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Abstract

The intent of this study is to present an argument for coaching as an effective professional development venue for teachers in elementary school settings. Adult learning suggests that coaching, where a teacher and coach work together through a cycle of planning, modeling and conferencing, is an effective method to increase teacher ability. Teachers who exhibit effective teaching methods often display high teacher efficacy and academic optimism. A mixed methods design was used to examine the construct of academic optimism which consists of three variables, teacher efficacy, trust in adults and students, and academic emphasis. A survey was given to teachers in four regions of the United States for the quantitative portion of the study. Focus group interviews and observations were also conducted to represent the regions of the U.S. Data mining was completed from public websites for district Annual Yearly Progress reports per No Child Left Behind mandates to determine changes in student achievement.

Thus, teachers who receive coaching do have impact on positive change on student achievement. Professional development through coaching is significantly related to teacher efficacy, student achievement and teachers’ belief that coaching increases their ability to impact student achievement. The types and levels of coaching also have a significant impact. The results of the qualitative analysis
indicate that the presence of coaching, and teachers high academic optimism, have a positive effect on student achievement as determined by state testing results.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The connection between teacher effectiveness and student learning appears to be logical. It seems that a higher performing teacher would increase student learning through their tutelage. However, the direct connection between teacher effectiveness and student learning is not as direct as it may appear. Teacher effectiveness is defined by individual constituent groups, parents, administrators and community members who may hold different values, respectively, to define the essence of an effective teacher. However an effective teacher is defined, improving teacher quality is a concern of educators, community, and policy makers. Considerable pressure from the public to improve schools has led to legislation targeting schools. For example teacher effectiveness was a central tenet of the No Child Left Behind Act (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 [NCLB], 2001).

The possibility of increasing teacher effectiveness is a driving force for school reform and change. While a school can be reformed by reorganizing the structure of the day, how students are placed in classrooms, or what curriculum is used to instruct, the critical factor of school reform is that teachers spend the majority of the day with students and the teachers’ ability to positively impact student learning makes a tremendous difference (Stronge, Ward, Tucker, & Hindman, 2008). Numerous studies link teacher effectiveness to student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, & Heilig, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Peske & Haycock, 2006; Wayne & Youngs, 2003). Additionally, research indicates that lower performing students tend to be placed with less effective teachers (Stronge et al., 2008). Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997) emphasized this point saying, “the immediate
and clear implication of this finding is that seemingly more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than any other single factor” (p. 63).

Teacher coaching has been one form of professional development aimed at improving teacher pedagogy for nearly 40 years. Joyce and Showers (1980) first proposed peer coaching as in-classroom professional development that reinforces the transfer of new skills from professional development to practice. Currently coaching is used as professional development in large scale initiatives for various reasons including the development of individual teachers’ ability to meet student needs and to ensure consistent and effective implementation of large-scale teaching initiatives. There are multiple goals for coaching, often determined by the organization rather than the individual teachers.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this research was to investigate the connections between academic optimism, teacher efficacy, student achievement, and professional development through coaching. The identification of the effect of embedded, personal professional development through coaching on teachers’ academic optimism and efficacy provides insight into school change and inform current practices, which includes increased accountability for teacher evaluation. The identification of possible connections between coaching and teacher academic optimism and teacher efficacy provides insight into high quality professional development structures. These connections were analyzed against student achievement data were to understand any significance that exists between coaching, teacher self-perceptions and student achievement.
Research Questions

RQ1. Is academic optimism higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ2. Is teacher efficacy higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ3. Is student achievement higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ4. Do teacher efficacy, trust in students and parents, academic emphasis and the presence of coaching predict student achievement?

RQ5. Do different coaching experiences predict student achievement?

RQ6. Is there a difference in teacher efficacy between teachers with different levels of coaching experiences?

RQ7. Is there a difference in student achievement between teachers with different levels of coaching experiences?

RQ8. What was coaching like and why did it make a difference?

Background

The factors that determine teacher effectiveness are numerous. A meta-analysis of extant research divides the literature into four dimensions of teacher effectiveness: instructional expertise, student assessment, learning environment and personal qualities of the teacher (Stronge et al., 2008). Instructional expertise includes the expectations that the teacher has for student achievement (Wenglinsky, 2002). Student assessment includes how the teacher monitors for student learning (Janisch & Johnson, 2001). Learning environment includes the teacher’s behavioral expectations (Good & Brophy, 1997; Marzano, 2003; Pressley, Allington, Wharton-McDonald, Block, & Morrow, 2001). Personal qualities include teacher enthusiasm, motivation and attitude toward teaching.
(Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, 2003). These four dimensions coalesce together into teacher efficacy, or how teachers perceive their ability to impact student achievement and their academic optimism, which is their belief about how students will perform academically.

Limited research has been done regarding the relationships between the self-perceptions of academic optimism and teacher level efficacy of teachers with the achievement of students, or how these constructs function for teachers who have not received coaching compared to teachers who received coaching. This qualitative and quantitative study was designed to discover the relationship between teacher perceptions of academic optimism, teacher efficacy, and student achievement among teachers who receive coaching. The continued drive in public policy and local school districts to increase student achievement suggests a need for understanding how professional development impacts teacher’s belief in their teaching ability and the learning ability of their students.

In this opening chapter, background information supporting the premise of this study is introduced. The purpose in pursuing the investigation and suggested methods to conduct the study are discussed. A quantitative survey model and a qualitative focus group interview model are presented. A review of the literature indicates that a mixed method design is appropriate for this study. Additionally, a brief argument supporting the exploration of academic optimism, despite limited research that fully identifies the construct, is presented.

**Development of Academic Optimism as a Construct**

Academic optimism is a new construct in the literature, appearing within the last five years. Academic optimism refers to teachers’ beliefs in student abilities. If a teacher holds high levels of academic optimism, he or she believes that students can accomplish any learning presented to them well, regardless of
students’ background or past learning experiences. Initial research in this area suggests that teachers who have high academic optimism influence levels of student achievement when socioeconomic status and previous achievement are controlled (Beard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2010).

Academic optimism has been related to the collective efficacy of a school. Hoy, Woolfolk, and Kurz (2008) suggested that academic optimism may also be an important individual teacher characteristic. They hold this premise to be true because efficacy, trust, and academic emphasis have parallel meaning at the individual teacher level, whereas previously, the construct was only considered at the school level. This seminal study by Hoy et al. (2008) on teacher’s academic optimism tested the construct at an individual level and attempted to identify predictors of teachers’ sense of academic optimism. In a subsequent study, Beard et al. (2010) stated that, “Academic optimism is one of the few organizational characteristics of schools in the United States that influences student achievement when socioeconomic status and previous achievement are controlled” (p. 1136).

Teacher efficacy, teachers’ perception of their ability to positively impact student learning, accounts for differences in student achievement (Munoz & Chang, 2007). Therefore, it appears that professional development focused on increasing teacher efficacy would enhance teacher effectiveness. Coaching is embedded professional development and is one method for training teachers to implement instructional strategies that impact student learning. Additionally, in the last decade, coaching has become more prevalent as an improvement strategy in school reform.

Twenty-five years of research on teacher efficacy indicates that the dominant theoretical frame of exploring teacher efficacy is the psychological lens (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Rotter’s (1966) and Bandura’s
(1986, 1997) research follows this tradition. Rotter conceptualized teacher-efficacy locus of control. Locus of control is teachers’ beliefs that factors under their control have a greater impact on the results of their teaching than do factors in the environment or in the student. Bandura proposed a teacher efficacy construct based on social-cognitive theory, adding an additional expectation, outcome expectancy, to the construct (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Therefore, self-efficacy focuses on the individual’s perceived ability to produce an outcome, or the individual’s belief that he or she has the requisite skills to bring about an outcome (Dembo & Gibson, 1985). Teaching efficacy is related to the way teachers view the connection between teaching and learning (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983; Dembo & Gibson, 1985). Therefore, teacher efficacy is connected to the particular situation of teaching, not a generalized sense of efficacy which applies to any situation.

Guskey (1988) proposed linking teacher efficacy to student performance, demonstrating the need for high quality professional development of teachers to student learning outcomes. Later, teacher efficacy was examined as a connection to organizational change and effective school environments (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). This connection leads to a call for high quality professional development for teachers to ensure teacher quality. A high quality professional development program considers the process of teacher change. Two decades ago, Joyce and Showers (1988) proposed a model of professional development which positively impacted teachers’ ability to change and implement new instructional practices. Embedded, personal professional development in coaching was found to be an effective mode to deliver new instructional practices and increased the likelihood that new instructional practices would be implemented after a teacher received coaching.
As nationwide testing through the National Assessment of Educational Progress indicated lagging achievement of students in the United States behind other countries, and an unchanging achievement gap between ethnic groups, schools are increasingly expected to perform at higher levels (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Since teachers are the single factor which most influences student learning, expectations of teacher accountability is growing (Darling-Hammond, 1997, 2000; Peske & Haycock, 2006). This urgency for teacher accountability is evident in current federal legislation. In early 2010, the reauthorization of Title I was conceptualized under Race to the Top legislation, which continues the edict laid out in the No Child Left Behind Act for highly qualified teachers. Race to the Top adds an expectation for tying student achievement results to teacher evaluation (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

**Significance of the Study**

This study aimed to examine teachers’ beliefs about their practices, their beliefs about student ability, the connection of these concepts to achievement and how to effectively improve these connections through high quality professional development. Coaching was identified as a possible high quality professional development structure. The study explored if there were factors related to beliefs and perceptions unique to elementary school (second through sixth grade) teachers, using a survey and focus group interviews. The study findings are useful to inform researchers, policymakers, administrators and professional development leaders in designing effective professional development opportunities for teachers within current educational pressures to ensure effective teachers are available for the workforce.
Theoretical Framework

There are two conceptual theoretical frameworks related to the inquiry of this study: transformative and adult learning.

Transformative

The ontology of transformative methodology is that multiple realities are shaped by political, social, cultural, economic, ethnic, gender and disability values. This methodology includes an interactive link between the research and the participants, whereas the people who are the research participants are involved in the planning, analysis and use of the research. This is based upon the action research tradition. This methodology supports inclusion of diverse voices and viewpoints from minority groups within society (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2006).

The transformative paradigm emerged due to growing dissatisfaction with the dominant research paradigm, which based a majority of the sociological and psychological theory on the White, male perspective, which was not inclusive of gender, ethnic groups, or disabled populations. Sielbeck-Bowen, Brisolara, Seigart, Tischler, and Whitmore (2002) posit that knowledge and values are culturally, socially and temporally contingent. Critical self-reflection is necessary as the characteristic of the one who holds knowledge will influence the creation of knowledge. In other words, the participant interacts with the research to develop knowledge about the context, viewpoints, emotions and actions of participants.

Changes in the demographics and cultural competency of the overall population in the United States create a need for a more inclusive research paradigm (Gall et al., 2006). The Hispanic population is expected to triple between 1999 and 2030 making it the largest minority group in the United States, and the African American population is expected to rise by 70%. The changes in demographics indicate a need for race-sensitive research. Quintana, Troyano, and
Taylor (2001) suggest that researchers become aware of and apply indigenous theories to their inquiry in order to focus on culturally appropriate theories and models to inform inquiry.

The methodology of the transformative approach requires an inclusion of qualitative methods to some measure, therefore mixed methods can be used. Within the description, contextual and historical factors are described, particularly in relation to oppression, or a minority viewpoint (Gall et al., 2006). A summary of a transformative study may include the following: evaluation problem, evaluation question, method, participants, instruments and procedures, results and discussion. The key to this paradigm is the focus on the evaluation problem.

**Adult Learning**

In addition to the transformative and pragmatic paradigms, adult learning theory is a foundational theory for the methodology of the study. Adult learning, as identified by Knowles (1990), refers to motivation as that state when an adult is ready to learn things they need to know. In contrast, Wlodkowski (2008) suggested that adults needed to experience a gap in their competence in order to create a context and need for an adult to be motivated to learn. What is clear that within the opportunity to provide learning through staff development is that the focus is not on the teacher, but on the participant and his or her level of learning. Adult learning is known as andragogy, in contrast to child learning or pedagogy. Knowles (1984) explained andragogy as a set of theories around how adults learn and what motivates them to learn. Andragogy is a foundation for the consideration for different approaches to professional development and the consideration of the adult as the learner. One such approach is developing supportive, cooperative relationships to give adult learners opportunity for feedback (Wlodkowski, 2008).
Knowles (1984, 1990) considered learning along a continuum with pedagogy on one end and andragogy on the opposite end. He suggested that there is a point where instructors cease to apply pedagogical teaching methods and apply andragogical methods. While this stopping and starting point is not clear in the development of adulthood, what is clear is that adult learning theory must be considered within the research inquiry as often people automatically apply past experiences and assumptions about teaching to current situations (Conaway, 2009; Ellis, 1987). This study examines professional development, and specifically coaching, as adult learning and the theory of adult learning as a foundation for understanding the research questions and choice to employ a mixed methodology.

**Summary**

The research regarding the development of effective teachers is examined through the lens of teacher-efficacy and academic optimism. Academic optimism is a new construct appearing in the literature within the last five years. Academic optimism can be considered to include teacher efficacy, teacher trust in parents and students and academic emphasis. Teacher efficacy although identified earlier as a construct, is now considered to be part of academic optimism. Teacher efficacy is not self-efficacy or collective efficacy; it refers to the efficacy of a teacher to have impact on student learning, so while it is a personal construct, it is not related to self-esteem, or self-worth, of the individual. Teachers with strong efficacy and an optimistic outlook of student ability may have students who have higher scores on achievement tests. Additionally, high quality professional development is influenced by adult learning theory. One promising structure of adult learning is coaching where a teacher and coach work together through a cycle of planning, modeling, and conferencing.
Definitions

Academic Optimism

Individual teacher sense of academic optimism is the teacher’s beliefs that he or she can teach effectively, that their students can learn, and parents will support them so that the teacher can press hard to achieve learning, (Beard et al., 2010). For this study, academic optimism consists of teacher efficacy, teacher trust in parents and students and academic emphasis (see Figure 1 in chapter 2).

Academic Emphasis

Teacher’s positive belief that he or she can make a difference in the academic performance of his or her students through the emphasis of teaching and learning (Hoy et al., 2008).

Andragogy

A set of theories around how adults learn and what motivates them to learn.

Coaching

Process of an instructional coach working with an individual teacher to improve teacher practice; often employing a cycle of planning, modeling, observing, reflecting and conferencing.

Collective Efficacy

“Perceptions of teachers in a school that the efforts of the faculty as a whole will have a positive effect on students” (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000, p. 480).

Efficacy Expectations

Motivation is influenced by the person’s expectations about his or her ability to influence or achieve a desired outcome, directly related to the effort he or she is willing to put into working for the outcome (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008).
**Instructional Coach**

Individual that provides professional development in a one-on-one relationship utilizing a cycle of planning, modeling, observing and reflecting.

**Outcome Expectations**

Motivation is influenced by the person’s expectations about the likely consequences of a certain behavior (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008).

**Pedagogy**

A set of theories and practices around how children learn.

**Professional Development**

The process that a professional group seeks to acquire more of the characteristics concerning their profession, and the improvement in quality of service provided by an individual (Koster, Dengerink, Korthagen, & Lunenberg, 2008).

**Self-Efficacy**

“Beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations” (Bandura, 1997, p. 2)

**Social-Cognitive Theory**

Bandura’s theory of self-regulatory strategies, motivation and achievement in academic settings (Pajares, 1996).

**Teacher-Efficacy**

Teachers belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Guskey & Passaro, 1994).
Teacher Trust in Parents and Students

Teacher’s positive belief that he or she can make a difference in the academic performance of his or her students by trusting parents and students to engage in the learning process (Hoy et al., 2008).
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Student Achievement Gap and Teacher Effectiveness

During the last 20 years, United States graduation rates from high school have been stagnant, falling below the attainment of other countries. In 2000, only 69% of the U. S. high school students graduated, with a standard diploma, within four years compared to 77% in 1969 (Barton, 2005). In addition, the achievement gap in the United States between minority students and White students has fluctuated only slightly over the last two decades (Darling-Hammond, 2010). While many factors contribute to this gap, the gap is impacted by teacher qualification and quality. Teachers’ academic background, preparation for teaching, certification status and other experiences impact significantly their students’ achievement levels (Darling-Hammond, 2010). The United States has lagging educational attainment and has not responded in the same manner as other nations which were previously low attaining.

The negative effects of an ineffective teacher continue into future years lowering students’ academic achievement. Two or three ineffective teachers in a row compound the problem, resulting in significant deficits in student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2009). For example, Sanders and Rivers (1996) found that students in two different districts in Tennessee taught by effective teachers during the first 3 years finished at the 96th and 83rd percentiles on average on fifth grade math state tests. Students taught by ineffective teachers finished at the 44th and 29th percentiles, respectively. Another analysis indicates that students who receive three ineffective teachers in a row may achieve at levels
on the state test that are 50 points below students who did not have three ineffective teachers in a row (Peske & Haycock, 2006). Recent research confirms this finding. In 2007, Jordan, Mendro, and Weerasinghe (1997) completed a study comparing reading achievement percentile scales. Findings found that students who started third grade relatively in the same spot in reading achievement (60th percentile) finished sixth grade several quintiles apart (35 percentiles). Those students assigned to three effective teachers in a row finished at about the 70th percentile and those students assigned to three ineffective teachers in a row finished sixth grade reading achievement around the 40th percentile.

