I agree.
435	LC:	We keep talking about what we're teaching
436		And management
437		But it's really
438		I think about relationships
439		And how are we constructing those relationships.
440		Your clips are beautiful examples of that.
441	Ms. West:	Okay. (smiles)
442	LC:	Now you feel good?
443	Ms. West:	Yeah.
444		I feel good.

445	LC:	You won't get nervous this summer.
446	Ms. West:	Okay.
447	LC:	I promise you.
448		(both laugh)
449		Well I can't promise.
450		But I'll try.
451	Ms. West:	I want to take that promise.
452	LC:	Okay.
453		(both laugh)
454		So let's see what happens now.
455		Now you've given Pam this opening to go in any way that
456		she's comfortable.
457		And you've made it possible for her to say, can I do it a
458		different way?
459		And so you've made room for her ideas.
460	Ms. West:	Okay.
461		(continues to play Venn Diagram clip comparing football to another sport)
462	LC:	Oh boy this is fun.
463		There was so much wonderful stuff going on in there
464	Ms. West:	Oh, okay.
465	LC:	Did you notice how
466		First of all
467		By not asking a known answer question
468		The IRE pattern
469	Ms. West:	Um-hm.
470	LC:	Did you notice how Paula kept talking?
471	Ms. West:	Okay. Yeah.
472	LC:	Whereas the other kids would give you the one word
473		And that's it.
474		And there's no real
475	Ms. West:	Dialogue?
476	LC:	Dialogue.
477	Ms. West:	Exactly.
478	LC:	But here
479		Pam's not only talking at you
480		She's trying to really communicate
481		She's trying to show you and everybody else
482		(makes shape of goal posts similar to Pam on the tape)
483		Here's what this is
484		Did you notice what you did to align with her?
485		Watch this.
486		Let's go back a second.
487		This was a beautiful move I hadn't even noticed.

488	*(Replays clip)*	
489	*Ms. West:*	*Called a goal post.*
490		*Right?*
491	*(LC moves clip back a little further)*	
492	LC:	Just watch cause it's really fun.
493	Ms. West:	Okay.
494	*Ms. West:*	*Right. So that's actually*
495		*Um*
496		*That's called a goal post*
497		*Right?*
498	LC:	Do you see what you did?
499	Ms. West:	Made the goal post?
500	LC:	You did the same thing she did.
501	Ms. West:	Oooohhhh.
502		Yeah.
503		She did do (gestures like goal posts)
504	LC:	She went like this. (shaped hands like goal posts)
505		And then you listened to her
506		And then
507		You validated what she said because you did the same
508		motions she did.
509	Ms. West:	Okay
510	LC:	You connected so beautifully with her
511		And oh and yes
512		That's called a goal post
513		Not like
514		So who knows what Pam's trying
515		It was just so honoring
516	Ms. West:	Okay.(laughs)
517	LC:	And she is connected to you
518		And when she's connected
519		(points to clip on screen)
520		Look there's hand
521		There's eye contact
522		I would argue that even she's in this right now.
523		Because her head's up.
524		She's looking at you.
525	Ms. West:	I see. Yeah.
526		That's what I'm looking at.
527		Her heads down
528		But I think she must have been looking because I didn't
529		say well
530		Will you sit up?

531	LC:	Yeah.
532		Isn't that interesting.
533	Ms. West:	Um-hm.
534	LC:	And so this was a moment of real dialogue.
535		Of conversation
536		And because it went
537		It went on this way
538	Ms. West:	Okay.

| 539 | *(LC continues to play clip)* | |

| 540 | LC: | Let's look at some more. |

541	*Ms. West:*	*And you have to kick it through the goal posts.*
542		*But the ball still has to go through something?*
543	*P:*	*(unintelligible)*
544	*Ms. West:*	*They're both sports.*

545	LC:	Do you see how you were really having a conversation?
546	Ms. West:	(nods)
547	LC:	So there was meaning being made.
548		So that's why the other kids were also with you.
549		Look at
550		I think another hand is up over there besides.
551		And it was never about evaluating her answer.
552		It was always about understanding her answer.
553	Ms. West:	Okay. (nods)
554	LC:	Isn't
555		It's beautiful
556		I love it

557	*(LC returns to clip)*	
558	*Ms. West:*	*(writes on chalk board)*
559		*Britt?*
560	*B:*	*(unintelligible)*
561	*Ms. West:*	*Both sports use balls.*
562		*Cloris?*
563	*C:*	*(unintelligible) basketball*
564	*Ms. West:*	*What?*

565	LC:	Do you see how you've made it possible for kids not to
566		know?
567		That it's okay for them not to know.
568	Ms. West:	Well you know what I notice in my classroom regularly?
569		I want them to know it's okay not to know
570		So it's math

304

571		We usually do math and once we review it
572		If someone has something more I ask them
573		Do you see where you made your mistake?
574		And they'll say, Yes.
575		And then I'll clap for it.
576		Tell 'em that's good you found your mistake.
577		So I want them to feel like
578		If I say the wrong thing it's not horr
579		I don't want them to be scared to ask questions.
580	LC:	And so
581		For me the issue is
582		How you do that?
583		It's one thing to say to kids
584		Don't be afraid to ask questions.
585		And there are lots of times you'll hear teachers say, any
586		questions?
587		And it's completely silent.
588		It's another thing to have created the interactions with kids
589		That made them feel comfortable enough
590		And if we can understand how to create those interactions
591		With intentionality
592		It will allow us to have more opportunities
593		To engage some kids
594		Who otherwise might not be engaged.
595	Ms. West:	What
596		That's one thing that I do
597		I know during the regular school year on purpose
598		And I have middle school so they're not as tender
599	LC:	Yes.
600	Ms. West:	As elementary.
601		And uh um so
602		We do things where if they had the right answer we'll say
603		Nnnnnnnn and everybody laughs
604		Or
605		You know so
606		I do want them to be comfortable with the wrong answer.
607		And um so I guess
608		That's what I'm doing here too but just in a different way.
609	LC:	Okay.

| 610 | *(LC continues clip)* |

611	LC:	Do you see what happened?
612		The kids were now talking to each other.
613		If we can create a dialogue that is exchanged around the
614		room

615		It's sort of like you can think of it like the
616		power is kind of circulating around the room.
617		People speaking up who have answers.
618		Who doesn't have answers.
619		And people are trying to question each other
620		Those kids
621		I mean they're not shown on the screen
622		But you can hear how they're talking to each other
623		And you're listening in as a participant.
624	Ms. West:	Okay.
625	LC:	You're not listening in here as an authority.
626		Look how you're leaning into the kids.
627		And how you're really trying to make sense and make meaning of it.
628	Ms. West:	Okay.
629	LC:	They can see that.
630		Wow.
631	Ms. West:	This is so amazing.
632		Cause I'm not paying attention to it.
633		Like I say it's not
634	LC:	You're doing it.
635	Ms. West:	It's not intentional
636	LC:	But now
637	Ms. West:	Now I will be.