Teacher training and job embedded professional development can improve teachers’ abilities and subsequently increase the possibility that students will attain higher academic results. New York City’s Community School District #2, a diverse urban district composed of 22,000 students speaking collectively more than 100 languages, of which 70% were students of color and a majority were from low-income families, focused on a comprehensive approach to improving teacher quality (Elmore & Birney, 1998). During 1987 to 1997 the district achievement in reading and math rose significantly, outperforming New York state norms and New York City averages (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Elmore & Birney, 1998). The focus of the reform was on major improvements in teaching ability.

The fact that the achievement gap has remained relatively unchanged over the last two decades, and that teacher quality significantly impacts student achievement, provides a stage for professional development for teachers and preservice teachers to ensure that the highest quality and highest prepared teachers are in U.S. classrooms. Professional development is how on-the-job training is provided to teachers traditionally. The professional development of teachers in the
U. S. looks significantly different than the professional development of teachers in other countries (Darling-Hammond, 2009, 2010). U. S. teachers are often subjected to short-term training in which they receive information and some follow up support. In other countries, teachers work together for an extended period examining a lesson or student learning results based on a single lesson. Japanese lesson study is one such example. The overall results of professional development can impact teacher capacity in content knowledge as well as in their efficacy beliefs.

This chapter recounts the constructs of academic optimism and teacher efficacy. Academic optimism will be considered at the level of teacher within the school organizational framework consisting of district, school and individual teacher. Teacher efficacy, framed by social cognitive theory, will be considered as a construct related to self-efficacy. The middle of the chapter discusses the change process and the effect of adult learning theory within the change process. The end of the chapter explores professional development and covers the history of coaching as a professional development structure. The chapter builds the depth of coaching as a professional development structure which may affect teacher efficacy and academic optimism and suggests that further research in this area is warranted.

**Teacher’s Academic Optimism**

Academic optimism is a latent construct that has been related to student achievement. Up to 2007, academic optimism had been researched as a property of the school, not of the teacher (Hoy et al., 2008). The construct is made of collective efficacy, trust in parents and students, and academic emphasis (Hoy, Tarter, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2006; McGuigan & Hoy, 2006). Due to the emergence of this construct, limited literature is available examining the construct in action.
Hoy et al. (2008) set out to empirically show that academic optimism is an individual teacher characteristic. Previous to their exploratory study, academic optimism was considered only a collective measure of efficacy. Academic optimism is made of three constructs: teacher trust, academic emphasis and teachers’ sense of self-efficacy. In the past, teacher trust and academic emphasis were identified as having parallel meaning at the organization and individual level, while teacher’s sense of self-efficacy was considered only at the individual level. The purpose of their 2007 study was to test the construct of academic optimism at the individual level. They also intended to identify predictors of teachers’ sense of academic optimism.

The construct of academic optimism is grounded in the theoretical perspective of positive psychology. Positive psychology explores optimal environments (Seligman, 2002). In contrast to humanistic psychology, positive psychology relies on empirical research to understand the human condition (Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005). Seligman described a change in viewpoint of psychology from a point of what can go wrong with a person, to what can go right. This viewpoint includes a focus on optimism and explanatory style (Seligman, 2006; Seligman et al., 2005). Optimism stems from research on learned helplessness; whereas optimism is justified through expectations. Expectations are framed by an individual’s expectancy of good event or bad events occurring (Seligman et al., 2005). Optimism is the antithesis of helplessness and is a way to increase personal control (Seligman, 2006). Optimism underscores hope, responsibility, and a general positive disposition to life.

Hoy et al. (2008) conducted a study on academic optimism. Academic optimism is more specific than the general optimism of teachers. Academic optimism is the teacher’s positive belief that he or she can make a difference in the
academic performance of his or her students through the emphasis of teaching and learning, by trusting parents and students to engage in the process, and by believing in his or her own capacity to overcome difficulties, and displays resilience and perseverance (Hoy et al., 2008). Hoy et al.’s (2006) earlier research focused on academic optimism at the school level, in the attempt to conceptualize and measure teachers’ sense of academic optimism, they used the same theoretical base.

**Variables Examined**

**Optimism.** The teachers’ sense of academic optimism is comprised of three highly related concepts: teacher sense of efficacy, teachers’ trust in students and parents, and teachers’ focus on creating a positive and challenging academic environment for students (Hoy et al., 2008). In this study to test teacher academic optimism, the researchers defined multiple variables as a possible predictor of academic optimism. These included classroom context, teachers’ beliefs about classroom management and teaching, teachers’ citizenship behavior and teachers’ dispositional optimism.

**Classroom context.** The students occupying a classroom are a context in which teachers work; three characteristics of students, socio-economic status, ethnicity, and disability status were considered in the Hoy et al. (2008) study.

**Teachers’ beliefs about classroom management and teaching.** Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) conceptualized teachers’ beliefs about classroom management along a continuum with custodial beliefs anchoring one of the continuum and humanistic beliefs the other end of the continuum. Custodial teachers are defined as individuals who “view students as irresponsible and undisciplined who must be controlled through punitive sanctions” (Hoy, 2001, p. 425). In contrast, a humanistic teacher sees classrooms as a place to foster
interpersonal relationship. Humanistic teachers are defined as an individual who, “is marked by optimism, openness, flexibility, understanding, and increased students self-determination” (Hoy, 2001, p. 426).

**Student-centered teaching beliefs and practices.** Teachers’ instructional and academic choices tend to resemble their beliefs about how children learn. Humanistic teachers employ teaching strategies consistent with the creation of child-centered classrooms, which tend to be less traditional.

**Teachers’ citizenship behavior.** Citizenship behavior refers to a teacher’s willingness to “go the extra mile” to ensure students succeed. This definition refers to how a teacher uses his time and works with others. Specifically, it assumes the teacher is altruistic in behavior, courteous and committed to the value of helping others as a civic responsibility.

**Teachers’ dispositional optimism.** Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) defined optimism as a tendency to believe that one will generally experience good outcomes in life and avoid bad outcomes. Optimism as a measurable personality characteristic has been outlined through the *Life Orientation Test* (LOT) developed by Scheirer and Carver (1985). A meta-analysis of 56 studies using the LOT found that optimism significantly correlated with measures of coping and stress, and psychological systems affecting health, (Hoy et al., 2008).

**Hypothesis of Empirical Study**

Hoy et al. (2008) formed a set of seven hypotheses to explore the construct of teacher academic optimism. They believe that teachers who believe in the potential of all students, make management and instructional decisions aligned with these expectations, and are committed to the success of their students will be more academically optimistic. This recent, seminal research on academic optimism as a construct of teacher beliefs was framed by the following:
1. Teacher self-efficacy, teacher’s trust in parents and students, and teacher academic emphasis form a more general construct called academic optimism.

2. The classroom context (student socioeconomic status, number of students with accommodations, and number of students from ethnic and racial minorities) is related to academic optimism.

3. Humanistic classroom management beliefs of teachers are positively related to individual academic optimism.

4. Student-centered teaching beliefs and practices are positively related to individual academic optimism.

5. Individual citizenship behavior of the teacher is positively related to individual academic optimism.

6. Academic optimism is positively related to the general personal disposition of optimism (Hoy et al., 2008, pp. 825-826).

**Study methods.** A questionnaire using existing items from established measures was created to assess teachers’ sense of efficacy, trust in students and parents, academic emphasis, beliefs about management and teaching, individual citizenship behavior and demographic questions about teachers and classrooms. The Ohio Department of Education’s database of 2,045 schools with third and fourth grade classes was used to mine data. A random sample of 350 schools was selected, with a total of 220 schools agreeing to participate in the study. One third and fourth grade teacher was randomly selected from each school to receive the questionnaire; in all, 351 teachers received the questionnaire and a total of 205 useable questionnaires returned.

**Instrument.** The 71-item survey included sections assessing academic optimism, beliefs about instruction and management, individual citizenship, and demographics. The items assessing trust, academic emphasis and citizenship were
adapted from measure of school-level variables; items were reworded to focus on the individual teacher rather than a group. Classroom context variables were social-economic status (SES), accommodations, and racial and ethnic groups. These data were collected through teacher reports. Teachers’ sense of academic optimism is made up of teachers’ sense of self-efficacy trust in students and parents and their academic emphasis. The short form of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale, (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) was utilized. This short form consists of 12 items on a 9-point Likert scale using a continuum of 1–nothing, to 9 – a great deal. Reliabilities for the full scale in this study was .92

To measure teachers’ trust in students and parents, Hoy et al. (2008) used one subtest from the Omnibus T-Scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003), which was the faculty trust in clients subtest. The reliability for individual teacher trust in this study was .83. To measure academic emphasis, the researchers used one subtest from the Organizational Climate Index (Hoy, Sweetland, & Smith, 2002) to measure academic emphasis. The reliability of the academic measure in this study was .60. To measure teachers’ beliefs about classroom management, a 10-item form of the Pupil Control Ideology (Hoy, 2001; Willower et al., 1967) was used. This instrument measures teachers’ beliefs about management along a continuum from custodial to humanistic. The reliability of the instrument in this study was .65. Instructional beliefs and practices were assessed using the 7-item Constructivist Teaching subscale of the Teacher’s Belief Survey (Woolley, Benjamin, & Woolley, 2004), with a reliability for the scale at .72. Citizenship behavior was measured using the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005) modified to assess teacher-level beliefs. To measure personal optimism, the researchers used the Life Orientation Test (Scheier & Carver, 1985). This instrument had a reliability score of .84.
**Findings.** Hoy et al. (2008) defined a set of seven hypotheses; these hypotheses revolve around the idea that teachers who believe in the potential of all students, make decisions, both management and instructional, which align to the expectations. Additionally, they are committed to the success of their students. The method involved a questionnaire using existing items from established measures around teacher efficacy, trust in students and parents, academic emphasis, beliefs about management, citizenship behaviors and demographic questions.

Hoy et al. (2008) found five predictors of academic optimism that account for approximately two-thirds of the variance. Three variables were measured: classroom context, teacher’s sense of academic optimism, and teachers’ self-efficacy. A 71-item instrument was designed to measure the three variables and define the construct of academic optimism. To test the hypothesis that teachers’ sense of efficacy, trust in parents and students and academic emphasis from the construct of academic optimism, the teachers’ mean scores for trust, academic emphasis and teacher efficacy were analyzed. One strong factor was revealed, which the researchers labeled academic optimism. This factor accounted for 67% of the variance, and indicates that the researchers’ theory that a second-order latent construct of individual teacher academic optimism is valid.

After defining the individual construct of teacher academic optimism, predictors for academic optimism were studied. To investigate the correlation between classroom context, humanistic classroom beliefs, student centered teaching beliefs, individual citizenship to teachers’ academic optimism, a zero-order correlation was calculated. Three of the teacher beliefs and practices predictor variables were significantly related to teachers’ sense of academic optimism and two were not, where $p < .01$. Social Economic Status (SES) of
students was the only classroom context variable to have an independent effect on teachers’ academic optimism, with lower levels of SES being correlated with lower levels of teacher academic optimism, particularly in urban school settings (Hoy et al., 2008). A multiple regression analysis was completed to evaluate how well classroom context variables predicted teachers’ level of academic optimism; the findings indicate a strong correlation between the linear combination of classroom context variables and teachers’ level of academic optimism.

Beard et al. (2010) completed a pilot study to determine whether academic optimism was a viable construct at the individual level. The researchers also inquired into the makeup of the construct as teacher self-efficacy, teacher trust, and academic emphasis. Similar to the previous study by Hoy et al. (2008), they predicted individual sense of academic optimism would be a second-order latent factor. The researchers diagrammed the hypothesis as a structural model (see Figure 1). The study included two challenges, first to develop operational measures for each element of academic optimism, and secondly to improve the individual measures of two variables, trust in parents and teachers, and academic emphasis (Beard et al., 2010).

An instrument was designed to measure the two concepts of trust in students and parents and academic emphasis. Reliability and validity assessments were conducted on a sample of 72 elementary teachers in graduate school classes in Texas, Alabama and Ohio who responded to 24 items on a survey. A scale was formed with two sets of four questions that reliably measured teacher academic emphasis and teacher’s trust in parents and students. The loadings were high, above .80 (Beard et al., 2010).

The study sample included 260 elementary school teachers from 14 schools in Ohio. The sample included teachers from rural, suburban, and urban settings;
the sample selection was not random (Beard et al., 2010). The component parts of academic optimism were constructed of teacher sense of self-efficacy, teacher trust in parents and students and the academic emphasis of teachers.

To measure the component, teacher sense of self-efficacy, a short form of the *Teacher Sense of Self-Efficacy Scale* was used to measure teacher self-efficacy beliefs. The original tool, written by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) was comprised of 12 items each with a measure along a nine point continuum from 1 “nothing” to 9 “a great deal.” The higher the score indicates the higher the teacher’s sense of self-efficacy. The items formed three sub-scales for teacher sense of self-efficacy, one for instructional strategy, one for classroom management, and one for student engagement. Through an exploratory factor analysis, Beard et al. (2010) identified three items of the scale, one from each subscale, to measure teacher sense of self-efficacy, with a reliability measure of .73.

The second component, trust in parents and students, was measured using the items identified in Beard et al.’s 2010 pilot study. The pilot study tested the factor of structure and reliability of the new measure utilizing a sample of 72 elementary teachers who were enrolled in graduate classes at the University of Texas, San Antonio, University of Alabama, and the Ohio State University. The participants responded to 24 items. The items were grouped into two sets, one set to measure academic emphasis and one set to measure trust in parents and students. Four items in each set had high loadings (above .80) that formed a scale; both scales had alpha coefficient reliabilities of .87, resulting in two sets of four items measuring each construct. Trust in parents and students was measured using four Likert items, two measuring trust in parents and two measuring trust in
Figure 1. Hypothesized model of individual teacher academic optimism (Beard et al., 2010, p. 1138).
students. Participants indicated agreement with the item using a continuum of strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). The scale had an alpha coefficient of reliability of .79.

The third component, academic emphasis was measured using the other four items from the pilot study. Participants indicated agreement with the item using a continuum of strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). The scale had an alpha coefficient of reliability of .71. Table 1 outlines example items from the Beard Hoy et al. (2010) short form tool.

Two analyses confirmed the hypothesis of the study. In model I, the three first-order factors were used to define the second-order factor (see Figure 2). The first-order factors were (a) teacher’s sense of efficacy (b) trust and (c) academic emphasis; the second-order factor was academic optimism. Model II was designed to allow the items to correlate with each other. The results indicated that all of the factor loadings were significant and the goodness of fit indices were strong. The goodness of fit for model II included $\chi^2$ score of 38.118 ($p = 0.329$) with $df = 35$, not significant.

**Efficacy**

Bandura’s (1977) social cognitive theory and his construct of self-efficacy defined perceived self-efficacy as the beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute a course of action required to produce an outcome. Self-efficacy beliefs influence thought and emotions that enable individuals to expend and sustain substantial effort in the pursuit of their goals. Self-efficacy beliefs also guide the individual to persevere toward the goal in the face of adversity and rebound from setbacks. Additionally, self-efficacy beliefs guide individuals to exercise control over events that affect their lives (Bandura, 1986, 1997).
Table 1.

*Question Items from the Beard et al. (2010) Short Form Tool*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale Title</th>
<th>Item Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Emphasis</strong></td>
<td>“I ask students to explain how they get their answers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I press my students to achieve academically.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I give my students challenging work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I don’t accept shoddy work from my students.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust in Parents and Students</strong></td>
<td>“I have confidence in my students”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I can count on parent experts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I trust my students.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I trust the parents of my students.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Efficacy</strong></td>
<td>“How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-efficacy is a distinct construct from other conceptions of self, such as self-concept, self-worth and self-esteem. Specifically, self-efficacy is a judgment about the capability to complete a task, or reach a goal, that is not evaluative, but a driving force (Bandura, 1977). For example, a person may be fully aware of capabilities of drawing, knowing a second language, or cooking, and have no desire to learn about these skills with no effect on his or her self-esteem (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy is a perception of competence, not actual level of competence. This difference is important to note as people often over or under extend, or over or under inflate, their actual abilities and this estimation can result in the amount of effort they exert for goal attainment (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy is tightly coupled to a person’s estimation of their own skills and abilities and does not attribute results to luck.

Bandura (1986) proposed four sources of efficacy expectations: mastery experiences, physiological and emotional states, vicarious experiences and social persuasion. Mastery experiences are the most powerful source of efficacy reinforcement. The perception that a performance has been successful raises efficacy and this belief reinforces the amount of effort an individual will put forth in a continued cycle. This phenomenon can be a positive or negative cycle. A vicarious experience is one in which the skill is modeled by another. The closer the observer perceives him or herself to be similar to the model, the stronger the impact on efficacy. Social persuasion is a pep talk or feedback; it also contributes to increases in self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986, 1997).

Bandura (1978, 1986) defined individuals’ interpretation of results as reciprocal determinism. Reciprocal determinism postulates that personal factors, such as cognition, behavior and environment interact to create influences. These
Figure 2. Hypothesized model of individual teacher academic optimism (Beard et al., 2010, p. 1138)
influences are called *triadic reciprocality* (Bandura, 1986) (see Figure 3). Bandura stated that reflection was a unique human trait, and through this self-referent thinking people evaluate and alter their own thinking and behavior (Pajares, 1996). Efficacy affects peoples’ thought patterns and emotions. Individuals who have low self-efficacy tend to exert less effort and do not focus on specific goals.