Chapter VI Results: During the Coaching Conference
Extended Transcript: Ms. East and Literacy Coach

1		This is a fascinating
2		Wonderful piece of transcript
3		This is so critical
4		When Joyce was performing
5		This was a whole performance
6		It wasn't about you
7		Or the teacher
8		Or her learning
9		It was about her peers
10	Ms E:	Umhm
11	LC:	And the biggest difference that I see between those fourth graders
12		And the sixth, seventh, and eighth
13		It is that the peer group becomes increasingly [important
14	Ms E:	[important
15	LC:	So
16		When she stands up
17		Yes
18		She's sorta helping you to get across your idea
19		But once she sees she's successful at that
20		And the kids are buying in
21	Ms E:	(continues to nod and agree)
22	LC:	You may as well not be in the room
23		Because she's looking for acceptance
24		And then
25		it was so interesting to me because
26		She's white
27		And the only white kid in there
28	Ms E:	Umhm
29	LC:	And blonde no less
30		She's really (gestures for long hair—implies she particularly fair)
31		And you were trying
32		It seemed as though you were trying to be extra nice
33		Not to make her feel
34		She was so different
35		Not to make her feel bad
36		But she was taking full advantage of [that
37	Ms E:	[that
38		Yeah
39	LC:	And
40	Ms E:	(smiles)

41		I can see that
42	LC:	And she was also playing to the kids
43		It seems
44		To find a place
45		To relate to them
46		And I don't know if she was pushing for one up on everybody
47		But
48		Clearly
49		This learning
50		Was about so much more
51		Than whatever the lesson was
52	Ms E:	Umhm
53	LC:	So
54		That's how I read this
55		I mean
56		Maybe I should have waited for you to give me your interpretation
57		What are you thinking as you look at this
58	Ms E:	Well
59		I guess as I'm looking at it
60		I do feel certainly
61		Well
62		I had less talk time than before
63		So before I talked too much
64		And here
65		It was interesting
66		Because I have no talk at all
67		And it was about gaining control back
68		And I lost control
69		I lost control
70		I lost sight
71		Even though we were talking about summary
72		I had to keep coming back to summary
73		Or summarizing
74		Or showing summary of this lesson
75	LC:	(reaches arm out to touch Ms. E's shoulder)
76		That is fascinating
77		I did not see it that way at all
78		What I saw this as is
79		How do I explain it
80		One of the concepts that we work with in discourse analysis
81		Is that we understand that power circulates in the classroom
82		And to have a classroom where everyone feels they're a part of it
83	Ms E:	Umhm
84	LC:	You know
85		It's kind of like
86		Now that I think about it

87		What you were doing with your kids
88		In fourth grade in terms of choosing partners
89		By the end of the year
90		This is what we do
91		This is how you take your responsibility
92		These are the norms in this group
93		And it just kind of where everybody gets used to it
94		And they work with it
95		Here
96		What's important to me is the understanding that
97		Kids aren't
98		Especially middle school kids
99		They're no longer
100		They're not trying
101		Even if they want to be school congruent
102		Even if they want to learn
103		There's always the peer [pressure
104	Ms E:	[Umhm
105	LC:	and so
106		It wasn't really about you at all
107	Ms E:	Umhm
108	LC:	In fact
109		I thought you went out of your way to give her room and space
110	Ms E:	umhm
111	LC:	And you actually let go
112		To let her have the floor
113		Because the kids were all enjoying it
114	Ms E:	Umhm
115	LC:	They were all into this movie thing
116		And yet it allowed Joyce to really
117		Step up and have some
118		What's the word I want
119		Not power so much
120		But
121		To be recognized by the group
122		You know
123		To be socially acceptable
124		And so I think there are
125		You positioned her so that she wouldn't feel bad
126		You went out of your way to do that
127		And you know
128		You did pull her around
129		So I don't see it as a contr
130		That's so interesting to me
131		It's not about control
132		It's about how do we empower all the voices in the room

133	Ms E:	And I guess as you're saying that now
134		I guess
135		In a sense
136		You know
137		I want my fourth graders to have more independence
138		Or work as team and having that independence
139		In the classroom
140		That (xx) to make choices and decisions
141		And I guess
142		Hmm
143		I don't know
144		I guess I was trying to relate that to what happened on the sixth grade level
145		She had that freedom
146		Where the kids had some freedom
147		She had that freedom
148		But I guess I was concerned that maybe
149		Looking at this transcript here
150		Was there to::o much freedom given
151		And not being a middle school teacher
152		Trying to make that adjustment
153		I guess for me
154		Just really trying to make that adjustment
155		Trying to get a feel for them
156		And I guess they get a feel for me
157		I'm in their environment now
158		Whereas I'm comfortable in my elementary environment
159		Now I'm in their environment
160		And I'm trying to
161		I guess
162		Fit in
163		I don't know if that really makes sense
164	LC:	Oh
165		It makes so much [sense
166	Ms E:	[yeah
167	LC:	You know
168		That idea of fitting in
169		Everybody was trying to fit in
170		You were all feeling your way at the beginning
171		How are we gonna be together in this room
172		And so
173		We all have choices to make about what's gonna work
174		And what's not gonna work
175		So one of the things that I noticed a hint of in this
176	Ms E:	Umhm
177	LC:	And I mentioned earlier
178		Is the issue that the kids showed they understood it

179		So but then they had every day the same kind of work
180	Ms E:	Umhm
181	LC:	So gradually
182		it became more difficult to work with them because
183		even though they might have known it
184		they might choose not to do it
185		but they know it
186	Ms E:	Umhm
187	LC:	They made that kind of clear
188	Ms E:	Yeah
189	LC:	And so that was important
190		I thought
191		And then
192		When it seemed like they got most engaged
193		Was when it was something they could contribute to
194	Ms E:	Yeah
195	LC:	So when you used movies as an example
196		Of how to get at main idea details summaries
197		They were all over it
198		So that becomes
199		So how do we use their worlds
200		Maybe
201		Their lives
202		Their knowledge
203	Ms E:	(continuously nodding)
204	LC:	To build on
205		To help them learn the academic things that we want to teach
206		That was what I was thinking
207		And I was also thinking just how much Joyce was playing for the crowd
208		She was playing for the approval of the kids
209		It had nothing to do with you
210		I mean
211		It wasn't about you
212		It was like there was a hunger there to be recognized
213		So um
214		I didn't see it as losing control at all
215		I think that in middle school
216		I'm a middle school person more than anything
217		With middle school kids it's never about control
218		Because with middle school kids=
219	Ms E:	=you can't control
220	LC:	You don't control
221		You work with em
222	Ms E:	And I know
223		That the first year I worked over there
224		It went smoothly

225	It didn't go so bad
226	I had some bumps here and there
227	But this year
228	It was
229	(shakes her head)
230	Sooo
231	It was a big adjustment
232	I don't know
233	Just some of the students I had before
234	They were now in eighth grade
235	Going into eighth grade
236	And
237	I just feel like I
238	Again
239	I was gonna say control
240	But as you say
241	It's not control
242	But for me
243	Fitting in their environment
244	I guess
245	For me I would say
246	Fitting in
247	Understanding now I'm not dealing with
248	I've been working with fourth grade students
249	I'm now with middle school students
250	And there's a lot of independence there
251	And learning
252	My now
253	Trying to fit in their environment
254	Learning how to adjust myself
255	How do I now teach
256	I was
257	For me it was a learning experience too
258	Because I couldn't get it this year at all
259	I just (shakes head) couldn't get it
260	And for me I guess it would
261	I had to learn some things as well
262	You know
263	Being in their environment
264	At some point I found myself having to relax a little bit
265	Whereas I wanted to have that control
266	I wanted to be
267	'I'm the center
268	you should be listening'
269	and I guess for me
270	that certainly should be

271	I want to work towards more as a facilitator
272	And not being that central person
273	I want it to be on you
274	And that would be my ultimate goal
275	To give the students more independence
276	And even though there was some independence
277	She had the freedom to talk
278	But for me
279	As I do see it
280	I do feel that
281	There was less of me talking
282	I agree with that
283	But I think in terms of the teaching
284	What they were to get
285	I don't think again
286	They got it

Chapter VII Results: Post-coaching Analysis
Extended Transcript: The LC's Discourse Pattern Emerges

1	Ms. W:	Now how would you change this particular conversation about
2		I noticed the big contrast in this clip and the other clip.
3		But, how do you change this topic
4		What I want them to know about this
5		To being like when we were doing the Venn Diagram
6		See the Venn Diagram to me was different
7		Because it was their ideas
8		Or they're
9		They're able to tell me
10		And there is no right or wrong answer
11		So how would you change this kind of conversation
12		To that kind of conversation?
13	LC:	It's the best question.
14		Alright.
15		First of all
16		You don't always want to.
17	Ms. W:	Okay.
18	LC:	There are times when you want to
19		And there are times when you don't want to
20	Ms. W:	Okay.
21	LC:	That's part of this whole intentionality.
22		But there's a whole different level of engagement here
23		And it's
24		So for me
25		One of the questions is
26		What are they really learning
27	Ms. W:	Uh-huh.
28	LC:	And I kept asking that all the way through.
29		Let me know you a different clip.
30		And let's see if that connects in some way.
31	Ms. W:	Okay.
32	LC:	This one is the same day
33		Same thing
34		Oh, this is perfect.
35		Thank goodness you had that same outfit on.
36	Ms. W:	(laughs)
37	LC:	Um so here we are.
38		This is the same lesson on comprehension.
39		But it's toward the end.
40	Ms. W:	Okay.

41	LC:	Okay?
42	Ms. W:	Okay.
43		
44	*(LC plays clip.)*	
45	*Ms. W:*	*Yes?*
46	*R:*	*Can I read a book from this book bag?*
47	*Ms. W:*	*Can you do what?*
48	*R:*	*Read a book?*
49	*Ms. W:*	*Sure.*
50		*But we're about to start another assignment in about two minutes.*
51		
52	LC:	Okay.
53		That was fascinating.
54		The same kind of thing happened another time during the summer
55		with Angel.
56	Ms. W:	Okay.
57	LC:	Where she had a book
58		A novel
59		And she took it out to read.
60		So the question for me was
61		What is reading?
62		When we ask kids about comprehension
63		And then we ask them to fill out
64		Answer questions in response to writing
65		Which was MEAP prep basically
66	Ms. W:	Um-hm.
67	LC:	From what I could see.
68		So what is it we really want to teach?
69		What do we want kids to value?
70	Ms. W:	Okay.
71	LC:	Do we want
72		If I've got kids in summer school
73		And I'm thinking about
74		What can I do best for these kids in terms of literacy
75		I'm thinking
76		Wow
77		If I can get a kid to bring a book
78		I can get a kids to bring books in
79		and show them that reading is something
80		People do and that
81		And how we make meaning out of that
82		And why it connects to our lives
83	Ms. W:	Um-hm
84	LC:	That's another way of thinking about comprehension.
85	Ms. W:	Okay.
86	LC:	So it was real interested because both with Dani