*Figure 3. Model of Reciprocal Determinism*

**Teacher Efficacy**

Teacher efficacy is defined as “the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance” (Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977, p. 137). Guskey and Passaro (1994) defined teacher efficacy as “teachers’ beliefs or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated” (p. 628). Teacher efficacy as a construct developed 21 years ago and since has undergone transformation and identification as researchers work to further define the construct (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Teacher efficacy was conceived by the RAND researchers in 1976 with the research of Rotter’s (1966) social learning theory as a foundation for the construct
(Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). The RAND researchers sought to define the extent that teachers believed they could control reinforcement of their actions. The RAND researchers added two efficacy items to the survey. These items focused on locus of control, or whether teachers believed reasons for student achievement lay within themselves or with the environment (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

The construct of teacher efficacy was determined by summing the scores of the two additional items on the survey. This construct claimed to reveal the extent to which a teacher believed that the outcome of teaching in student motivation and learning were internally controlled by the teacher, or due to teacher actions, and not an influence outside of the teachers’ control (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). The RAND items were groundbreaking in the exploration of teacher perception regarding their ability to impact student learning.

RAND Item 1: “When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment,” (Armor et al., 1976, p. 206). This item measures collective efficacy of teacher general perceptions about teacher ability to impact student learning and motivation.

RAND Item 2: “If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students,” (Armor et al., 1976, p. 206). This teacher efficacy item measures personal teacher efficacy, as it measures the teachers’ confidence in their abilities to overcome outside factors which could make learning difficult (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

The RAND research results indicated a strong correlation between these two efficacy items to variations of reading achievement among minority students. This construct was not the only theoretical base for the construct of teacher
efficacy. Bandura’s (1977) social cognitive theory and his construct of self-efficacy is also a support for teacher efficacy.

Self-efficacy and other efficacy constructs, like teacher efficacy, have the common trait that these constructs are beliefs about one’s perceived capability (Pajares, 1996). These constructs are different because self-efficacy is defined in terms of a person’s perceived capabilities to attain a defined performance or task and then achieve defined results (Pajares, 1996; Ross & Bruce, 2007a; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). So, where teacher efficacy is the teacher’s expectation that he or she can bring about results in student learning, self-efficacy is the belief in one’s capabilities to organize and act to produce attainments (Bandura, 1977; Ross & Bruce, 2007a).

**Teacher Efficacy Connection to Bandura’s Self-Efficacy Model**

Teacher efficacy is a multidimensional construct, consisting of at least two dimensions that correspond to Bandura’s two-component self-efficacy model (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). The groundwork for this construct was laid by Brophy and Everston (1977) who studied effective teachers and the outcome of their work. In the Texas Teacher Effectiveness Study, Brophy and Everston discovered that teachers successful in producing student learning gains tended to have higher expectations for students and took personal responsibility for student learning. Furthermore, the teachers in the study viewed student learning difficulties as obstacles to overcome with appropriate teaching methods, rather than indicators that students could not learn.

Brophy and Everston’s (1977) research revealed a link between teacher behavior and student outcomes, with teachers who possess higher self-efficacy producing greater results through their teaching methodology. They did not label
this construct teacher-efficacy, and researchers were uncertain of how to measure the construct. What was revealed, however, is the suggestion of an inadequacy in the system as it is possible that students exposed to low-efficacy teachers will learn less than from high-efficacy teachers.

Gibson and Dembo (1984) were the initial researchers who worked to develop an instrument to measure teacher efficacy and provide construct validation for the variable. This early instrument was important because at the time, while teachers’ sense of self-efficacy has been identified, researchers were not certain how to conceptualize and accurately measure the construct. Gibson and Dembo analyzed responses from 208 elementary teachers from two neighboring school districts using a 30-item scale. This study led to two factors that corresponded to Bandura’s two component model of efficacy. The first factor represented the teacher’s sense of personal teaching efficacy or belief that he has the skills and abilities to influence student learning. This factor accounted for 18.2% of the total variance. This factor was indicated by items such as, “If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.” The items in the first factor reflect teachers’ personal responsibility for student learning and correspond to Bandura’s self-efficacy dimension (Dembo & Gibson, 1985).

The second factor represented the belief teachers have that they can bring about change is limited by factors external to the teacher and the classroom. These external factors include the students’ home, family background and parental influences. This factor accounted for 10.6% of the total variance (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), and is represented by items such as, “When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.” This second factor relates to Bandura’s outcome expectancy dimension.
The findings suggest a correlation that can be used to process outcomes of studies which examine the pattern of teacher assignments in elementary, junior and senior high school (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Gibson and Dembo found that observation data were in classrooms suggest that teacher efficacy may influence patterns of classroom behavior known to increase student achievement gains.

These early studies considered teacher self-efficacy, later research considered teacher self-efficacy and organizational health of schools. Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) examined the work of Gibson and Dembo (1984) more deeply and found that the first dimension of self-efficacy for teachers did not clearly correlate with Bandura’s (1986) outcome expectation. Rather, Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) suggested a differentiation exists within the construct of teaching efficacy related to teachers’ attitudes toward education. These two dimensions are general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy. General teaching efficacy refers to an individual’s beliefs that teachers, in general, can and should influence strongly student performance in spite of barriers. Personal teaching efficacy refers to a teacher’s belief that he or she has the ability to strongly influence student learning (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). Teachers’ attitudes toward education were correlated with their general teaching efficacy of purpose and the ability of teachers to accept or challenge student barriers to learning.

Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) conducted an empirical study to determine the effect of school health on teachers’ general and personal self-efficacy. The researchers hypothesized, “We expected that teachers’ sense of both personal and general teaching efficacy would be most closely related to aspects of organizational health that support the accomplishment of teaching goals and thus the meeting of instrumental needs (institutional, integrity, academic emphasis, resource support and principals influence)” (p. 361). They surveyed five teachers
from 37 elementary schools each in New Jersey from a total sample of 179 elementary teachers. The survey was a short form of the Gibson and Dembo (1984) tool, previously adapted by Woolfolk and Hoy (1990). A short form of the instrument was used consisting of five personal efficacy and five general efficacy items. The items for the short form were selected because they had the highest factor loadings in previous research. Responses to each item were along a 6-point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Alpha coefficients of reliability were .77 for personal teaching efficacy and .72 for general teaching efficacy.

Dimensions of schools’ health were assessed using the Organizational Health Inventory for elementary schools, which consisted of 39 items measuring six elements of school health (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). Participants responded to items with a 4-point Likert scale from rarely to very frequently occurs. A sample item includes “teachers are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands.” The six scales have relatively high reliability. The Alpha coefficients were as follows: institutional integrity (.86), consideration (.91), principal influence (.83), morale (.89), resource support (.87) and academic emphasis (.72). Findings were determined by a series of statistical analyses. A correlational analysis revealed that principals influence ($r = .26, p < .01$), academic emphasis ($r = .23, p < .01$), experience ($r = .17, p < .01$), and educational level ($r = .21, p < .01$) were significantly related to personal teaching efficacy. Institutional integrity ($r = .18, p < .01$), academic emphasis ($r = .16, p < .05$), and experience ($r = .21, p < .01$) predicated general teaching efficacy. Because the relationship between variables such as academic emphasis and personal teaching efficacy may be the accidental consequence of their relationships with yet another variable, such as perceived influence of the principal, a series of multiple regressions analyses was
performed to examine the independent effects of personal and organizational health variables on each dimension of sense of teacher efficacy. Findings include that principal influence, academic emphasis, and educational level had unique, significant effects on teachers’ sense of personal efficacy. The combinations of organizational health variables and personal variables produced significant multiple correlations ($R = .35$, $F(8,155) = 2.71$, $p = .01$), explaining 12% of the variance (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993).

The findings defined the differences between general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy. A sense of general teaching efficacy was predicated by institutional integrity and morale, both of these dimensions showed significant independent effects on general teaching efficacy (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). Two dimensions of organizational life predicted results in personal teacher efficacy. The analysis of the variables indicated that healthy school climate, which includes strong principal influence and academic emphasis, resulted in significance in the zero-order correlations and the beta coefficients in a regression analysis, indicating a relationship between these variables and personal teaching efficacy (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). On the other hand, personal teaching efficacy was not related to high morale. These finding suggest that teachers working in environments with supportive principals and other teachers who set high expectations have greater personal teaching efficacy.

**Domain and Context Specificity of Teacher Efficacy**

The extent of teacher’s efficaciousness with one content area compared to another content area, or with a group of students relates to the domain and context specificity of teacher efficacy (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). Due to the connection between teacher efficacy and context, self-efficacy assessments should specifically
correspond to the critical task being assessed and the domain of functioning being analyzed (Pajares, 1996). The problem with general self-efficacy instruments is that a subject must speculate on self-perceptions of competence without a specific task in mind. Therefore, judgments on self-perception instruments are general and may or may not relate to an imagined task. Likewise, it is detrimental to a study if the items are too specific, not allowing the participant to make any generalizations to other situations (Pajares, 1996). For example, an item assessing teacher efficacy might be too specific if it states, “How much can you influence student learning when teaching factor analysis in algebra.” Bandura (1986) suggested that reasonably precise self-judgments of capability matched to specific outcomes result in the greatest predictions and superior explanations of behavior.

The connection between judgments of self-perception of content specific tasks and teacher efficacy led to new directions for teacher professional development. Cantrell and Callaway (2008) sought connections between teacher efficacy, the perceptions of high and low implementers of a content literacy program, and responses to professional development. The study examined the self-perceptions of 78 teachers involved in the Content Literacy Project, a year-long professional development program designed to help secondary teachers implement content literacy in their classrooms. The professional development program included a 5-day training during the summer and follow up coaching visits (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008).

Themes emerged from this qualitative study that indicated the relationship between teacher professional development through coaching and teacher efficacy. High and low implementers were characterized by both similarities and differences between general, personal, and collective efficacy for content literacy teaching (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). High implementers exhibited a higher sense
of general efficacy than low implementers. Themes in the responses of high implementers indicate that they have a belief in the responsibility and potential to influence student learning no matter what difficulties are posed by student backgrounds and home influences. Cantrell and Callaway (2008) stated with conviction that “high implementers strongly expressed their beliefs about the potential of the teacher to address students’ needs and to overcome any barriers inherent in students’ background experiences” (p. 1744). Additionally, high implementers were characterized by persistence that helped them work through the barriers of learning to implement new teaching techniques in content literacy. Seven of the 16 teachers interviewed reported experiencing failure with content literacy strategies initially, but continuing in spite of the initial experiences, low implementers were not as successful working through barriers. Low implementers did not report that colleagues were a resource to help them with implementation barriers.

**Collective Teacher Efficacy**

Collective teacher efficacy is defined as the “perceptions of teachers in a school that the efforts of faculty as a whole will have a positive effect on students” (Goddard et al., 2000, p. 480). Collective efficacy has emerged as a construct to conceptualize teachers’ beliefs about the effectiveness of their schools (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008). Goddard et al. (2000) identified two key elements in the development of collective teacher efficacy; one element being the analysis of the teaching task and the other being the assessment of teaching competence. They argued that school staffs with high collective teacher efficacy are more likely to accept challenging goals, exert high levels of organizational effort and persist with students to produce higher levels of student achievement (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008). Likewise, teachers with low levels of collective efficacy are less likely to
put forth effort, more likely to give up and might achieve lower levels of student proficiency.

Cantrell and Hughes (2008) examined the impact of professional development on middle and high school content area teachers’ personal, general, and collective efficacy. The professional development was defined as coaching; follow-up meetings and teacher collaboration focused on content literacy implementation. A mixed-method design was implemented and included a survey, classroom observations and teacher interviews.

A 65-item survey was administered to 22 sixth- through ninth-grade teachers in a district in southeast United States (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008). The survey items included questions from teacher efficacy instruments developed by Woolfolk and Hoy (1990), Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) and Gibson and Dembo (1984). Additionally, this survey included 12 items from a collective teacher efficacy survey developed by Goddard (2002). All items were measured with a 6-point Likert format, ranging from “1” equals strongly agree to “6” equals strongly disagree. All of the survey items from the Woolfolk and Hoy (1990), Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) and Gibson and Dembo (1984) instruments had shown high reliability and validity (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008). The Goddard survey was not modified, Goddard reported a reliability of the short form at (alpha) = .94. Items modified were changed to reflect the content area of the project so that the questions would closely correlate to the type of modifications implemented. For example, an item was changed from “The amount a student can learn is primarily related to family background,” to “The amount a student can read is primarily related to family background” (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008). The survey assessed three domains of efficacy for literacy instruction: general teaching efficacy, personal teaching efficacy and collective teaching efficacy. An observation
protocol focused on three facets of content literacy approach as described in the Global Content Literacy Classroom implementation construct (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008).

Mean teacher gains in ratings for each efficacy scale from the pre to the post surveys included .49 as the largest gain, indicating that after engaging in professional development teachers exhibited an increased sense of their abilities to positively impact student literacy (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008). Small gains in collective efficacy (.29) and general efficacy (.20) indicate that teachers exhibited a belief that they could positively impact student learning in a general sense, and as a collective group (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008). The qualitative and quantitative results indicated that the impact of professional development, which included coaching, had positive impact on collective efficacy, an important point since links exist between collective efficacy and student achievement (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008).

**Teacher Self-Efficacy and Professional Development Formats**

Cantrell and Hughes (2008) showed the link between professional development and three constructs of efficacy, personal, general and collective. They identified professional development as including coaching, which was reinforced by research on effective professional development (Joyce & Showers, 1982, 1988; Ross, 1992). Another way of considering the construct of teacher efficacy is determining whether a type of professional development yields greater gains than others. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) examined the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and formats of professional development. They examined four different workshop formats to understand which format was related to increased teacher self-efficacy.
Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) postulated that it is important for researchers and school leaders to understand teachers’ self-efficacy due to the role self-efficacy plays in teachers’ implementation of new teaching methods and strategies. The majority of teacher change initiatives fail due to a lack of focus on teacher motivation and an understanding of change processes (Argyris & Schön, 1974; Guskey, 1986, 1998; Sarason, 1990). Teacher self-efficacy was found to be one of the most powerful influences on receptivity to change (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). They completed a quasi-experimental quantitative study examining the role of the format of professional development in increasing teacher self-efficacy and the implementation of a new teaching strategy.

Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) differentiated teacher training into four formats: information; information plus modeling; information and modeling plus practice; and information, modeling, and practice plus coaching. They surveyed 93 primary (K-2) and resource teachers from five different school districts and administered a pre and post survey in conjunction with the treatment of professional development. The instruments used included the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), a literacy instruction adaptation of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004), and a measure of implementation utilizing the Tucker Signing Strategies for Reading instruction. The researchers expected an increase in self-efficacy from treatment 1 to treatment 4 due to the additive approach of the treatment. A repeated measure ANOVA was conducted and revealed increases of teacher self-efficacy over time ($F(3, 89) = 33.42, p < .01$); however, the results for the treatment effect were not significant. While there was no significance for treatment, there was significance for time ($F(3, 89) = 19.69, p < .01$) and significant interaction between time and treatment, the research question of
interest \((F(3, 89) = 6.49, p < .01)\) (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). An interesting trend identified by the authors, is that while the teacher self-efficacy for reading instruction was homogenous at the beginning, treatment 1 and treatment 4 showed gains and the treatment 2 and treatment 3 remained unchanged, as differential rate of change over differential times. The results indicated that verbal persuasion, vicarious experiences and limited mastery experiences are not powerful when delivered in large group settings and support the point that authentic task-specific mastery experiences and the individualization of verbal persuasion is raising teacher self-efficacy beliefs and implementation of a new teaching strategy (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Overall, the results indicated the complexity in raising teacher self-efficacy.

**Change Process**

Several change process models exist in the literature. All models described the changes that people go through as they move from one state to another. Generally, these stages include pre-contemplation, action of change, and maintenance. Three specific models are the transitional approach to change, stages of change, and the Concerns Based Adoption Model (Amado & Amato, 2001a, 2001b; Hord & Hall, 2005).

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (C-BAM) is a useful tool for understanding the steps that teachers go through as they face change in schools and classrooms (Elish-Piper, L’Allier, & Zwart, 2008). Professional development can address the concerns teachers at any level of change experience; this would be a focus for peer coaches. The stages of concern are listed in Table 2.

Review is a necessary component in transitional change and helps individuals identify what occurred during practice, and how to improve actions (Amado & Sharpe, 2001). Review occurs as part of coaching practice when the
coach and teacher debrief a lesson together. Action is the most difficult step of change and occurs within individual change and organizational change. Action is required within the accelerated rate of change in today’s educational field. However, people within organizations, specifically teachers implementing expected reforms shy away from action as with action people become more exposed and vulnerable as they seek greater understanding of best practice (Bridger, 2001).

A greater need for collaboration and consultation are needed for teachers to improve practice. Organizational development theorists recognize that an increase on consultation and collaboration help people manage internal and external complexity with greater independence (Bridger, 2001). While independence of application of skills and knowledge is the outcome, it comes through collaboration. That is why individuals feel exposed and vulnerable during the change process and at times avoid the collaborative relationship. Bridger (2001) describes this phenomenon as,

Just when the need has become greater for collaboration and interdependence, the contradictory tendency to fall back on familiar competencies and structures has asserted itself. This paradox is a more complex issue than just resistance to change. Dealing with it involves acquiring a capability for recognizing and relinquishing valued but outmoded forms of working, while at the same time using insight to face tendencies toward rivalry and envy accompany a greater emphasis on interdependence. (pp. 156-157)

Change does not always end with happier or more fulfilled individuals, but rather individuals work in new and different ways in response to their environments (Ambrose, 2001; Bridger, 2001). This is the goal with instructional coaching, for teachers to guide teachers through a process of learning new instructional strategies and approaches to ensure student learning despite the complexities of student learning abilities and backgrounds.
Table 2.  
*Concerns-Based Adoption Model Descriptions by Stage (C-BAM)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Concern</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Teacher Questions that Coaching Can Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>The teacher knows nothing about the change to be implemented</td>
<td>“What is it?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>The teacher gathers information about the change.</td>
<td>“How does it work?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>The teacher wonders how the change will affect his or her teaching and personal and professional situation.</td>
<td>“How will this affect me?” “Will I be able to do this?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>The teacher is concerned about practical aspects of implementing the change.</td>
<td>“How will I fit it into my teaching or classroom?” “How will I manage the materials and classroom to implement the change?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>The teacher considers the effect of the change on students.</td>
<td>“Is it worth it?” “Is it working for my students?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>The teacher makes modifications to the change and shares ideas with others.</td>
<td>“It’s working, but how are others implementing the change?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refocusing</td>
<td>The teacher is satisfied with the change and begins to consider other problems and issues.</td>
<td>“Is there something else that is better?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Elish-Piper et al., 2008; Hord & Hall, 2005).
Organizational change is the institutionalization of new meanings (Amado & Amato, 2001a). School districts that implement instructional coaching as a construct of improving teacher ability to deliver high quality instruction are focused on organizational change as the outcome is improved practice. This in turn effects the organizational culture and in essence and the way of doing business. These day to day routines are examined by researchers. Definitions of change are grounded in the work of anthropologists. Geertz (1973) identified culture as “the fabrics of meaning out of which human beings interpret their experience and guide their action” (p. 42). Amado and Amato (2001a) described change as follows, “Organizational change is viewed as a process by which new meanings emerge, giving rise to a reinterpretation of past experiences and a reorientation of action, whereby repetitive actions are interrupted” (p. 74). Changing repetitive action occurs during the coaching process. Teachers work with other teachers to reinterpret instructional practices, take new actions, reflect on the action and then work toward maintaining new routines that increase student learning.

Levy (1986) conceived organizational change as a model with two change order categories. Change at earlier stages fall into the first order change category (Amado & Amato, 2001b). First order change includes change that is reversible and does not take concentrated effort for individuals to change beliefs or add knowledge to existing schema that is too different than current knowledge (Amado & Amato, 2001b). An example is learning to drive a car. Second order change is change that is irreversible (Levy, 1986). This type of change lead to substantive changes that effect individual’s knowledge base and practices. An example is when a person adopts and permanently retains a new health regime in response to an illness.
The discipline of psychotherapy has led to an understanding regarding how individuals approach change and maintain new behavior. The concept emerged during research that Prochaska and DiClemente (1982) conducted investigating the processes that individuals use to change unwanted behavior. Prochaska and DiClemente studied smokers and the stages they went through during smoking cessation therapy. The subjects identified four stages of change they experienced. The first stage identified by the subjects was thinking of stopping smoking. The second stage was becoming determined to stop. The third stage they identified as actively modifying behavior. The fourth stage subjects identified as maintenance and no longer smoking (DiClemente & Prochaska, 1982; Prochaska & DiClemente, 1982). While the literature did not identify the method for this research, it did state that the study was empirical and the identification of stages emerged from the subjects. Prior to Prochaska and DiClemente’s research, stages of change had not been identified in any therapy (Prochaska & Norcross, 2007).

The stages of change through which people progress are precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance (Prochaska & Norcross, 1994, 2003). According to Prochaska and Norcross (1994) the five stages of change are described as follows; During the stage of precontemplation, an individual has no intention of changing problem behavior. The person is unaware of a problem. At the contemplation stage, an individual is aware that a problem exists and is considering taking action to change the problem. During the preparation stage, an individual takes action and has some small successes with his or her actions. Individuals at this stage are trying out the change, and are not fully engaged (DiClemente et al., 1991). For example, DiClemente’s (1981) study of smokers revealed that people at this stage might smoke fewer cigarettes per day, but have not yet tried to stop smoking. When individuals are engaged in the action
stage, they modify their behavior and experiences to change and work to overcome their issue or problem. When an individual makes a change, he or she hopefully enters the maintenance stage. This stage involves maintaining the new state where unwanted behaviors are replaced with new behaviors. This stage lasts indefinitely.

Two additional levels were subsequently identified as processes within these five stages. These additional levels are titled recycling and termination. Recycling occurs when individuals return to previous stages if initial change effort is not successful (Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). Termination is the name of the process beyond the stages of change. Termination occurs when new behaviors and/or thoughts are completely integrated into a person’s repertoire.

Prochaska and DiClemente (1982) indicated that the stages of change are evident in subjects undergoing therapy, and people not undergoing therapy, but motivated by self-change. Andragogy holds that choice as self-directed study is an important part of adult learning; therefore it is feasible that Prochaska and DiClemente’s identification of stages of change apply to individuals working to change their own behavior. DiClemente (1981) identified the only variable that related to long-term success was the level of self-efficacy the individual possessed when he or she stopped smoking. Levels of self-efficacy were indicators of relapse within the first five months of quitting smoking. Individuals were more likely to resist relapse dependent on how they saw themselves able to deal with internal and external pressures to smoke (DiClemente, 1981). These findings suggest that successful change efforts involve the restructuring of peoples’ behavior and thoughts about one’s self (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1982).

Prochaska and Norcross (2007) argued through the theory of Stages of Change, that individuals can move several times between stages, and new
behaviors and thoughts are not part of the person’s repertoire and daily living until the person no longer regresses to other stages and the behavior is permanently part of who the person is. Prochaska and Norcross’s (2007) argument relates to Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy theory in that people develop in a cyclical fashion, rather than a linear progression.

**Change Initiatives and Stage Distributions**

Van de Ven and Poole (1995) stated that organizational change theories, not as fully developed as other disciplines such as psychotherapy and sociology, draw heavily upon research from other disciplines (Prochaska, Prochaska, & Levesque, 2001). Clarifying the connection between the organizational change and development, and the study of individuals’ change and development gives insight to organization change initiatives. Stage distribution studies across a range of behaviors found that 40% of pre-action subjects are in the Pre-Contemplation stage, and only 20% of the population of subjects were in the Contemplation stage (Prochaska et al., 2001). As Prochaska et al. (2001) described, if only 20% of an organization’s population is contemplating change, then it is clear as to why most organizational reform fails.

**Adult Learning**

Adults have a tendency to resist new learning as adding new information to thought structures and patterns can be threatening to the comfort level of adults. Argyris (1976) discussed single and double loop learning. Single-loop learning is learning that matches prior experiences and knowledge and is not difficult for a person to accommodate. Double-loop learning requires the learner significantly change schema and challenges knowledge developed from past experiences (Argyris, 1976). Schön (1987) refers to familiar experiences and information as
knowledge in action. This is knowledge that an individual is able to perform without significant learning on a daily basis, for example driving a car. Learning that requires significant change in schema development is titled reflection in action. This process is the action taken when existing schema is no longer adequate to accommodate new learning. Reflection guides the adult learner through the change process to develop new understandings and knowledge.

Key principles of adult education include focusing on the change process and grounding the work of coaches in adult learning theory (McKenna & Walpole, 2008). Adult learning theory takes into consideration the learning needs of participants, both coaches and coached teachers (McKenna & Walpole, 2008; Showers, 1984). Understanding and applying the theories of adult learning within the context of change increases the probability that training and coaching will meet the needs of participants and have an effect on their attitudes and ability to implement new practices.

Trotter (2006) examined adult learning theories and impact on professional development programs through a review of research. Trotter concluded that three themes appear in the literature: the influence of past experience, the importance of input and choice, and the importance of reflection and inquiry. High quality professional development would include these three themes. This requires some examination of individuals responsible for designing adult learning sessions to ensure that respect, input and reflection are part of learning experiences for adults (McKenna & Walpole, 2008). These themes are apparent in the principles of adult learning identified by Terehoff (2002). Effective professional development requires that these seven principles be embedded in the training situation: environment set up for adult learning, involving participants in mutual planning, attending to participants’ needs and interests, involving the participants in
designing the program goals and objectives, involving participants in the program design, implementation and evaluation (McKenna & Walpole, 2008; Terehoff, 2002).

These seven principles take into consideration the characteristics of adult learners. Effective professional development for adults is not subject focused, but rather, problem or performance focused (Terehoff, 2002). Adults need to know why they are learning something and be treated by others as capable of self-direction. Adults have a depth of experiences which are resources to tap in training, and their readiness to learn is a function of social performance, whereas children have limited life experiences and their readiness to learn is a function of biological development and school pressure. Adults have also developed a deeper sense of internal locus of control than children.

**Andragogy**

Knowles (1984) described adult learning as andragogy theory. The pedagogical model is a traditional model and one that most adults have experience from their childhood learning experiences. The andragogical model emerged in the 1960’s and focused on unifying action around a theory of adult learning in that it heightened awareness of distinguishing learning environments for adults different than that for children (Knowles, 1984). Andragogical assumptions include regarding the concept of the learner as self-directing, assumes that adults enter the learning experience with a greater volume of past learning and different quality of experience than children. The andragogical model assumes that adults become ready to learn when they experience a need to know or do something to perform more effectively in some part of their lives. Any life change can be a source of readiness for learning such as the birth of a child, loss of job or divorce. Readiness for learning can also be prompted by exposing an adult to more effective role
models, and providing diagnostic experiences that assess knowledge gaps between their current state and desired goals (Knowles, 1984).

Adults are motivated to learn after they experience a need in their life; most often, they don’t learn for the sake of learning, but to accomplish some task or solve a problem. Adults need to know what they are learning and the importance of the learning. Lastly, the andragogical model indicates that potent motivators for adult learning are internal, including self-actualization, self-esteem, and better quality of life (Knowles, 1984). Herzberg’s (1966) and Maslow’s (1970) theories of human needs support this focus on internal, human need versus external motivators like a promotion or salary increase.

In contrast to the pedagogical model where content is the basis for the format of instruction, in the andragogical model, process is the design underlying the format for instruction (Knowles, 1984). The andragogical model assumes that there are many sources of information affecting adult learning including peers, field resources and multi-media sources.

Various studies have confirmed the effects of the andragogical model in schools for the professional development of teachers. Ellis (1987) proposed four hypotheses regarding teacher professional development and theory of action of the school principal related to embedded andragogy in the day-to-day supervisory activities. Three of the hypotheses were confirmed. The first hypothesis, directly connected to teacher professional development, stated that, “Teachers with high needs for growth and achievement will respond more positively to enriched jobs, will see more meaning in their jobs, and will assume more responsibility for their jobs than will teachers with low growth needs” (p. 115). The second hypothesis stated, “That the presence of core dimensions of job design will result in greater internal motivation, greater productivity and less absenteeism and turn over on the
part of teachers” (p. 115). The third hypothesis, also confirmed, stated, “that supervisors who are perceived to use an andragogical model of supervision will be perceived as allowing for a higher degree of presence of the core job dimensions than are supervisors who are not perceived to use andragogical models” (p. 115). The fourth hypothesis was not confirmed. It stated “that supervisors who are perceived to use an andragogical model of supervision will have on their staffs teachers with higher needs for growth and support than will supervisors who are not perceived that way” (p.115).

The study conducted by Ellis (1987) included a sample size of 207 teachers from one county in Connecticut. The survey was the Job Diagnostic Survey which is a nationally normed survey. The scores produced a Mean Potential Score (MPS). The participants’ MPS was compared to the mean scores of the norm group. Significant differences were found, indicating that teachers with high growth and achievement needs see greater meaning in their jobs and assume greater responsibility for their jobs than do teachers with low growth and achievement needs ($F(1, 130) = 7.26$). A significant difference ($F(1, 136) = 29.75$) was found indicating that those who perceive the presence of core dimensions of job design are more internally motivated to perform well on the job than those who do not perceive the presence of core dimensions. The MPS was also used to determine the perceived presence of core job characteristics. Teachers who perceive their supervisors to use andragogical behaviors perceive a greater degree of presence of the core job dimensions than teachers who do not perceive their supervisor as employing an andragogical model ($F(1, 133) = 69.96$).

James (2007) explored two models of staff development in South Carolina to see if andragogical models were incorporated in the design and implementation of the model. Furthermore, James checked for the existence of significant
differences between teachers’ and staff developers’ views of the relevance of selected components of andragogy, and determined the existence of significant differences between teachers’ and staff development directors’ perceptions of the use of selected components of andragogy in current staff development programs in South Carolina. The sample consisted of 185 participants, 85 staff developers and 100 teachers from three different districts. The survey included six categories of andragogy with four questions for each of the six categories. Questions were answered on a Likert scale from 5- Strongly agree to 1- Strongly disagree. Analyses of t-tests were conducted. One finding indicated that teachers and staff development directors agreed with the researchers who asserted that adults must be involved in the learning process and must see a need to learn new material, and see benefits from learning the new material. The results also indicated that teachers did not believe that andragogical components were applied in the design of staff development.

Bentley Stallworth (2009) conducted a qualitative study, seeking through case study, to identify embedded principles of andragogy used in staff development models. Additionally, the study sought to identify the professional development activities that improved their performance as a professional learning community. Two schools were selected for the case study. The population chosen for the sample was engaged in a mandated project based on a federal mandate from a settlement in Special Education to ensure that the schools engage in professional development activities. The study revealed that professional development at the two schools resulted in the formation of a professional learning community which embraced the seven assumptions of the andragogical model.

Conaway (2009) investigated which adult age group was most accepting of andragogy principles so that more effective teaching may occur. The adult age
groups were studied: emerging adults (18-25), young adults (26-39) and mature adults (40-59). A cross-sectional quantitative design used a computer based Likert scale to assess a convenience sample of 59 students in college courses. A MANOVA, ANOVA and regression analyses were conducted to examine differences between the three age groups, andragogical principles and course satisfaction. While no differences existed between age groups and andragogical principles or course satisfaction, significance was found when age was combined with acceptance of andragogical principles. The study determined that age and acceptance were predictive of course satisfaction, indicating that andragogical principles should be used in professional development programs of all adult age groups.

**Professional Development and Organizational Change**

Any change effort within an organization should be understood in the context of the system it affects. Increased participation in the change process has been connected to post-change effort maintenance of implementation. Szabla (2007) explored employee perceptions of change strategies; he hypothesized those individuals who perceived the change strategy as a power-coercive strategy will have lower response to change than those who perceive the change strategy as rationale. In other words, employees perceiving a change as power-coercive will not implement the new actions or behaviors outlined in the change strategy. Szabla (2007) used two scales to determine employee perceptions. One scale was the Perception of Change Leadership Strategy Scale, which was developed to measure employee perception of the motivation for the change strategy. An item example of determining a rational-empirical change leadership strategy is “To get employees to change, those leading the change are using logical arguments and
factual evidence to carry out this change” (Szabla, 2007, p. 539). This item is in contrast to the power-coercive change leadership strategy items, “To get employees to change, those leading this change are using their positions of power and using threats to implement the change” (Szabla, 2007, p. 539). Another approach to employee perception of change is the normative-reeducative change leadership strategy. An item measuring this strategy focuses on employee beliefs and perceptions: “Those leading this change are spending a lot of time dealing with how the change is being accepted by employees” (Szabla, 2007 p. 72). Szabla (2007) conducted a MANOVA to determine the effect of the three change strategies. Findings indicated that resistance to organizational change is complex and multifaceted, one clear finding was that employees who held the most positive beliefs about normative-reeducative change approach experienced the most positive emotions connected to change and had highest intentions to support the change.

Often, change initiatives fail due to employee resistance (Deloitte & Touche, 1996). Often failure occurs because organizations and the leaders of organizations do not understand the change processes (Kee & Newcomer, 2008). Overlooking the focus of the strategy, or understanding the context of the employee in the organization can hinder the change effort. Most change is implemented through some type of employee development program (Argyris & Schön, 1974).

**Professional Development, Teacher Efficacy and Student Achievement**

Potential links between teacher efficacy and student achievement exist and indicate a needed emphasis on improving teacher efficacy as a means of school improvement (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Dembo & Gibson, 1985; Ross, 1992).
Sustained professional learning opportunities that are collaborative and classroom embedded support effective models of teacher learning which leads to student achievement gains as related to an increase in teacher quality (Bruce, Esmonde, Ross, Dookie, & Beatty, 2010). An empirical study by Bruce et al. (2010) suggested that teachers engaged in deepening their learning and applying it effectively to the classroom on an ongoing basis were able to maximize their learning from sustained professional development. The mixed method study used a convergence model of triangulation with qualitative and quantitative data. A small sample consisted of two contrasting districts in Canada; one district had a history of high student achievement in mathematics, the other did not. Pre and post teacher surveys were compared to student achievement results in mathematics. One theory that arose from this study was that because of the sustained, reflective, and questioning nature of the teacher professional learning community in one district, the teachers had a more accurate understanding of their estimation of what was possible in student achievement. Additionally, the group of teachers with higher teacher efficacy results had higher student achievement results on the pretest of mathematical knowledge.