87		Not Dani
88		With Angel and I couldn't
89	Ms. W:	Rae
90	LC:	Thank you, Rae.
91		Um and Rae
92		Both of them
93		And Rae was one of the least connected kids
94		And she had a book
95		But the response to the book was
96		We've got another worksheet to do.
97	Ms. W:	Um-hm
98	LC:	When
99		And the same thing basically really happened with Angel, too.
100		She had a book
101		But there was never really any notice of it.
102		It never became part of the conversation.
103	Ms. W:	Okay.
104	LC:	Guys
105		They're reading
106		This is what we're
107		Why are we doing any of this
108		If not to be readers
109		If not to have a reading life
110		Not to use reading for our purposes
111	Ms. W:	Uh-huh.
112	LC:	beyond the test.
113		So it raised real questions for me
114		About where
115		Alright
116		One of the questions it raised is
117		What really matters?
118		So who decides what your curriculum would be?
119	Ms. W:	Who decides my curriculum?
120	LC:	for this for example
121		This summer school class?
122	Ms. W:	Ummm
123		Kinda sorta me but
124		Not really
125		We do these
126		These umm
127		BBC's
128		I don't know if you noticed those on the board
129		And they're Black Board Configurations
130		And everyday we have to have a new BBC
131	LC:	Okay
132		BBC stands for

133	Ms. W:	Black Board Configuration
134	LC:	And what is that
135		That's the Do Now
136	Ms. W:	Exactly
137		It's the Do Now
138		The AIMS where the students can see the intention of what they're
139		supposed to
140		learn
141		And the homework
142		And those are kinda restricting
143		Uh for me.
144		They are good in the fact that they give me order.
145		But they are restricting in the fact that I have to do a new one every
146		day.
147		It's supposed to be something different.
148		What if they're not ready for something different?
149		What if we need to do the same thing.
150		So I kinda am able to say what I want them to learn
151		But we do have to
152		You know
153		Go with the um the benchmarks and are we making
154		This benchmark this benchmark and
155		So it's the benchmarks but then it's the BBC's that make it even
156		more
157		Restrictive when you have to say
158		Everything is something new.
159		Everyday is new.
160		And I would be in trouble if I didn't have a new one.
161	LC:	What would happen?
162	Ms. W:	Um Somebody will probably write me up
163		Memo
164		Or this is something to say this is the same BBC I saw yesterday.
165	LC:	Does somebody usually come in and look?
166	Ms. W:	Yes.
167	LC:	Who comes in and looks?
168	Ms. W:	During the regular school year
169		The principal, the assistant principal, the Director, the
170		I don't know what those other people are called
171		I guess they're supervisors,
172	LC:	Oh my goodness.
173	Ms. W:	they uh they don't come on a daily basis
174		But sometimes they do come two days in a row.
175		And if they do
176		Then they will say
177		Well
178		This is the same one as yesterday

179		
180		
181	LC:	But the issue is
182		What can we see in our practice
183		That some of this discursive work might be useful for
184		And I'm struck by the story of the kids that are afraid in some
185		classrooms.
186		And you associate the IRE with that.
187	Ms. W:	Uh-huh.
188	LC:	as a way of
189	Ms. W:	Cause I watched it
190		Just watching it and how you showed me the difference in this
191		other interaction
192		Versus the IRE way and I just thought about how
193		Yeah
194		To me
195		It kinda relates
196		Even though I still with the IRE would welcome other responses
197		and
198		Other answers
199		I wouldn't make anybody feel uncomfortable with anything
200		With that either but
201		I just liked the difference of everybody participating
202	LC:	So let's take that same focus and go back to Rae
203		Let me take it back to the beginning of this.
204	Ms. W:	Okay.
205	LC:	And let's replay it.
206		And let's think about
207		What are our options as teachers
208		Given the BBC's
209		Given
210		You know
211		They're telling you to teach the benchmarks.
212		But they're not
213		I don't see them
214		Telling you you have to use this material
215	Ms. W:	They don't
216	LC:	And I don't see them telling you you have to say this
217		It's not scripted.
218	Ms. W:	They don't.
219	LC:	So actually
220		Other than those four minutes and the AIMS
221		The students will be able to that's on the board
222	Ms. W:	(nods)
223	LC:	The homework
224		That keeps you focused

225	Ms. W:	Yes.
226	LC:	But that doesn't actually constrain what you're allowed to teach
227	Ms. W:	It's just that whatever I have on the board [though has to be
228	LC:	[So you have to be
229		planful
230	Ms. W:	Uh-huh
231	LC:	And you have to adjust.
232		Okay. So if
233		Now I know you're a math person
234		And if I were doing this in math
235		I wouldn't have a thing to say to you
236		So
237	Ms. W:	You probably would still (smiling)
238	LC:	No. I wouldn't. (smiling)
239	(Both laugh)	
240	LC:	I don't understand math
241		But I do
242		I do get a little bit with literacy
243		And what I noticed is that Rae's been a reluctant participant
244	Ms. W:	(nods)
245	LC:	in the class
246		A lot of times she doesn't follow what everybody else is following
247		She's just kind a
248		And she's not in it socially as much as the others
249	Ms. W:	Nope. She's not.
250	LC:	So I really watched her.
251		And I thought
252		We've got to watch for the moments
253		Just like you were doing with Amar
254		What are the moments
255		So we don't lose them
256		That we can build upon that can reposition a student so they see
257		themselves differently in the school?
258	Ms. W:	Okay.
259	LC:	And that's what I thought of when I looked at this thing with Rae.
260	Ms. W:	Okay.
261	LC:	So
262		Let's replay it and let's think it through again,
263	Ms. W:	Okay.
264	LC:	And see what the implications are.
265	Ms. W:	Okay.
266		
267	*(LC plays clip.)*	
268	*Ms. W:*	*Yes?*
269	*R:*	*Can I read a book from this book bag?*
270	*Ms. W:*	*Can you do what?*