Smith and Rowley (2005) found that teachers are more likely to participate in professional development in schools with more collaborative environments. Therefore, it appears likely that teachers are more willing to invest in their learning if they experience the professionalism that an organizational commitment requires (Smith & Rowley, 2005). Current legislation like No Child Left Behind is based on a control strategy; it employs an external assessment based on externally established criterion. While the NCLB strategy produces increases in student achievement, the long-term effect on teacher commitment is not clear. The Smith and Rowley study examined several variables and the interaction between
variables. These were teacher turnover, participation in professional development content activities, teacher control over classroom practice, teacher influence over school policy, teacher’s level of influence compared to others in the organization, collaborative instructional environments, administrative support and the social climate of the school. Coaching is a collaborative strategy involving constructs identified by Bandura (1977). Bandura postulated four sources of efficacy expectations including mastery experiences, vicarious experiences (modeling), physiological and emotional states, and social persuasion (pep-talks).

Professional development focused on improving student learning outcomes by changing teachers’ attitudes and beliefs of exemplary instructional practices appears to create success in student intervention programs. Zakierski and Siegel (2010) conducted a case study of one school in New York where they trained staff in exemplary teaching practices. Several programmatic changes were made including an expansion of the literacy block, increased student access to reading materials and sustained professional development through weekly grade level meetings focused on data and coaching for teachers from the reading specialist. The results of the case study were promising and revealed that it is necessary for teachers to receive specific training in content areas and receive support they need to guide their own learning to impact student achievement (Zakierski & Siegel, 2010).

Shidler (2009) investigated the effects of a three year coaching model for teacher efficacy on student achievement. The first year of the coaching model, which was focused on coaching for instructional efficacy in specific teaching methods and content, included coaching from theory to practice and resulted in significant correlations. Year two and three of the coaching model, which was less specific in focus did not show significant correlations. Participants were 360
preschool children enrolled in 12 classrooms, a coach was assigned to each classroom to help the teachers implement a specific literacy program. Students were assessed using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III and an alphabet letter recognition assessment. For each year of the study, ranks were implemented for the hours coaches spent in the classroom and the student outcomes in gain scores and letter identification scores. A hierarchical linear model was used for the regression analysis to determine the effects of the two mitigating variables: time and mean scores of student growth. The lack of significance in year two and three suggests a need for specificity in coaching models when connecting coaching effects on teacher efficacy and student achievement.

**Professional Development and Teacher Commitment**

Research suggests that high teacher efficacy is correlated with higher student learning outcomes, and teachers will commit to professional development if the setting is more collaborative than controlling. Currently, No Child Left Behind has created an atmosphere of accountability and control in schools which could negatively impact teacher commitment to professional development (Smith & Rowley, 2005). In an investigation of this idea, Smith and Rowley found a zero sum impact of control or commitment strategies on professional development for teachers. The study also suggested that developing teacher commitment to professional development does not affect the amount of professional development they participate in, but does affect the teacher retention rate. Teachers working in schools with a stronger commitment strategy, over a control strategy, implementing school reform have higher retention rates and greater stability in staff. The method included a three-level hierarchical linear model to predict teachers’ level of participation in four different professional development
activities. The three levels related to the amount of teacher control in the school. Data for the study came from the National Center for Educational Statistics’ nationally representative School and Staffing Survey (SASS) and its supplement, the Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS). The data bank used for this study was the 1999-2000 SASS public school survey linked with data from the 2000-2001 TFS; the 1999-2000 data bank was composed of 52,000 elementary and secondary teachers (Scherff & Hahs-Vaughn, 2008). Teacher efficacy was first identified as a construct by two Rand Corporation evaluation studies (Dembo & Gibson, 1985).

**Professional development and teacher change.** Teacher change can be supported through belief development (Belcastro, 2009). Change efforts should be a logical outcome of professional development programs, and change efforts often focus on changing teacher beliefs. A modification of beliefs comes from a compelling reason for change (Guskey, 2002), which can include the challenge of beliefs. Authentic change occurs when beliefs are challenged and found lacking to aid student learning (Guskey, 2002). Koster et al. (2008) explored change in teacher cognition and behavior through a qualitative study examining teacher attitudes and beliefs after change had been implemented through professional development. Through the examination of teacher portfolios, they found that professional development activities contributed to the personal development of participants. While this was a small study with only 25 participants, the findings suggest that professional development may affect teacher belief.

The three major goals of professional development programs are change in teacher classroom practices, in their attitudes and beliefs and in the learning outcomes of students (Guskey, 1982, 2002). The relationship of these outcomes is complex and multiple factors can hinder the change process (Fullan, 1993). The order of outcomes can affect the magnitude of the change process and affect the
effectiveness of the process. It is important that a change in practice precede a change in teachers’ attitudes and beliefs as the behavior change causes the attitude and belief change. Guskey (2002) suggested that the order of change in a model of teacher change is critical. Professional development comes before changes in teacher practices, which results in student learning outcomes, and lastly, a change in teachers’ beliefs and attitudes. A change model cannot focus on changing teachers’ attitudes and beliefs first, but rather, must give teachers new experiences to develop changed attitudes and beliefs (Fullan, 1993; Guskey, 2002).

Guskey (1986, 2002) suggested that most professional development opportunities try to erroneously change teacher beliefs about a program or teaching practice and then expect commitment. However, teacher attitudes and beliefs are largely formed by experiences they have in their classrooms (Guskey, 1986). Crandall (1983) found that teachers became committed to new practices after they had engaged in using the new strategies in their classrooms. Another study which revealed the connection between teacher commitment and change was a large scale professional development project that focused on mastery learning (Guskey, 2002). The teachers who attended the training fell into three groups after the training was complete. There was a group of teachers who implemented the new practices and saw results, others who implemented but didn’t see results and another group that did not implement at all.

Guskey (2002) examined the relationship between teacher expectations for student performance and student achievement outcomes. In this study, 44 intermediate and high school teachers from two school systems volunteered to participate in a professional development session. The teachers were taught the mastery learning format. Three weeks after returning to class from the training teachers were asked to complete a survey on student potential. The degree of
change in instructional effectiveness was determined through two constructs: comparing mastery and control classes and examining two outcome measures. Correlations were calculated between teachers’ initial ratings of students, students’ course grades, students’ course examination scores and teachers’ final rating of students. Ratings between the ‘no-change’ group remained unchanged from the beginning to the end of the term for students in both of the teachers’ mastery classes \((r = .92)\), and their control classes \((r = .90)\). There was a statistical decline in the consistency of their ratings of students in the mastery classes \((r = .53)\), suggesting that the correlations between these measures were consistently high in the mastery classes and control classes of teachers in the ‘positive-change’ group, and comparisons of the mastery classes of the positive change group were significantly lower. Results indicated that as students are provided time and instruction appropriate to their learning, the correlation between students’ attitude before instruction and their achievement after instruction should be zero. The greatest reductions in correlations should be seen in classrooms where instructional techniques had been most successfully implemented (Guskey, 2002).

**Theory of Teacher Change**

Teacher efficacy is a self perception and not an objective measure of teacher effectiveness (Ross & Bruce, 2007a). Ross and Bruce (2007b) created a theory of teacher change after a qualitative study on how a Grade 8 teacher experienced professional development and how this professional experience affected sources of efficacy information. The core of the model (Figure 4) is the teacher self-assessment which includes observation, judgment and reaction. Teachers self-assess through observing their effect on student achievement, make a judgment about how well they reached their goals and reflect on their level of satisfaction (Ross & Bruce, 2007a). This model suggests that peer input and
change agent input (professional development providers) provide information to teachers about their work, which informs their self-efficacy and satisfaction with reaching goals.

Ross and Bruce (2007a) conducted empirical research to measure professional development (PD) effects on teacher efficacy. In this study, Ross and Bruce focused on a guiding research question: “Will Grade 6 teacher PD that explicitly addressed teachers’ sources of efficacy information increase teacher efficacy beliefs?” (p. 53). The three research questions explored whether professional development would increase teacher-efficacy beliefs about their ability to engage students, to implement appropriate teaching strategies, and student management (Ross & Bruce, 2007a). The method was a randomized field trial involving all elementary schools in a single district in Canada. The dependent variable was teacher efficacy and the independent variable was the professional development. Teacher efficacy was measured using the 12 items from Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) which was adapted for mathematics instruction. Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 being a low score and 5 being a high score. Additionally, other measures were given to assess the equivalency of the groups. Standards based mathematical teaching was measured with 20 items on a Likert scale. Student achievement assessment data were gathered from Grade 6 mandated assessments and correlated to the teacher standards based items and the teacher efficacy items.

Treatment consisted of one full day of professional development followed by three 2-hour workshops delivered after school. The professional development added to the four sources of efficacy constructs described by Bandura (1997): mastery experience, vicarious experience, social persuasion and physiological and
Figure 4. Model of teacher self-assessment as a mechanism for teacher change. (Ross & Bruce, 2007a, p. 12).
affective states. To determine differences, a MANOVA was conducted. The dependent variables were the posttest scores on three teacher efficacy variables, the covariates were the pretest scores on the same variables. The independent variable was the professional development. Large covariant effects existed for each of the dependent variables. Significant univariate effect existed for the treatment on the teacher efficacy variable of classroom management, which accounted for 5.7% of the total variance (Ross & Bruce, 2007a). This study provided additional support for Ross and Bruce’s theory of teacher change in that two strategies designed to increase teacher opportunities for mastery experiences were significant in classroom management, and emphasized that student knowledge development is the prime criterion for assessing teacher success.

Ross and Bruce’s (2007a) findings are significant because the finding adds to the body of knowledge on how teacher efficacy is a powerful predictor of teacher outcomes and student achievement. For example, teachers with higher self-efficacy may be more willing to implement new teaching ideas (Ross & Bruce, 2007a).

Coaching

Peer coaching is a professional development strategy that improves teacher performance. Joyce and Showers (1980) first proposed peer coaching as in-classroom professional development that reinforces the transfer of new skills from professional development to practice. Joyce and Showers (1980) completed a series of studies to test the hypothesis that weekly seminars would help the teachers being trained implement what they were learning. The weekly seminars were coaching sessions conducted by other teachers. The study showed that teachers who had regular sessions with another teacher where they planned
together had higher rates of transfer of new learning than for participants who worked alone to implement new practices (Showers, 1985).

Currently coaching is used as professional development in large scale initiatives. Reading First (Munoz & Chang, 2007), a mandated training for schools receiving federal funding under NCLB, mandates required literacy coaches to work in schools implementing Reading First training in grades kindergarten through third grade. Literacy coaches are professionals dedicated to the professional development of teachers to increase their repertoire of teaching skills to increase student literacy levels (McKenna & Walpole, 2008). There are many types of coaches used in the school system serving grades K-12, including data coaches, math coaches, literacy coaches, and instructional coaches (Taylor, 2008). There are different models of coaching, each specifying different criteria. Coaches mentor new teachers, provide Cognitive Coaching (Costa & Garmston, 2002), provide peer coaching, subject matter coaching, program specific coaching and reform oriented coaching (McKenna & Walpole, 2008). Overall, the coach provides specific feedback to teachers implementing new strategies in their area of expertise. Instructional coaches are coaches who are not content specific, but focus on the implementation of pedagogical practices (McKenna & Walpole, 2008; Taylor, 2008).

Coaching has become a wide-spread action in non-education organizations as well. Coaches in the workplace focus on increasing employees’ productivity, satisfaction and mindfulness (Taylor, 2008). The literature indicates that executive coaching in the workplace can be an effective means of positive individual change (Grant, Curtayne, & Burton, 2009). Organizational coaching studies support the increase of participants’ workplace well-being. This finding is consistent with the seminal research by Joyce and Showers in 1980 that showed a positive trend in
work satisfaction and peer relationships between coaches and participants (Showers & Joyce, 1996).

Types of Peer Coaching

Coaching provides additional formal and informal support for teachers to expand the responsibility of instructional leadership beyond the principal (Taylor, 2008). There are various types and forms of coaching which vary in purpose, time and structure. While coaching can be formalized through a position, or be a process peers employ to help one another, or a professional development action taken by an administrator, all coaching has some similarities. Coaches can incorporate any of the characteristics in Table 3, and still be considered a coach.

History of Coaching

Prior to 1980, coaching was not a focus of teacher professional development. National movements to improve education and raise literacy levels were the focus of legislation. In 1955, Flesch wrote *Why Johnny Can’t Read-And What You Can Do About It*; this text was a focus of educators as it criticized current reading methods (Fitzgerald, 2010; Israel, & Monaghan, 2006). Reading research in the 1950s indicated that many American adults were functionally illiterate, leading to a rise in focus on reading instruction (Sears, 2008).

This increased focus lead to legislation targeting illiteracy. While this legislation mandated teacher training, it did not focus on the implementation of teacher skills, but rather on providing training for teachers in teaching reading. Additionally, reading specialists, teachers credentialed beyond a basic credential, increased to meet the demand of increasing literacy levels. In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act focused on special instruction for children in urban schools to increase their literacy skills (Fitzgerald, 2010).
Table 3.

Dimension and Classification of Instructional Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Dimensions</th>
<th>Procedural Dimensions</th>
<th>Structural Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Form</strong></td>
<td><strong>Authority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist to General</td>
<td>Technical, Collaborative, Problem-Solving</td>
<td>Formal to Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational, collegial or personal</td>
<td>Passive to Active</td>
<td>On-site, off-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ratio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content, pedagogical, curricular</td>
<td>Directive to Facilitative</td>
<td>One coach to one teacher, grade, or school, or multiple schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Coachee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice, Learner, Expert</td>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous, periodic, rare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Span</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than one year, one year, multi year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Taylor, 2008)

Research in the 1970s indicated a low transfer of reading skills of teachers to classroom implementation once training ceased (Showers & Joyce, 1996). Despite the focus of legislation and a wealth of funding targeting instruction, there was a lack of change in teacher practice. This lack of change could be attributed to minimal research on adult learning and how adults learn teaching strategies. It was assumed that teachers could attend summer training or intense training workshops during the school year and independently implement new teaching strategies (Showers & Joyce, 1996).
In 1980, Joyce and Showers’ seminal research supported a new training design, “modeling, practice under simulated conditions, and practice combined with feedback” (Joyce & Showers, 1980, p. 384), was the training design that produced greatest results (Showers & Joyce, 1996). At the time, conditions were not designed for the transfer of skills. Joyce and Showers (1982) confirmed their hypothesis in subsequent research that “coaching, following initial training, would result in much greater transfer than would training alone” (Showers & Joyce, 1996, p. 14).

A subsequent study by Showers (1984) further developed the understanding in the field on teachers’ transfer of learning from training to classroom through peer coaching. The study focused on three questions: Can teachers be trained to coach their peers in the classroom application of new teaching strategies? Do teachers who are coached by peers transfer training at a greater rate than uncoached teachers? Do students of peer-coached teachers perform better on a general transfer task and model specific tasks than students of uncoached teachers? Additionally, the study examined the attitudes of both coaches and coached teachers toward the coaching process. The teacher and student samples were drawn from six middle schools and included six coaches.

Teachers were assessed using the Paragraph Completion Method developed by Hunt, Butler, Noy, and Rosser (1978) that measured the conceptual level of teachers. This instrument was chosen to measure conceptual level and was positively related to acquisition of skills and the transfer of skills to complex instructional environment (Showers, 1984). Another instrument utilized was the Teacher Innovator System, also known as the Teacher’s College Skills and Strategies Interaction Analysis System by Weil, Guillon, and Cole (Showers, 1984). This instrument was used to classify teacher behavior on three dimensions:
structuring, information processing and feedback. A measure of verbal ability was given to students to measure student growth, the *V-3 Wide Range Vocabulary Test* by the Educational Testing System, 1963 (Showers, 1984).

This study included three phases, sample selection, pre-testing and initial training; peer coaching; and transfer task. In phase one, 21 junior and middle school teachers and six peer coaches were selected to participate. The *Teacher Conceptual Level* assessment was administered, seven weeks of training in a new teaching strategy was completed by the teachers, and peer coaches received 18 hours of training in coaching. For 6 weeks, the teachers received follow-up peer coaching to boost their level of implementation of the new teaching strategies learned during the seven-week training, six teachers did not receive coaching. In late May, follow up assessment was completed including a final interview of teachers in June.

Mean scores for transfer of training elements of coached, partially coached and uncoached teachers were compared (Showers, 1984). Findings were significant in regards to the transfer of skills from training to classroom and the comfort level of the coached teacher. Additionally, student achievement data were examined through a concept attainment test and verbal ability assessments. Two ANOVA analyses were conducted. The results of the first ANOVA showed significant contributions for student verbal ability and teacher transfer of training, but a non-significant contribution of treatment condition to student outcomes. The results of the second ANOVA indicated that coaching significantly contributed to higher student achievement on the concept attainment measure, with $p<.003$ (Showers, 1984).

Early training programs including the coaching of teachers did not yet identify the professional dedicated to helping teacher transfer skills as a “coach.”
Across the country, programs were created where teachers helped teachers improve their skills. In California, the Santa Clara Office of Education which offered regional staff development to 33 school districts implemented a pilot titled Teacher Advisor Program (Servatius & Young, 1985). The program was designed to support teachers who completed one of two training programs focused on strengthening skills and add one or two new skills to the repertoire of each participant. After completing three days of training, participants were to contact teacher advisors (coaches) for follow up support. The results of this pilot program indicated that teachers who received both training and coaching implemented the trained skills correctly and consistently.

Bruce and Ross (2008) conducted a peer coaching study in relation to school reform models and the increase of teaching strategies in mathematics in grades 3 and 6. Bruce and Ross define peer coaching as, “an intensive professional development (PD) activity in which teachers provide one another with feedback about their teaching” (p. 347). Bruce and Ross created a descriptive assessment tools from their previous research and National Council of Teachers of Mathematics policy statements. This assessment tool was used to conduct a qualitative study of 12 teachers who were trained and then coached in math instructional practices. While the sample size was too small to conduct statistical significance tests, Bruce and Ross did calculate means and standard deviations for each dimension of the effective teaching scale. The results indicated that peer coaching resulted in teachers improving practice toward standards based methods, the professional development program had positive effects on teacher efficacy and the coaching caused participants to reflect on practice.

Teacher focused coaches, like literacy coaches, have become a prevalent approach to providing ongoing, job-embedded professional development focused
primarily on modeling of instruction and teacher collaboration (Deussen, Coskie, Robinson, & Autio, 2007; Elish-Piper et al., 2008). Toll (2005) identified the current role of literacy coaches as similar to the role Joyce and Showers’ research identified. Literacy coaches observe instruction, conference with teachers, provide demonstration lessons and provide professional development sessions. Criticisms of the coaching model are that the application focused on a one-size fits all model and did not accommodate for adult learning processes (Elish-Piper et al., 2008). Adult learning, andragogy, considers the effects of the change process and adult learning patterns.

**Effects of Coaching on Teacher Efficacy and Student Achievement**

Ross (1992) conducted research to determine effects of teacher coaching on teacher efficacy and student achievement. The study examined mediating effects of teacher efficacy on coaching and achievement with a small sample (18 teachers) of grade 7 and 8 history teachers. The research questions asked included: whether student achievement would be higher in classrooms of teachers who interacted more extensively with their coaches, if student achievement would be higher in classrooms of teachers with higher self-efficacy beliefs, and whether coaching and teacher efficacy would interact in that higher-efficacy teachers would benefit more from coaching than low-efficacy teachers. The 18 teachers were assigned 6 coaches and the treatment consisted of actions to implement a new history curriculum guide. This treatment included three resources: new curriculum materials, three half-day workshops occurring over the school year and work with coaches. There was no classroom observation component to the coaching model as many contacts were phone or face-to-face conversations. Student outcomes were measured twice, once in September and once in May. The knowledge instrument
was a multiple choice instructions based on the Ontario Assessment Instrument Pool. Teacher efficacy was measured in May with a self-report instrument developed by Gibson and Dembo (1984). Coaching was measured by a questionnaire measuring the perception of teachers on how they used the three personnel resources with respect to student outcomes, and an interview of teachers and coaches in June (Ross, 1992).

The first hypothesis of the study was confirmed: student achievement was higher in classrooms of teachers who interacted more extensively with coaches. The second hypothesis was also confirmed: that student achievement would be higher in classrooms with teachers who have high teacher efficacy. The third hypothesis was not confirmed due to the small sample size. No interaction between coaching, teacher efficacy and achievement existed. While this study did not confirm the hypothesis that coaching affects teacher efficacy and achievement, it appears that this relationship might exist and a larger sample size might reveal how and when this phenomenon occurs. Certainly, current reality in U.S. schools indicates that there is a problem with the level of achievement students are attaining (Zakierski & Siegel, 2010).

**Coaching and Student Achievement Needs**

Large numbers of elementary students are not leaving primary school prepared for middle school (Akhavan, 2008; Slater, 2004). Likewise large numbers of middle school students are not prepared for high school and an alarming number of high school students do not graduate (Munoz & Chang, 2007; Scherff & Hahs-Vaughn, 2008). Despite school reform efforts occurring over the last two decades, the dropout rate remains relatively unchanged since 1992 (U.S. Department of Education, 2007).
The ability to read well is a determining factor in the achievement gap. Although reading scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress improved for Black, White and Hispanic students in 2007, only the Black-White gap for fourth graders narrowed in comparison with the 1992 and 2005 gaps. The achievement gap as measured by the NAEP test remains unchanged between white and minority students since 1992 (Lee, Grigg, & Donahue, 2007; Livingston & Wirt, 2005; National Center for Education Statistics, 2004). During the 2006-2007 school year, in California, Black 10th graders passed the California High School Exit Exam less frequently than other ethnic groups (Edsource, 2008).

The 2001 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) has increased the expectations for public schools, and requires states to implement more rigorous standards (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). The aim of this legislation is to close the achievement gap and requires that standards be applied to all students regardless of race, socioeconomic status, disability or ability to speak English (Zakierski & Siegel, 2010). The legislation does not state how schools are to meet the edict, only that reading instruction be founded on research-based practices (Dearman & Alber, 2005; Zakierski & Siegel, 2010).

Another clear pattern exists that students from poverty backgrounds achieve lower levels in school performance than students from high socioeconomic status backgrounds (Goodwin, 2000). This pattern appears to exist regardless of the comprehensive school reform in place. Schools that traditionally serve students from low socioeconomic backgrounds have been the focus of targeted intervention via legislations and school reform projects. Regardless of the school reform model implemented, the level of implementation, and the type of the program, these schools do not reach the same level of achievement as schools serving students from high socioeconomic backgrounds.
Comprehensive school reform has been a significant factor in federal education reform efforts. The most current and controversial reform effort is NCLB. Schoolwide reform was considered as a response to the poor outcomes of earlier reforms which were targeted to specific populations or programs and appeared to be fragmented and disjointed (Gross, Booker, & Goldhaber, 2009). Comprehensive schoolwide reforms became a leading strategy emphasized by the Department of Education between 1998 and 2005. During the last 5 years, comprehensive schoolwide reform has been driven by the NCLB targets. Since 2007 comprehensive school reform has not been a prominent reform strategy used by the federal government. The reform strategy now in the spotlight at the federal level is reform defined by the Race to the Top legislation. The design of reforms as defined by state’s applications in comparison to the RFA is underway (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

NCLB, a large scale policy initiative, includes a focus on the teacher and teacher qualification to teach the student population served. NCLB requires that every student in schools receiving Title I funding have a highly-qualified teacher (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). The Institute of Educational Sciences focuses on developing an understanding of teacher preparation and defines effective teacher preparation (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2007).

Professional development is needed to ensure that all teachers are considered highly qualified as defined by NCLB. Some districts across the nation are using coaching as a structured professional development for school reform (Fitzgerald, 2010). Camburn, Kimball, and Lowenhaupt (2008) studied the effects of a literacy coach initiative that was implemented in a large, decentralized urban district in order to increase student achievement results through meeting local needs by empowering the schools to improve. The school district served over
500,000 residents and enrolls over 90,000 students in approximately 200 schools. A mixed-method evaluation was guided by three questions: 1- What was the history of the development of the literacy coach initiative? 2- How was the initiative implemented in schools, and 3- What factors served as supports and impediments to implementation? A survey was administered to 58 coaches serving in elementary schools. Analyses of the survey data showed the typical practices of a coach in the district and showed how coaching practices varied from school to school. A multivariate analysis was conducted on survey data to understand district wide patterns of support for coaching. In-depth case studies on eight elementary schools provided evidence for the research questions through interviews of principals, coaches and teachers. Results indicated that coaches were more likely to engage in direct coaching, rather than administrative duties like paperwork, if they perceived their professional development as high quality. A second regression analysis predicted that coaches were more likely to provide direct coaching to teachers when they believed the expectations for coaching were clear, with the significance at .056. These results are an example of a school district responding to legislative requirements to improve student learning through coaching (Camburn et al., 2008).

Taylor (2008) suggested that instructional coaching has increased in popularity as a model of professional development because teachers’ preservice education is often weak which, in turn, creates a need for strong in-service programs. Because most teacher professional development is made up of brief and incoherent activities, there is a need for strong peer coaching as professional development (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001). Coaching impacts professional development in multiple ways through embedding,
extending, deprivatizing and connecting professional development to teacher needs (Taylor, 2008).

**Summary**

The review of the literature suggests that teachers who are coached may have higher academic optimism and teacher efficacy than teachers who are not coached. Additionally, the literature indicates that teachers who exhibit higher academic optimism and teacher efficacy have students who achieve higher results on assessments than teachers with lower levels of academic optimism or teacher efficacy.

This section of the dissertation focused on the constructs of academic optimism, teacher efficacy, coaching and possible effects on student achievement. Academic optimism was described at the level of teacher within the school organizational framework. Prior to the seminal research by Beard et al. (2010), academic optimism was only considered at the school or organizational level. Teacher efficacy, framed by social cognitive theory, was discussed as a construct related to self-efficacy. The change process and the effect of adult learning theory within the change process were discussed as related to teacher professional development. The end of the chapter explored professional development and covered the history of coaching as a professional development structure. The chapter builds the depth of coaching as a professional development structure which may affect teacher efficacy and academic optimism and suggests that further research in this area is warranted. The following chapter discusses the methods for this study.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the method and design that were used to undertake this study. The major components of this chapter include a justification and purpose of the study, the framework underlying the study, description of the sample, detailed description of the instrument, and information regarding the method and procedure of the data collection and analysis. A focus on the transformative framework was appropriate for this study as gaining clear insight into teachers’ sense of efficacy, their academic optimism, experiences with coaching and subsequent effects on student achievement, requires a mixed method methodology guided and shaped by multiple realities as no one person’s experience can describe all influences upon the shaping of an excellent teacher.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to investigate the connections between academic optimism, teacher efficacy, student achievement and professional development through coaching. The variables were defined by (a) teacher academic optimism, (b) teacher efficacy, (c) student achievement data, and (d) the type and amount of coaching teachers receive.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study are:

RQ1. Is academic optimism higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ2. Is teacher efficacy higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ3. Is student achievement higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?
RQ4. Do teacher efficacy, trust in students and parents, academic emphasis and the presence of coaching predict student achievement?

RQ5. Do different coaching experiences predict student achievement?

RQ6. Is there a difference in teacher efficacy between teachers with different levels of coaching experiences?

RQ7. Is there a difference in student achievement between teachers with different levels of coaching experiences?

RQ8. What was coaching like and why did it make a difference?

**Research Design**

Traditional quantitative analysis was used to gather and analyze teacher perceptions of their optimism and their ability to affect students. Teachers who were coached and not coached were compared. In addition to the quantitative analysis, qualitative focus group data were gathered and analyzed. The transformative framework is appropriate for this study as traditional research frameworks have been criticized for focusing mainly on the dominant cultural experience. As many teachers represent females and varied ethnic backgrounds, employing a framework to understand the experience of a person in the field is critical. In order to gain an understanding of the individual experience, honoring and learning from the diversity of the sample population, some qualitative analysis is required (Jick, 1979).

The transformative framework guides the examination of the domains of academic optimism, teacher efficacy and coaching through a mixed method design. The data were gathered with a survey, focus group interviews, observations and data mining. These four data sources provided the opportunity for data source triangulation in order to understand more fully the phenomena and
relationships occurring between teacher coaching, perceptions of teacher efficacy, academic optimism and student achievement.

Quantitative data for the study came from surveys given to teachers across the United States. The survey included five subscales to assess demographic information, teacher sense of efficacy, and academic optimism which is further subdivided into two constructs: teacher belief in students and parents and the ability of students to learn, and coaching. Additionally, quantitative data were mined from state-level Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) data stored electronically and available to the public. School-level data were gathered. Qualitative data came from focus group interviews of participating teachers. The focus group interviews were semi-structured interviews with the researcher prompting for information and allowing an open-ended response by the participant in order to develop an understanding of coaching in practice.

Participants

The participant sample consisted of volunteers. To be eligible to participate in the study teachers: (a) must have worked in a district that reports data to the state level and these data are accessible on the state webpage, (b) must have taught grade 3, 4, 5, or 6 or a combination of those grades during the 2009-2010 academic year, and either (c) must have received some type of coaching from a peer, colleague, designated coach, or administrator during the 2009-2010 school year, or (d) did not receive any type of coaching during the 2009-2010 school year.

Participants were chosen from four regions of the United States, the West, Midwest, South and Northeast. Targets states for each region include California, New Mexico, Wisconsin, Ohio, South Carolina, North Carolina and New York. The districts and county offices that participated include Fresno Unified School
District, Lexington and Richland Counties in South Carolina, and Gasden Independent School District, New Mexico. These contacts come from the researcher’s contacts across the U.S. due to speaking engagements arranged through Heinemann Speakers and through the researcher’s website. Additionally, the researcher’s editor through Scholastic sent the survey to her contacts. The participating districts represented suburban and urban schools in grades third through sixth grade, as these grade levels report data for AYP results.

When all participating districts were identified, email addresses were gathered to form a main contact for all third, fourth and fifth grade or combination classroom teachers for all schools in those districts. The survey was sent to these teachers via the contact person in each district, and the sample consisted of those teachers who responded to the survey.

Four or five teachers from each of the four regions were selected for focus group interviews based on the researcher’s main contact in each district. Teachers were identified for the focus group interviews by the main contact and this person gave the researcher the individual teachers’ email addresses. The district or county office representative was contacted to organize the focus group interview meetings.

**Instrumentation**

There were three types of instrumentation to gather the data in this study. One type of instrument was the survey, which included demographic, teacher optimism, teacher efficacy, and coaching questions. The second instrument was the AYP scores from online resources through district and county websites. The third type of instrument was the focus group interview protocol.
**Survey Design**

The survey was designed with items from two main sources: Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy’s (2001) scale of teacher efficacy and the new construct designed by Hoy et al., (2008) designed to assess teacher’s academic optimism. These instruments were used to confirm the construct of teacher’s academic optimism in a very recent study by Beard et al., (2010). The original instrument included 71 items assessing academic optimism (constructed of teacher efficacy, trust and academic emphasis) beliefs about instruction and management, individual citizenship, and demographic questions about teacher background and the classroom characteristics. The instrument that was used for this research measured teachers’ academic optimism, teacher’s experience with coaching, and demographic information about teacher background. Academic optimism is a construct which includes teacher efficacy, teacher trust in students and parents, and academic optimism.

**Academic optimism: Teacher efficacy.** The short form of the *Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale* (TSES) was used to measure teacher sense of efficacy (Hoy et al., 2008; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The short form of the TSES consists of 12 items assessing on a 9 point continuum with anchors at 1-Nothing, 3- Very Little, 5- Some Influence, 7- Quite A Bit, and 9- A Great Deal. The scale is scored as the higher the score, the greater the efficacy. The scale includes three 4-item subscales: *Efficacy for Instructional Strategies, Efficacy for Classroom Management, and Efficacy for Student Engagement* (Hoy et al., 2008). This scale is grounded upon previous research by Gibson and Dembo (1984), which established the first scale of teacher-efficacy. In previous research, reliability for the full scale of TSES ranged from .92 to .95, and for the subscales from .8 to .90. Sample items of the scale include:
**Efficacy for Instructional Strategies.** How well can you implement alternative teaching strategies in your classroom?

**Efficacy for Classroom Management.** How much can you do to get students to follow classroom rules.

**Efficacy for Student Engagement.** How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?

**Academic optimism: Teacher trust in students and parents.** Teacher trust was measured using items identified in Hoy et al.’s (2008) exploratory study. Four Likert items measured teacher trust in parents and students. Two of the four items focused on teacher trust in parents, and two items focused on teacher trust in students. This scale was based on the *Omnibus T-Scale* (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003), the faculty trust in clients subtest. A Likert scale measured teacher trust. Participants indicated their agreement on each item from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree, with the higher score indicating higher agreement with the item. Previous research resulted in a reliability of .79 for the four items. A sample of the items includes: “I trust the parent of my students,” (Beard et al., 2010).

**Academic optimism: Teacher academic emphasis.** Academic emphasis was measured using items from the instrument designed in the exploratory research by Hoy et al. (2008). The scale was developed from the *Organizational Climate Index* (Hoy et al., 2002) designed to measure achievement press. Seven Likert items measured academic emphasis. Teachers indicated their agreement with each item from 1- strongly disagree, to 5- strongly agree. In previous research the scale had a reliability score of .71. Items include: “I give my students challenging work,” (Beard et al., 2010).

**Coaching.** Coaching experiences were assessed through 13 questions, five questions that rate the frequency of coaching, and seven questions that measure
the impact of coaching through the elements of the coaching cycle including preplanning, modeling, co-teaching, and reflection. The questions were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, and one opened-ended question describing a different rate or impact of coaching. Frequency of activity were measured where 1 is equal to never, 2 is equal to once per month, 3 is equal to twice monthly, 4 is equal to at least once per week, and 5 is equal to more than once a week, whereas the lower number indicates a lower frequency and the higher number indicates higher frequency. Impact of coaching was measured on a five point Likert scale were 1 equals not applicable, 2 equals not at all, 3 equals sometimes, 4 equals often, and 5 equals a lot.

**Demographics.** Demographic data for teacher variables were assessed with seven questions designed to understand participants’ gender; ethnicity; years teaching experience; school identification as rural, urban or suburban; and grade level.