271	*R:*	*Read a book?*
272	*Ms. W:*	*Sure.*
273		*But we're about to start another assignment in about two minutes.*
274		
275	LC:	(stops clip)
276		Okay.
277		So now.
278		What's valued there?
279		What are the values we're placing on that interaction?
280		For example,
281		To me what's valued is collecting the papers and going on to the
282		next assignment.
283	Ms. W:	Okay.
284	LC:	But here we have a kid who has a book in her bookbag
285		And wants to read it
286		That's a moment of opportunity for me.
287	Ms. W:	Okay.
288	LC:	For a moment where
289		I can reposition that child
290		You have a book, Rae?
291		In your bookbag?
292		What are you reading?
293		Oh my goodness.
294		Tell me about it.
295		Is it a series?
296		Have you been reading this a lot?
297		You guys, I've got to interrupt you.
298		I do not believe this
299		This is the most wonderful thing
300		Rae has
301	Ms. W:	Okay. (serious look)
302	LC:	You do that with a lot of different ways with kids.
303		But generally it had been over something they said
304		Having to do
305		Well there was a lot over around clothing
306		That was
307		They did a lot with that
308		The hair
309	Ms. W:	(smiles)
310	LC:	What's
311		Okay. I forgot her name for the moment.
312	Ms. W:	Cloris.
313	LC:	Cloris.
314		Of course. Cloris who is beyond cute.
315		And you know
316		She's playing with your hair to the point where you say, 'Cloris,

317		now you stop that girl.
318		Go sit your butt in the chair.
319		You know.
320	Ms. W:	(smiles)
321	LC:	Which was just hysterical. And
322		it was such good repartee between you two.
323		And so there's a lot going on around the physical appearance and
324		you know
325		who we are
326		And I see now that some of that just goes back to your own
327		schooling at that age.
328		It's a natural fit.
329		But now there's another thing we can think about
330		And that is
331		When is a kid doing something that's really literate
332		And how can we make that part of the conversation
333	Ms. W:	Okay
334	LC:	So that when Angel
335		Angel had a book also another day
336		And she said can I take it out
337		It's like
338		That could be the most important thing they're doing
339	Ms. W:	Ummm
340	LC:	because when you do the comprehension as a worksheet
341		It falls right into the qri pattern
342		You know
343		Who knows what comprehension is
344		And someone gives you the answer
345		And the kids are just busy doing what they've got to do
346		So they're told they've got to do that.
347		Rae's not being told she has to read.
348		And isn't that
349	Ms. W:	Right
350	LC:	what we really want for kids?
351	Ms. W:	Hmm
352	LC:	And Angel
353		No one was
354		They were choosing to read
355		And so if we could get kids to think about choosing to read as
356		something they'd rather do
357	Ms. W:	Um-hm
358	LC:	than other things
359		and if we could shift the balance of instruction
360		from the worksheets
361		Which is
362		You know

363		What we got here
364	Ms. W:	Um-hm
365	LC:	to the authentic work
366		What would happen for kids?
367	Ms. W:	Right
368		They'd like to read and would practice reading and comprehending
369	LC:	and they do it
370		Maybe not giving you a definition
371		But they do it
372	Ms. W:	Uh-huh
373	LC:	Cause you can't read unless you're following along
374		And so what if the kids
375		I mean
376		Here
377		These are kids that don't have a lot materially
378		But look at this
379		They've got books
380		And you know
381		I bet I bet most of them would have a book
382	Ms. W:	Right
383	LC:	and so
384		Couldn't we teach the same
385		Well
386		I'm not sure what's being taught
387		I'd have to work at it
388		But
389		We could look at a few of those things
390		But couldn't we get our kids to be better readers by doing real
391		reading?
392	Ms. W:	Yes.
393	LC:	where they're making some choices
394	Ms. W:	(Nods)
395	LC:	So one of the questions I asked myself is
396		What's being privileged here?
397		When we look at this
398		This is a text to me
399		This is a text just like I'm reading a book (referring to the
400		computer screen)
401	Ms. W:	Okay.
402	LC:	When I read the video
403		What do I see
404		Well I see what's most important
405		Watch the body language
406		
407		
408		So now going back to where we were.

409		Notice how you're leaned into her.
410		This is your wonderful self who's always
411		You know
412		Communicating with the kids.
413	Ms. W:	Okay.
414		
415	*(LC replays clip)*	
416	*Ms. W:*	*Can you do what?*
417	*R:*	*Read a book?*
418	*Ms. W:*	*Sure.*
419		
420	LC:	Now look.
421	Ms. W:	Uh-huh.
422	LC:	Do you see what you did?
423	Ms. W:	Uh-huh.
424	(Ms. West is shown on the clip as turning away from Rae as she answers the	
425	question.)	
426	LC:	So she knows that's not a valued
427	Ms. W:	Yep.
428	LC:	It's not a [valued
429	Ms. W:	[I see [it
430	LC:	[you turned right away immediately
431		So that wasn't where
432		That's not important
433	Ms. W:	(nods her head emphatically)
434		Yep.
435	LC:	And that happened with Angela, too
436		Which is why I really wanted to bring that up
437		Cause I thought wow
438		This is so [great
439	Ms. W:	[okay
440	LC:	Here's been
441		One of my most disaffected kids
442		She's got a book
443		And so I want to privilege
444		How do I get a reading life
445		And how does that become
446		Part of who I am
447		And part of my identity
448	Ms. W:	Okay
449	LC:	So
450		And you know how you talked earlier about the worksheets.
451	Ms. W:	Uh-huh
452	LC:	And how they made you feel
453		Like just be quiet and do what you gotta do
454		So there are holdovers from that

455	Ms. W:	Uh-huh
456	LC:	here
457	Ms. W:	Uh-huh. Uh-huh.
458	LC:	And so the question is so how else can we think about teaching
459		reading
460		And getting to higher levels of thinking too
461		The IRE doesn't get you very high levels
462		It gets you just what's the answer
463	Ms. W:	Okay (nods)
464	LC:	That's interesting.
465	Ms. W:	Uh-huh. That is.

REFERENCES

Achinstein, B., & Villar, A. (2002). *Politics of the mentoring process for novices: Negotiating professional relationships and new teacher learning*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation*. New York: Quill.

Allen, D., Nichols, P., & Ancess, J. (2004). *Coaching as inquiry: Interpreting culture and leveraging change*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Meeting.

Atkinson, J., & Heritage, J. (1999). Jefferson's transcript notation. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader*. London: Routledge.

Baker, C. D. (1997). Ethnomethodological studies of talk in educational settings. In B. Davies & D. Corson (Eds.), *Oral Discourse and Education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education.* (Vol. 3, pp. 43-52). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Baker, C. D. (2002). Ethnomethodological analyses of interviews. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 777-795). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Baxter, J., & Atherton, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Aristotle's poetics: Translated and with a commentary by George Whalley*. Canada: McGill-Queen's University.

Bean, R. M. (2008). Literacy coaching at the middle school/high school levels. In S. Lenski & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Reading success for struggling adolescent learners* (pp. 265-287). New York: Guilford.

Bean, R. M., Draper, J. A., Hall, V., Vandermolen, J., & Zigmond, N. (2010). Coaches and coaching in Reading First schools: A reality check. *Elementary School Journal, 111*(1), 87-114.

Biancarosa, G., Bryk, A. S., Atteberry, A., & Hough, H. (2009). *Coaching in Literacy Collaborative and its effects on teachers and students*. Paper presented at the SREE.

Blamey, K. L., Meyer, C. K., & Walpole, S. (2009). Middle and high school literacy coaches: A national survey. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 52*(4), 310-323.

Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Brown, D., Reumann-Moore, R., Christman, J. B., & Riffer, M. (2008). *Links to learning and sustainability: Year three report of the Pennsylvania High School Coaching Initiative*. Philadelphia: Research for Action.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978/1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buly, M. R., Coskie, T., Robinson, L., & Egawa, K. (2006). Literacy coaching: Coming out of the corner. *Voices from the Middle, 13*(4), 24-28.

Camburn, E. M., Kimball, S. M., & Lowerhaupt, R. (2008). Going to scale with teacher leadership: Lessons learned from a districtwide literacy coach initiative. In M. M. Mangin & S. R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 120-143). New York: Teachers College Press.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher, 28*(7), 15-25.

Coggins, C. T. (2004). *Coaching as a districtwide reform strategy.* Unpublished Dissertation, Stanford.

Coggins, C. T., Stoddard, P., & Cutler, E. (2003). *Improving instructional capacity through field-based reform coaches*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association.

Cornett, J., & Knight, J. (2008). Research on coaching. In J. Knight (Ed.), *Coaching: Approaches and perspectives* (pp. 192-216). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (1994). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon

Cothran, D. J., & Ennis, C. D. (1997). Students' and teachers' perceptions of conflict and power. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(5), 541-553.

Crawford, T. (2008). Winning the epistemological struggle: Constructing a cultural model of shared authority in an elementary classroom. *Teachers College Record, 110*(8), 1706-1736.

Croft, A., Coggshall, J. G., Dolan, M., Powers, E., & Killion, J. (2010). *Job-embedded professional development: What it is, who is responsible, and how to get it done well*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(8), 597-604.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wei Chung, R., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*: National Staff Development Council and The School Redesign Network at Stanford University as part of their multi-year study, The Status of Professional Development in the United States.

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 20*(1), 43-65.

Deussen, T., & Buly, M. R. (2006). *Connecting coaching and improved literacy*. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Education.

Deussen, T., Coskie, T., Robinson, L., & Autio, E. (2007). *"Coach" can mean many things: Five categories of literacy coaches in Reading First* (No. REL 2007- 005 Issues & Answers Report). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.

Dole, J. A. (2004). The changing role of the reading specialist in school reform. *The Reading Teacher, 57*(5), 462-471.

Donaldson, M. L., Moore Johnson, S., Kirkpatrick, C. L., Marinell, W., Steele, J. L., & Agee Szczesiul, S. (2008). Angling for access, bartering for change: How second-stage teachers experience differentiated roles in schools. *Teachers College Record, 110*(5), 1088-1114.

Ellison, J., & Hayes, C. (2009). Cognitive Coaching. In J. Knight (Ed.), *Coaching: Approaches and perspectives* (pp. 70-90). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Erickson, F. (2004). *Talk and social theory: Ecologies of speaking and listening in everyday life*. Malden: Polity Press.

Ertmer, P. A., Richardson, J., Cramer, J., Hanson, L., Huang, W., Lee, Y., et al. (2005). Professional development coaches: Perceptions of critical characteristics. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*(1), 52-75.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Fleischer, C. (1995). *Composing teacher research: A prosaic history*. NY: State University of New York Press

Frost, S., & Bean, R. (2006). Qualifications for literacy coaches: Achieving the gold standard. *Retrieved April 12, 2010, from www.literacycoachingonline.org/briefs/LiteracyCoaching.pdf*.

Garet, M. S., Birman, B. F., Porter, A. C., & Desimone, L. M. (2003). *Does professional development change teaching practice? Results from a three-year study. Lessons from the Eisenhower Program Executive Summary. Retrieved April 10, 2010 from www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/epdp/execsum.pdf-2003-08-21*.

Garet, M. S., Cronen, S., Eaton, M., Kurki, A., Ludwig, M., Jones, W., et al. (2008). *The impact of two professional development interventions on early reading instruction and achievement (NCEE 2008-4030)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

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

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Gibson, S. A. (2005). Developing Knowledge of Coaching. *Issues in Teacher Education, 14*(2), 63-74.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

Goffman, E. (1981). Forms of talk. Oxford: Blackwell.

Goldenberg, C., & Galimore, R. (1991). Changing teaching takes more than a one-shot workshop. *Educational Leadership, 49*(3), 69-72.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). New York: Academic.

Guskey, T. R., & Yoon, K. S. (2009). What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(7), 495-500.

Hall, B. (2004). Literacy coaches: An evolving role. *Carnegie Reporter, 3*(1). Retrieved from http://www.carnegie.org/reporter/09/index.html

Harré , R., & Van Langenhove, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action*. Malden: Blackwell.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hess, F. M., & Finn, C. E. (2007). Held back: No Child Left Behind needs some work. *Policy Review, 144*, 45-58.

Hough, H., Bryk, A., Pinnell, G., Kerbow, D., Fountas, I., Scharer, P. . (2008). *Measuring change in the practice of teachers engaged in Literacy Collaborative professional development: Preliminary results from a four year study.* Paper presented at the National Reading Conference. Retrieved from http://www.literacycoachingonline.org/library/resources/hough-h-bryk-a-pinnell-g.html

Hubbard, R. S., & Power, B. M. (1999). *Living the Questions: A guide for teacher-researchers*. York: Stenhouse.