**Student Achievement Data**

Student achievement data were mined from public information databases after the survey was completed. Three years of data were examined in order to identify any trends that exist in the fall or rise of student learning achievement scores on state high stakes assessments. While it was not possible to access individual teacher scores, grade level data and school data were examined.

**Focus Group Questions**

Focus group questions delved into the experience of the teacher participating in coaching professional development. The coaching professional development was based on a coaching cycle which occurred sometime between August 2009 and June 2010. A coaching experience may include all or parts of the
coaching cycle: pre-observation conference, co-teaching where the coach demonstrates a teaching method or strategy, a post-observation conference, then a repeat of the cycle including a pre-conference, co-teaching where the teacher teaches and the coach observes and a post-observation conference. Questions for the focus group interviews included:

   - How has coaching changed your teaching?
   - What did the coach do that made a difference for you?
   - What do you value about the coach’s expertise?
   - Do you identify with the coach? In what ways?
   - What is the best thing the coach did?
   - What could the coach have done differently?

**Pilot Study**

The survey measured teacher efficacy, academic optimism, demographic information and coaching experiences. The survey was tested through a pilot study. The survey was given to five teachers at a school in a large urban school district in Central California, and four teachers responded. The sample of teachers in the pilot survey included teachers who have received coaching and others who had not received coaching. The survey was conducted using a Web-based survey tool and administered using email addresses. Each teacher received an introductory letter introducing the pilot study and the reason for the pilot study. Teachers who responded received a note thanking them for their time. A small, informal focus group was conducted to gather information on these teachers’ reactions to the survey. The survey introduction was modified based on these reactions and improved for clarity.
Procedures/Data Collection

The 42-item survey was administered to participants through an online survey service called Zoomerang. Participants were contacted through email inviting them to participate in the survey. Participants were informed of the purpose of the study and asked for their consent and for their responses to survey questions. A sample consent letter appears in Appendix A. Participants who did not respond were reminded one week after the initial contact to complete the survey. After two attempts at gaining responses from non-responders, a third attempt was made between 2 to 3 weeks after the initial contact in order to encourage as many responses as possible. Sixty-six respondents in Fresno Unified School District responded by paper and pencil surveys. The principals of the represented schools requested the paper copies. The copies were provided, collected and the data were entered by hand into an Excel document.

Student achievement data were mined from public information databases after the survey was completed. Participants identified the school where they teach and the student achievement data for that school were examined. Three years of data were examined in order to identify any trends that exist in the fall or rise of student learning achievement scores on state high stakes assessments.

After the surveys were collected, a sample of teachers for focus group interviews was determined via volunteer. A similar number of teachers were interviewed from each region. A sample of four or five participants was selected from each region in the United States resulting in a total of four focus groups of five or six participants, totaling 20 participants.

The focus groups were run by the researcher face-to-face and via telephone. The focus groups were conducted through a semi-structured process, focusing on open-ended questions so that the give-and-take interaction led to spontaneous
responses from participants. The interviewer asked questions and then allowed the focus group members to respond freely in order to allow the responses to flow. The interviewer prompted for more information by asking follow up questions like, “why,” or “how.” Focus groups included four to five participants and lasted approximately one hour. The sessions were taped and the researcher took notes during the session, when possible. These tapes were later transcribed.

**Data Analysis**

**Qualitative Analysis**

The first five research questions were analyzed with $t$-tests, regression, and one-way ANOVA analyses. The first set of analyses answered the first three research questions, which are:

RQ1. Is academic optimism higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ2. Is teacher efficacy higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ3. Is student achievement higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

These analyses have three dependent variables and one independent variable. The dependent variables are academic optimism, teacher efficacy, and student achievement; the independent variable is coaching. The independent variable has two groups, teachers who were coached and teachers who were not coached during the 2009-2010 school year. The analysis to answer the first three research questions was an independent $t$-test.

To answer the next research questions, a series of regression analyses was run. The first regression analysis will answer the fourth research question:
RQ4. Do teacher efficacy, trust in students and parents, academic emphasis and the presence of coaching predict student achievement?

In this analysis, achievement is the dependent variable and teacher efficacy, trust in students and parents, teacher academic emphasis, and presence of coaching are independent variables.

Further regression analysis will answer the remaining research questions.

RQ5. Do different coaching experiences predict student achievement?

RQ6. Is there a difference in teacher efficacy between teachers with different levels of coaching experiences?

RQ7. Is there a difference in student achievement between teachers with different levels of coaching experiences?

In this analysis, teacher efficacy and academic optimism are the dependent variables and coaching practices are the independent variables.

**Qualitative Analysis**

The qualitative analysis will answer the last research question, RQ8. What was coaching like and why did it make a difference?

This transformative framework is designed to capture and understand the experience of each person involved in the study. The six qualitative, focus group research questions are designed to develop this understanding.

The coaching questions were coded according to themes which emerge from these data. A matrix was used to organize the information into categories of perceptions of coaching experiences, teacher efficacy and academic optimism. Any existence of patterns between the participants’ perceptions of coaching experiences and teacher efficacy and academic optimism was examined.
Limitations

Beard et al. (2010) call for future research linking teacher optimism with student achievement. A significant limitation of this study was the use of collective student achievement data rather than individual teacher or student, which includes the use of Annual Yearly Progress (AYP), as mandated by the No Child Left Behind legislation, as were data to determine positive change in student achievement. The AYP indicator is a broad look at student achievement and the nuances of student achievement by teacher, test area subcategory, and grade level decreases with broad examination of data change. By using a broad indicator for positive student achievement change it limited the ability to know student achievement change patterns for teachers who actually received coaching in a building, versus a teacher who may not have received coaching. This is because not all teachers are coached in any given school or a given grade level, and the AYP data indicator groups results in large categories. It is reported publically in these same large categories; therefore, it is not possible to look specifically at grade level information.

The design of the original test instrument was also a limitation. The number of items on the instrument measuring teacher trust in students and parents, and academic emphasis was limited. The questions measuring teacher trust in parents and students, and academic emphasis included only 10 items. Four of the items measured trust, and six items measured academic emphasis. Having only a small number of questions to measure these constructs did not provide enough information to formulate a pattern of results that could have been further examined for insight into each construct and its relation to coaching.

Another limitation included the absence of a comparison of teacher academic optimism to the collective academic optimism of the school in which the
teacher works. Collective academic optimism may influence individual teacher optimism. Optimistic norms in a school should reinforce a teacher’s tendencies to be optimistic or pessimistic (Beard et al., 2010). This construct was not measured in this study. An additional limitation included the lack of information collected on individual schools that demonstrate different levels of academic achievement and academic optimism in relation to the type of professional development implemented at the school.

Another limitation was the volunteer sample and lack of an equal distribution of responses across the four regions of the United States. The sample was organized from personal contacts the researcher had with teachers and administrators across the United States.

Two issues further impacted the development of the sample. First, the researcher was not able to make contact with her two sources in New York State in sufficient time to apply and pass the school districts’ IRB process; therefore, the sample of teachers from this area consisted only of eight respondents. Additionally, this situation made it difficult to organize a focus group in sufficient time to complete the study, and instead an observation was completed with the teachers when the researcher visited the school. Second, a political situation occurred in Wisconsin within 1 week of the survey being launched in the region represented by CESA 2. This political situation affected teachers in that the state legislation was debating whether to limit the collective bargaining rights of unions, which includes teachers. Prior to the political situation erupting in the state, the survey responses were beginning to be recorded on the Zoomerang Website. Once the political situation occurred, all responses ceased. It appeared that while people were committed to completing the survey, they prioritized their time based on
political, economic, and work related issues. At the time, completing the survey was not a priority.

Another limitation which occurred was the focus group interviews format. The researcher planned to complete the focus group interviews in person in each of the four regions of the United States. The focus group interviews were conducted in person in Wisconsin and California, but not in New Mexico or South Carolina. The researcher’s trip to New Mexico was canceled the night before due to a blizzard which gripped most of the country. The focus group interview was to be conducted in Las Cruces, New Mexico and the power was out in the area that the researcher was going to meet the teachers, and consequently, the trip was cancelled at the last minute, and it took several days for the region to recover from the blizzard. The unusual weather situation impacted the ability of the researcher to travel to the area, and therefore the interview was conducted over the phone. The resulting data were not as rich as with face-to-face interviews. The focus group interview from the sample representing South Carolina also occurred over the phone. Originally, the researcher had planned to conduct the study in North Carolina due to the enthusiastic response from a professional contact in Wake County. The researcher applied for the IRB process, but this process was lengthy and took more time than the researcher had available to complete the study. This required the researcher to switch from her North Carolina contact to a contact in South Carolina. The permission process in South Carolina was rapid, however, the delay in switching between North Carolina and South Carolina occurred at a time when the researcher was unable to travel, necessitating that the focus group survey be conducted by telephone.

Still another limitation was response rate. There were 234 people who viewed the survey online; however, of that group, only 154 people took the survey
online. This created a smaller sample than anticipated. It was not possible to determine a response rate as the invitation for teachers in grades 3 through 6 to take the survey was controlled by the researcher’s contacts. These contacts did not reveal the number of people they sent the survey link to via email, so therefore a response rate could not be calculated. It is unknown why all people who visited the Zoomerang Website did not take the survey; it could be that they were not teachers who fell into the targeted range of the survey, teachers in grades 3-6.

Summary

This chapter presents the research design, research questions, and procedures for this study. Included in the description was the design of the participant sample, the instrumentation and the data collection process. This study attempted to confirm the constructs of teacher academic optimism and teacher efficacy in relation to amount, type and quality of teacher coaching, an effective professional development format for teachers. Additionally, this study explored connections between teacher coaching and student achievement results. Teacher sense of academic optimism may be a force for student achievement, and this has implications for school reform (Hoy et al., 2006). The next chapter discusses the findings of the research.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS/OUTCOMES

In this chapter the results of the data analysis for this study are discussed. The mixed method design of the study was appropriate for the research questions and this sample as it allowed capturing the self-report perception of individuals on coaching, teacher efficacy and academic optimism while providing a deep look at the experiences and feelings of teachers who have been coached and those of instructional coaches as well. Instructional coaches were not surveyed, however two requested to participate in the focus group interviews. An evaluation of the statistical results determined whether or not statistically significant relationships exist between the independent variables (coaching) and the dependent variables (teacher academic optimism, teacher efficacy, student achievement).

The purpose of this study was to investigate the connections between teacher academic optimism, teacher efficacy, student achievement and professional development through coaching. The identification of the effect of embedded, personal professional development through coaching on teachers’ efficacy and academic optimism may inform current practices of systems change and professional development. The identification of possible connections between coaching, teacher academic optimism and teacher efficacy, may provide insight into high quality professional development structures which lead to a change in student achievement results. This chapter provides information on the quantitative and qualitative study results. For the quantitative results, a brief discussion of survey results, an overview of the population surveyed, and an analysis of the results is provided. For the qualitative results, an overview of the sample studied and an analysis of the findings is provided.

The research questions for this study are:
RQ1. Is academic optimism higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ2. Is teacher efficacy higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ3. Is student achievement higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ4. Do teacher efficacy, trust in students and parents, academic emphasis and the presence of coaching predict student achievement?

RQ5. Do different coaching experiences predict student achievement?

RQ6. Is there a difference in teacher efficacy between teachers with different levels of coaching experiences?

RQ7. Is there a difference in student achievement between teachers with different levels of coaching experiences?

RQ8. What was coaching like and why did it make a difference?

**Study Design**

The survey was provided for participants in two forms, online and paper. The survey was available on Zoomerang for a period of 8 weeks. Respondents in Fresno Unified School District who preferred a paper copy were provided a paper copy through the district mail. Respondents using the webpage version of the survey were also offered a paper copy if they chose; however, none of these participants requested a paper copy. The respondents returned the paper copy to the researcher and these data were inputted into an Excel document. The results from the Zoomerang Website were downloaded into an Excel document; both Excel documents were then merged into one database and entered into SPSS for analysis.
The sample of participants who accessed the Zoomerang web based version of the survey consisted of volunteers. The sample represented teachers across the four regions of the United States: the Northeast, the Midwest, the South and the West. The Northeast included respondents from Brooklyn, New York and New Hampshire. The Midwest was represented by respondents from Wisconsin. The southern region included respondents from South Carolina, North Carolina, Alabama, and Virginia. The western area included respondents from California, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington. The number of participants per state is shown in Table 4. Seven participants were contacted through Lois Bridges, Executive Editor at Scholastic publishing company. Two hundred ten participants were recruited from the researcher’s professional contacts with educators in New Mexico, New York, Wisconsin, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and California.

Each region in the United States was represented with either a focus group interview or an observation. Participant numbers in the focus groups varied by region. One teacher participated from Oregon, four teachers participated from California, four teachers and one coach participated from New Mexico, two teachers and two coaches participated from Wisconsin, and three teachers and one coach participated from South Carolina. Six teachers participated in the ethnographic observation from New York.

**Demographic Information**

Of the 243 people who accessed the survey online, not all individuals chose to take the survey. The total number of respondents was 217. Of the respondents, 151 responded online and 66 responded by paper copy. Of the total respondents, a large majority of respondents were female (see Table 5). Of the ethnicities
Table 4.

*Number of Participants by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to State</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
represented in the sample, the majority of respondents were Caucasian (65.4%).
The next largest ethnicity represented was of Hispanics (14.7%) (see Table 6). Of
the 217 respondents, 145 stated they received some type of coaching in the 2009-
2010 school year (66.8%), 58 stated they have not received coaching (26.7%), and
14 declined to state (6.5%) (see Table 7).

Table 5.

*Gender of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.

*Ethnicity of Participants by Number and Percentage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to State</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.

*Participants Receiving Coaching During the 2009-2010 School Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Receive Coaching</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Coaching</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to State</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents represented a spread of grade levels between third through sixth grade. Some teachers who taught upper grade students in combination classes or in multiage groups were classified in the category, other. This information is represented in Table 8.

Table 8.

*Number of Participants by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrument Development

Questions addressing teacher academic optimism included survey items measuring teacher trust in parents and students and teacher academic emphasis. The survey instrument was from three different scales and included the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), items from an exploratory study by Hoy, Woolfolk Hoy and Kurz (2008) measuring trust from the Omnibus Scales, and items from the Organizational Climate Index (Hoy et al., 2002) measuring teacher academic emphasis. The Cronbach’s Alpha for academic optimism questions is .916. This is much higher than the .70 value that Pedhazur and Schmelkin (1991) consider acceptable. The short form of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) by Hoy et al., (2008), and Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) was used for items 6-17 for this survey. These items measured teacher efficacy. The Cronbach’s Alpha for teacher efficacy data was .894.

Items measuring trust came from the survey items identified by Hoy et al. (2008). Two of the four items focused on teacher trust in parents, and two items focused on teacher trust in students. These questions appear as items 18-21 on the survey instrument. Cronbach’s Alpha for the trust data was .819.

Items measuring academic emphasis, survey questions 22-28, came from an instrument designed by Hoy et al. (2008). The scale designed to measure achievement press includes six Likert items measuring academic emphasis. The means and standard deviations for all survey items, except the demographic data that was previously explained, are listed in Table 9. The Cronbach’s Alpha for the academic emphasis data was .825.
Table 9.

Means and Standard Deviations for Survey Items Measuring Teacher Academic Optimism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Use of variety of assessments</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provide alternative explanations to alleviate student confusion</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Able to craft good questions</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Implement alternative strategies in classroom</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Control disruptive behavior in classroom</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ensure children follow classroom rules</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Calm a noisy/disruptive student</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Establish classroom management system</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Get students to believe they can do well</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Help students value learning</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Motivate students who show low interest</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Assist families to help students do well</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. (cont).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Trust student</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Trust students’ parents</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Parents are reliable in commitments</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Students are competent learners</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Parents do a good job raising children</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Students respect classmates</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Students are cooperative during instruction</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Students seek extra work for good grades</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Students can meet goals teacher sets</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Parents press for classroom improvement</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Parents pressure to maintain high academic standards</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coaching experiences on the instrument were assessed by 13 questions, item numbers 29-41. The survey included five questions that rated the frequency of coaching, and seven questions that measured the impact of coaching through the elements of the coaching cycle including preplanning, modeling, co-teaching, and reflection. Table 10 displays the means and standard deviations for the coaching items.
Table 10.

Means and Standard Deviations for Coaching Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Have been coached during 2009-2010 school year</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Time spent planning with coach</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Coach modeled in classroom</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Coach observed teacher</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Time spent reflecting on instruction with coach</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Degree coaching changed teaching</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Coaching increased confidence as teacher</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Degree improved student achievement from coaching</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Degree planned instruction with coach</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Degree coach modeled</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Degree coached observed</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Degree coach debriefed after teaching</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each section of the survey included unique scales to each subsection (see Appendix B). The first 12 questions, the short form of the TSES, assessed participant reactions on a 9-point continuum with anchors at 1- Nothing, 3- Very Little, 5- Some Influence, 7- Quite A Bit, and 9- A Great Deal. The next four questions, assessing teacher trust, were measured with a Likert scale. Participants indicated their agreement on each item from 1-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree, with the higher score indicating higher agreement with the item. Seven items measured academic emphasis. Participants indicated their agreement with each item from 1- strongly disagree, to 5- strongly agree.