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: International Reading Association.

International Reading Association. (2006). *Standards for middle and high school literacy coaches*. Newark, DE: Author.

International Reading Association. (2007). Standards for Reading Professionals: Revised role definitions as of August 2007.   Retrieved January 10, 2009, from http://www.reading.org/styleguide/standards_reading_profs.html

Johnston, P. H. (2004). *Choice Words: How our language affects children's learning*. Portland: Stenhouse.

Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Malden: Blackwell.

Johnstone, B. (2007). *Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). Malden: Blackwell.

Josselson, R. (2004). The hermeneutics of faith and the hermeneutics of suspicion. *Narrative Inquity, 14*(1), 1-28.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1980). Improving in-service training: The messages of research. *Educational Leadership, 37*(5), 379-385.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1981). Transfer of training: The contribution of coaching. *Boston University Journal of Education, 16*(2), 163-172.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. *Educational Leadership, 40*(1), 4-10.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1995). *Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. *Educational Leadership, 53*(6), 12-16.

Knight, J. (2009a). What can we do about teacher resistance? *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(7), 508-513.

Knight, J. (Ed.). (2009b). *Coaching: Approaches and perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (1998). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (5 ed.). Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

L'Allier, S., Elish-Piper, L., & Bean, R. M. (2010). What matters for elementary literacy coaching? Guiding principles for instructional improement and student achievement. *Reading Teacher, 63*(7), 544-554.

Labaree, D. F. (2004). *The Trouble with Ed Schools* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Leithwood, K., Louis Seashore, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. Minneapolis: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement: University of Minnesota; Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Association, 19*(3), 325-340.

Locher, M. A. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lord, B., Cress, K., & Miller, B. (2008). Teacher leadership in support of large-scale mathematics and science education reform. In M. M. Mangin & S. R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 55-76). New York: Teachers College Press.

Mangin, M. M. (2005). Distributed leadership and the culture of schools: Teacher leaders' strategies for gaining access to classrooms. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*(4), 456-484.

Mangin, M. M. (2009). Literacy coach role implementation: How district context influences reform efforts. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(5), 759-792.

Manouchehri, A. (2002). Developing teacher knowledge through peer discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education* (18), 715–737.

Matsumura, L. C., Garnier, H., Junker, B., Resnick, L. B., & Bickel, D. D. (2008). *Investigating the implementation and effect of the Content-Focused Coaching Program on instruction and learning*. Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting.

McCombs, J. S., & Marsh, J. A. (2009). Lessons for boosting the effectiveness of reading coaches. *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(7), 501-507.

McKenna, M. C., & Walpole, S. (2008). *The literacy coaching challenge: Models and methods for grades K-8*. New York: Guilford.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mitchell, J. C. (1983). Case and situation analysis. *Sociological Review, 31*, 187-211.

Mitchell, J. C. (1984). Typicality and the case study. In R. F. Ellens (Ed.), *Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct* (pp. 238-241). New York: Academic Press.

Moss, B. J. (1989). *The Black sermon as a literacy event.* University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago.

Mraz, M., Algozzine, B., & Watson, P. (2008). Perceptions and expectations of roles and responsibilities of literacy coaching. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 47*(3).

Murray, S., Ma, X., & Mazur, J. (2008). Effects of peer coaching on teachers' collaborative interactions and students' mathematics achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research, 102*(3), 203-212.

National Reading Panel Reports of the Subgroups. (1999). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington DC: Congressional Report.

Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2003a). *Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity*. Washington, DC and Providence, RI: The Aspen Institute Program on Education and The Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2003b). *Year II of collaborative coaching and learning in the effective practice schools: Expanding the work*. Cambridge, MA: Education Matters, Inc.

Neuman, S. B., & Cunningham, L. (2009). The impact of professional development and coaching on early language and literacy instructional practices. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(2), 532-566.

Newmann, F. (1990). Higher Order Thinking in Teaching Social Studies: A Rationale for the Assessment of Classroom Thoughtfulness. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22*, 41-56.

Newmann, F., Marks, H. M., & Gamoran, A. (1996). Authentic Pedagogy and Student Performance. *American Journal of Education, 104*(4), 280-312.

Nowak, R. (2003). *The discourse of literacy coaching: Teacher-coach interactions during a summer school practicum.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Florida.

Pace, J. L. (2003). Revisiting classroom authority: Theory and ideology meet practice. *Teachers College Record, 105*(8), 1559–1585.

Pace, J. L., & Hemmings, A. (2007). Understanding authority in classrooms: A review of theory, ideology, and research. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 4-27. Retrieved February 21, 2011, from Research Library. (Document ID: 1257659771).

Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Perkins, S. J. (1998). On becoming a peer coach: practices, identities, and beliefs of inexperienced coaches. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 13*(3), 235-254.

Poglinco, S. M., Bach, A. J., Hovde, K., Rosenblum, S., Saunders, M., & Supovitz, J. (2003). *The heart of the matter: The coaching model in America's Choice schools* (Evaluation Study). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Potter, J. (1996). Interests and category entitlements *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction* (pp. 122-149). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.

Putney, L. G., & Frank, C. R. (2008). Looking through ethnographic eyes at classrooms acting as cultures. *Ethnography and Education, 3*(2), 211-228.

Putney, L. G., Green, J. L., Dixon, C. N., Duran, R., & Yeager, B. (2000). Consequential progressions: Exploring collective-individual development in a bilingual classroom. In C. D. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry* (pp. 86-126). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rainville, K. N. (2007). *Situated identities, power, and positioning: Inside the practices of three literacy coaches in New Jersey.* Unpublished Ph.D., Teachers College, Columbia, New York.

Rainville, K. N., & Jones, S. (2008). Situated identities: Power and positioning in the work of a literacy coach. *The Reading Teacher, 61*(6), 440-448.

Rex, L. (2003). Loss of the creature: The obscuring of classroom inclusivity in classroom discourse. *Communication Education, 52*(1), 30-46.

Rex, L. (2006a). Acting "cool" and "appropriate": Toward a framework for considering literacy classroom interactions when race Is a factor. *Journal of Literacy Research, 38*(3), 275 – 325.

Rex, L. (Ed.). (2006b). *Discourse of opportunity: How talk in learning situations creates and constrains*. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Rex, L., & Green, J. (2007). Classroom discourse and interaction: Reading across the traditions. *Handbook of Educational Linguistics.*: Blackwell.

Rex, L., & Jordan, Z. (2005). Successful White-Black pedagogy: Discursive practices of a white English teacher with her Black students. *Research in the Teaching of English*.

Rex, L., & Nelson, M. C. (2004). How Teachers' Professional Identities Position High-Stakes Test Preparation in Their Classrooms. *Teachers College Record, 106*(6), 1288–1331.

Rex, L., & Schiller, L. (2005). *A critical analysis of power and politeness during literacy professional development workshops.* Paper presented at the National Council of Teachers of English Assembly for Research Mid-Winter Conference, Columbus, Ohio.

Rex, L. A., & Schiller, L. (2009). *Using discourse analysis to improve classroom interaction*. New York: Routledge.

Richardson, V., & Valdez, A. (1991). *The role dialogue plays in long-term teacher change*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Roller, C. M. (2006). *Reading and literacy coaches: Report on hiring requirements and duties survey* (web-based resource). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Russo, A. (2004). School-based coaching: A revolution in professional development--or just the latest fad? *Harvard Education Letter, 20*(4), 1-4.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.

Sailors, M., & Price, L. R. (2009). *Professional development that supports the teaching of cognitive reading strategy instruction*. Paper presented at the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness.

Sailors, M., & Shanklin, N. L. (2010). Introduction: Growing evidence to support coaching in literacy and mathematics. *Elementary School Journal, 111*(1), 1-6.

Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group. (1992). Do you see what we see? The referential and intertextual nature of classroom life. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 27*(2), 29-36.

Schiller, L. (1993). Points of view: A parent/child collaboration. *Changing Minds: The Partnership EES, Bulletin 8*(Summer), 24-25.

Schiller, L. (1996). Coming to America: Community from diversity. *Language Arts, 73*(1), 46-53.

Schiller, L. (1997). Memoir: Responding to genre and craft of language. *Literacy Consortium, 30*(1), 32-42.

Schiller, L. (2001). Making American Literatures in Middle School. In A. R. Gere & P. Shaheen (Eds.), *Making American Literatures in Middle and High School* (pp. 104-114). Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

Schwartz, S., McCarthy, M., Gould, T., Politziner, S., & Enyeart, C. (2003). *Where the Rubber Hits the Road: An In-Depth Look at Collaborative Coaching and Learning and Workshop Instruction in a Sample of Effective Practice Schools. Boston Plan for Excellence*. Boston.

Shaw, M. (2007). Preparing reading specialists to be literacy coaches: Principles, practices, possibilities. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education [Online], 3*(1), 6-17.

Showers, B. (1990). Aiming for superior classroom instruction for all children: A comprehensive staff development model. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(35), 35-39.

Showers, B., & Joyce, B. (1996). The Evolution of Peer Coaching. *Educational Leadership, 53*(6), 12-16.

Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. *Educational Leadership, 45*(3), 77-87.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

Snow, C., Ippolito, J., & Schwartz, R. (2006). What we know and what we need to know about literacy coaches in middle and high schools: A research synthesis and proposed research agenda *In Standards for middle and high school literacy coaches* (pp. 35-49). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Spillane, J. P., Hallett, T., & Diamond, J. B. (2003). Forms of capital and the construction of leadership: Instructional leadership in urban elementary schools. *Sociology of Education, 76*(1), 1-17.

Stoelinga, S. R. (2008). Leading from above and below: Formal and informal teacher leadership. In M. M. Mangin & S. R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 99-119). New York: Teachers College.

Stover, K., Kissel, B., Haag, K., & Shoniker, R. (2011). Differentiated coaching: Fostering reflection with teachers. *The Reading Teacher, 64*(7), 498-509.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (second ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Sunderman, G. L., & Kim, J. S. (2007). The expansion of federal power and the politics of implementing the No Child Left Behind Act. *Teachers College Record, 109*(5), 1057-1085.

Symonds, K. W. (2003). *Literacy coaching: How school districts can support a long-term strategy in a short-term world*. San Francisco, CA: Bay Area School Reform Collaborative.

Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1993). *Framing in discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tatum, A. W. (2004). A road map for reading specialists entering schools without exemplary reading programs: Seven quick lessons. *The Reading Teacher, 58*(1), 28-39.

Toll, C. A. (2005). *The Literacy Coach's survival guide: Essential questions and practical answers*. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Toll, C. A. (2007). *Lenses on literacy coaching: Conceptualizations, functions, and outcomes*. Norwood: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Twitchin, J. (Writer). (1979). Crosstalk [Film], *Communication Documentary Series Broadcast on the B.B.C.* UK.

Valenzuela, A., Prieto, L., & Hamilton, M. P. (2007). Introduction to the special issue: No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and minority youth: What the qualitative evidence suggests. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly 38*(1), 1-8.

Walpole, S., & Blamey, K. L. (2008). Elementary literacy coaches: The reality of dual roles. *The Reading Teacher, 62*(3), 222-231.

Watts, R. (1991). *Power in family discourse*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wayne, A. J., Yoon, K. S., Zhu, P., Cronen, S., & Garet, M. S. (2008). Experimenting with teacher professional development: Motives and methods. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(8), 469-479.

Weber, C. M., Raphael, T. E., Goldman, S. R., Sullivan, M. P., & George, M. (2009). Literacy coaches: Multiple issues, multiple roles, multiple approaches. *Elementary School Journal*.

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of social and economic organization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wegerif, R., & Mercer, N. (1996). Computers and reasoning through talk in the classroom. *Language and Educaton, 10*(1), 47-64.

Wells, G. C. (1993). Re-evaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 5*, 1-37.

Wells, G. C. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters: Bringing the classsroom back into discussions of teacher quality*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, Policy Information Center.

Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Discourse theory and practice: A reader*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.