The last 12 questions measured coaching. One question, number 29, measured if individuals had been coached or not and to what degree. Individuals answering ‘no’ on this item skipped the remainder of the coaching questions and concluded the survey with question 42 and 43, which prompted for the name of school and state from which the participant was responding. Coaching questions were measured on a five-point Likert scale, and included one opened-ended question (item 41) describing a different rate or impact of coaching. Frequency of activity were measured where 1 is equal to never, 2 is equal to once per month, 3 is equal to twice monthly, 4 is equal to at least once per week, and 5 is equal to more than once a week. The frequencies and percentages for coaching items are displayed in Table 11.

**Student Achievement Instrument**

The second instrument for measuring quantitative results was the measurement of student achievement data. Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) scores were mined from public databases for each school represented by a participant in the survey. AYP scores are a high level score card, which rate schools according to a number of indicators as addressed in the federal mandate No Child Left
Table 11.

Frequencies and Percentages for Coaching Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once per month</th>
<th>Twice per month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>More than once per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>29 13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>27 12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>19 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>13 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>22 10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32 14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A Lot</td>
<td>A Great Deal</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>55 25.3</td>
<td>33 15.2</td>
<td>41 18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>60 27.6</td>
<td>34 15.7</td>
<td>40 18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>69 31.8</td>
<td>33 15.2</td>
<td>15 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>79 36.4</td>
<td>21 9.7</td>
<td>23 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>85 39.2</td>
<td>20 9.2</td>
<td>6 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>67 30.9</td>
<td>31 14.3</td>
<td>20 9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Behind (2001). Because this type of student achievement data are not sensitive to individual results or fluctuations, the data were coded for change over three school years from 2007 to 2010. The codes ranged from 1-6, whereas 6 meant not applicable. The other codes included (1) no change, school did not meet AYP indicators, (2) no change, school did meet AYP indicators (3) slight change, school met a few AYP indicators, (4) some change, school met many AYP indicators, (5) significant change, school met more AYP indicators and (6) not applicable. The frequency for each code is displayed in Table 12.

Table 12.

*Frequencies of Codes for AYP Achievement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change, did not meet AYP indicators</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change, met AYP indicators</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Slight Change</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Some Change</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Significant Change</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences in Optimism Between Coached and Not Coached Teachers

The first research question addressed whether individual academic optimism is higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached. Optimism was measured by participant scores on the scale for teacher academic optimism, which included the subscales of teacher efficacy, trust in parents and students, and teacher academic emphasis. To address the question of whether the dependent variable (teacher academic optimism) was affected by the independent variable (coaching), three subscales comprising the construct of individual academic optimism were examined and compared to the teachers’ self-reports of being coached or not being coached. Means and standard deviations appear in Table 13 and the t-test results appear in Table 14. There is no significant difference in mean optimism ($t=.37$, df=193, $p=.71$, $r^2 = 0.1\%$) between coached ($M=4.05$) and non-coached ($M=4.09$) teachers.

Table 13.

Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes for Teacher Academic Optimism, Teacher Efficacy, and Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Optimism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Coached</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Coached</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Coached</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14.

Results of t-tests for Teacher Academic Optimism, Teacher Efficacy, and Student Achievement by Coaching Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Optimism</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences in Teacher Efficacy Between Coached and Non-Coached Teachers

The second research question addressed whether teacher efficacy, as indicated by participant scores on the short form of the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), is higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached. To address the question of whether the dependent variable (teacher efficacy) was affected by the independent variable (coaching), the TSES was examined and compared to the teachers’ self-reports of being coached or not. Means and standard deviations appear in Table 13 and the $t$-test results appear in Table 14. There is no significant difference in mean teacher efficacy ($t=.98, df=191, p=.32, r^2=0.5\%$) between coached (M=7.16) and non-coached (M=7.30) teachers.

Differences Between Student Achievement for Coached and Non-Coached Teachers

The third research question predicted whether student achievement would be higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached.
Achievement was measured by AYP results and coded by amount of change from no change (1) to substantial change (5). To address the question of whether the dependent variable (student achievement) was affected by the independent variable (coaching) a \( t \)-test was conducted. Means and standard deviations appear in Table 13 and the \( t \)-test results appear in Table 14. There is significant difference in student achievement (\( t = -2.44, df=194, p=.02, r^2=3.0\% \)) with coached teachers (\( M=3.33 \)) having higher student achievement than non-coached (\( M=2.78 \)) teachers.

**Relationship Between Coaching, Teacher Academic Optimism, Teacher Efficacy, and Student Achievement**

Research question 4 addressed whether teachers with higher academic optimism have higher student achievement. To address the question, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. Teacher academic optimism (teacher efficacy, teacher trust in students and parents, teacher academic emphasis) and coaching were the predictors and student achievement was the dependent variable. The means and standard deviations for teacher academic optimism, teacher efficacy and student achievement appear in Table 15. The results of the regression analysis appear in Table 16. The analysis revealed that the model was significant (\( F(4,174) = 8.24, p < .001, r^2 = .14 \)) and explains about 14\% of the variance in achievement. Table 17 displays the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (\( \beta \)), \( t \) values and probabilities for each value of the independent variables.
Table 15.

*Means and Standard Deviations for Teacher Academic Optimism and Teacher Efficacy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Emphasis</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16.

*Regression Analysis for Student Achievement by Teacher Efficacy, Trust in Parents and Students, Academic Emphasis, and Coaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>60.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>318.01</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>378.28</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17.

Regression Analysis for Student Achievement by Coaching, Teacher Efficacy, Trust, and Academic Emphasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher efficacy</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Parents and Students</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Emphasis</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq .01$  ** $p \leq .05$

The independent variable of teacher trust in parents and students ($t = -2.34, p = .02$) and coaching ($t = 2.68, p = .01$) significantly predicted student achievement, but teacher efficacy ($t = .63, p = .53$) and academic emphasis ($t = -1.46, p = .15$) do not.
Relationship Between Coaching Experiences and Teacher Academic Optimism

To answer research question 5, a series of analyses was performed for each of the dependent variables (teacher academic optimism, and its subscales of teacher efficacy, teacher trust in parents and students and teacher academic emphasis) and the independent variables (each of the 12 questions on coaching). The first regression used teacher academic optimism as the dependent variable. Further regression analysis focused on the individual variables that make up the variable of teacher academic optimism, which includes teacher efficacy, trust in students and parents, and teacher academic emphasis. The first of these regression analyses revealed that the model did not significantly predict teacher academic optimism based on coaching amount or type ($F(12, 112) = 1.79, p = .06$, adjusted $R^2$ was .07), however the results were nearly significant, and the dependent variable accounts for 7% of the variance in teacher academic optimism, see Table 18.

Table 18.

*Analysis of Variance for Teacher Academic Optimism and Coaching Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>55.08</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.63</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the model was not significant, one of the variables, degree of improved student achievement from coaching, ($t = 2.31, p = .02$) did show significance for predicting teacher academic optimism. In other words, teachers
who perceive that their students have higher achievement due to coaching, have higher teacher academic optimism. Table 19 displays the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), standard errors, standardized regression coefficients (β), t-values and probabilities for each variable.

The regression analysis for teacher efficacy revealed that the model did not significantly predict teacher efficacy based on coaching amount and type ($F(12,115) = 1.63$, $p = .09$, adjusted $R^2 = .06$) (see Table 20), however the results were nearly significant. Table 21 displays the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), standard errors, standardized regression coefficients (β), t-values and probabilities for each variable. One independent variable, question 36, appears to significantly predict the dependent variable of teacher efficacy. Again, teachers belief that they have increased student achievement because they were coached, significantly predicted teacher efficacy ($t = 2.70$, $p = .01$).

The regression analysis for teacher trust in parents and students revealed that the model approached, but did not reach significant prediction of teacher trust based on coaching amount and type ($F(12,122,) = 1.75$, $p = .06$, $r^2 = .147$, adjusted $R^2 = .06$) (see Table 22) Although the model explained 6% of the variance in trust, none of the independent variables was significant. Table 23 displays the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), standard errors, standardized regression coefficients (β), t-values and probabilities for each variable.

The regression analysis for teacher academic emphasis revealed that the model did significantly predict teacher academic emphasis based on coaching amount and type ($F(12, 118) = 2.22$, $p = .02$, adjusted $R^2 = .10$), and explained 10% of the variance in teacher academic emphasis. Table 24 displays the results.
Table 19.

Regression Analysis for Teacher Academic Optimism by Coaching Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 (cont).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36 Degree improved student achievement from coaching</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37 Degree planned instruction with coach</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38 Degree coach modeled</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39 Degree coached observed</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40 Degree coach debriefed after teaching</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Table 20.

Analysis of Variance for Teacher Efficacy by Coaching Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>83.03</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97.14</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. 

Regression Analysis for Teacher Efficacy by Coaching Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 (cont).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37 Degree planned instruction with coach</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38 Degree coach modeled</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39 Degree coached observed</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40 Degree coach debriefed after teaching</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Table 22.

**Analysis of Variance for Trust in Parents and Students by Coaching Survey Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Adjusted R^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>103.673</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121.552</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23.

*Regression Analysis for Teacher Trust in Parents and Students by Coaching Survey Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 (cont).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree improved student achievement from coaching</td>
<td>Degree planned instruction with coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree coach modeled</td>
<td>Degree coached observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree coach debriefed after teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24.

Analysis of Variance for Teacher Academic Emphasis by Coaching Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>64.20</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78.70</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25.

Regression Analysis for Teacher Academic Emphasis by Coaching Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Unstandardized Coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the independent variables was significant. Table 25 displays the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), standard errors, standardized regression coefficients (β), t-values and probabilities for each variable.

**Relationship Between Coaching Experiences and Teacher Efficacy**

To address whether there is a difference in teacher efficacy between levels of coaching experiences, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. Coaching experiences were grouped into five levels by respondents’ self-reports, with 1
indicating ‘no coaching experiences’, 2 indicating ‘coached once per month’, 3 indicating ‘coached twice per month’, 4 indicating, ‘coached once per week’, and 5 indicating ‘coached more than once per week.’ The means, standard deviations and sample sizes for teacher efficacy by level of coaching are reported in Table 26. The ANOVA results were not significant (\(F(4,188) = .83, p = .51\), adjusted \(R^2 = .004\)). Table 27 displays the mean and standard deviations for each option to question 29.

Table 26.

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Frequencies for Teacher Efficacy by Teacher Self-Report of Coaching Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Level</th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never coached</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached once per month</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached twice per month</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached once per week</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached daily</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27.

*Analysis of Variance for Teacher Efficacy by Coaching Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>Adjusted (r^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Level</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>132.59</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134.92</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship Between Coaching Experiences and Student Achievement

The seventh research question addressed whether teachers with more coaching experiences have higher student achievement as measured by teacher self-reports of levels of coaching and the student achievement data. Coaching experiences were grouped into five levels by respondents’ self-reports, with (1) indicating ‘no coaching experiences’ and (5) indicating ‘coached more than once per week’. The number, means and standard deviation for each level are reported in Table 28. In examining whether the dependent variable (student achievement) was affected by the independent variable (coaching level), an ANOVA was conducted with an alpha level of .05. The ANOVA results were significant ($F(4,191) = 3.75, p = .01$, adjusted $R = .5$). The mean and standard deviations for each reported level of coaching are displayed in Table 29.

Table 28.
Teacher Self-Report of Coaching Frequency by Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Level</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never coached</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached once per month</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached twice per month</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached once per week</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached daily</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29.

*Analysis of Variance of Student Achievement by Coaching Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Levels</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>375.29</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>404.75</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A post hoc analysis revealed four significant pairwise comparisons and appear in Table 30. The pairwise comparisons indicate that there was no significant difference between teachers who were never coached and teachers who were coached daily on student achievement results. Teachers who were never coached had lower student achievement than either teachers who were coached once per month ($p = .006$) or coached twice per month ($p = .008$). On the other end of the scale, teachers who were coached daily had lower student achievement than teachers coached once ($p = .02$) or twice ($p = .02$) a month.

Table 30.

*Pairwise Comparisons of Post Hoc Analysis of Student Achievement by Coaching Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairwise Comparison</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never Coached $&lt;$ Coached Once per Month</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Coached $&lt;$ Coached Twice per Month</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached Daily $&lt;$ Coached Once per Month</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached Daily $&lt;$ Coached Twice per Month</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Research Results

The eighth research question was a qualitative research question, inquiring into what coaching was like for participants and why it made a difference. Interview data, observation data, and survey data provided a rich understanding of the coaching experience and about what made a difference for participants and what did not. This section provides a summary of the qualitative results for the focus group interviews, the ethnographic observation of one school in New York, and commentary gathered from the coaching section of the survey. For detailed transcripts of the results, see Appendix C. The focus group interviews of teachers representing the four quadrants of the United States were conducted by phone and in person. The ethnographic observation was completed in person over one four-hour period. All names used are pseudonyms. Interviewees included in the discussion include the following:

A) Central U.S.
1. Carolee, female, teacher fifth grade
2. Sandra, female, current teacher upper grade, former coach
3. Sue, female, current administrator, former mentor/coach
4. Isabel, female, teacher upper grade, ESL

B) South
1. Sandra, female, teacher upper grade
2. Karen, female, teacher upper grade
3. Suzanne, female, teacher upper grade
4. Ruby, female, teacher upper grade
5. Heather, female, coach

C) West
Focus Group 1 New Mexico
1. Ann, female, teacher upper grade
2. Maria, female, teacher upper grade
3. Juana, female, teacher upper grade
4. Lynn, female, teacher upper grade
5. Julie, female, coach

Individual Interview, Washington
1. Ray, male, teacher upper grade

Focus Group 2, California
1. Tom, male, teacher sixth grade
2. Julianne, female teacher sixth grade
3. Nhia, female, teacher fifth grade
4. Marcy, female, teacher fifth grade

D) East

Ethnographic Observation, New York
1. John, male, fifth grade teacher
2. Mary, female, fifth grade teacher
3. Sandra, female, fifth grade teacher
4. Monica, female, second grade teacher
5. Shareen, female, second grade teacher
6. Holly, female, coach

**Themes**

From focus group interviews, observations and qualitative survey results, six themes emerged. The six themes formed into factors which are listed below. Transcripts of the focus group interviews appear in Appendix C, observation note transcripts are in Appendix D, and qualitative survey results appear in Appendix E.
In terms of coaching impact on the teachers, seven factors appeared consistently throughout all of the interviews, observations and qualitative survey results:

1) Positive impact of coaching for teachers and coaches;
2) People skills of the coach and the fit of the personality of the coach to the teacher;
3) The ability of the coach to focus on the personal development of each teacher versus rote implementation of programs;
4) Time the coach was available to teach teacher;
5) The coach’s ability to help teachers understand the use of data to plan instruction; and
6) The focus of the coaching work in each school in a side-by-side setting.

Positive Impact of Coaching for Teachers and Coaches

Coaching appears to positively impact both teachers and coaches. A variety of ways that coaching created this positive impact emerged including:

1) Sharing experiences;
2) Developing a perspective of student learning;
3) Providing resources;
4) Openness and opportunity to develop a comfort level.

Teachers and coaches appear to share experiences that make both individuals better at their jobs. Through shared experiences teachers learn how to handle issues in their classrooms, and coaches learn what works for an individual teacher in a given situation and then offers that advice to other teachers in similar situations. One coach described this as “you know we all face challenges everyday and just sharing those out we understand that what may not be the exact same
thing, we understand and we can share those experiences and I can learn how they handle things and vice-versa.”

Teachers report developing a broader perspective of their work due to the coaching they received. This perspective includes the continual learning children participate in from kindergarten into upper grade, which seems to lead teachers to develop reflective skills. Many teachers stated that prior to the experience where the coach made them aware of what children learned prior to their grade level, and what they needed to learn in their grade level to be prepared for the next, they were too narrowly focused on what they were to teach a child in any given year and did not understand the continuum. A coach described this experience in the following way, “I get the opportunity to work with all the different grade levels of teachers so just to be able to see that, and see that developmental progression…and understand what I should be seeing with student, at a particular grade level… that has helped me a lot, and I think it’s helped me work with teachers…” A teacher described it as “Prior to teaching fourth grade, I taught first and second grade for many, many years and I think that [coach] has helped me understand the mind of a fourth grader. Kinda like [individual] said, some of the things that I don’t find so humorous, she helps me to understand, ‘cause she taught fourth grade for many years, so she kinda helped me learn the nature of a fourth grader.”

Providing resources appeared in the transcripts and field notes multiple times. Teachers appreciate the coach being able to provide resources to them to meet their particular need at any given time. Teachers stated that they often do not have the time to research materials to meet student needs, or to teach something in a new way, and that the coaches provide a valuable service by finding and providing materials and resources quickly.
Additionally, the coach’s openness to help and focus on developing a positive comfort level for the coached teacher was critical for the coaching experience to positively impact the teachers and the coaches. Teachers eloquently stated their thoughts and feelings about the importance of the coach being open and understanding. Some examples include the following,

“…it [coaching] really has led all my teaching experiences and colleague relationships that no one should ever feel alone or unsupported, and we have most of the answers sitting around the table if we care to look, listen and try. So that’s been the biggest thing to help and … [have a ] connection to a coach.”

“I think that her expertise helped me to be a more effective teacher. Because doing stuff in the classroom, you try and it’s not working and it’s not working. You’re frustrated because the kids aren’t getting it, but looking at it from somebody else’s perspective [helps].”

“…[the coach] helps you be a more effective teacher with your frustrations because now I can consider being there.” [present with frustration].

Another person stated, “When the coach is effective it is someone that not only looks at what the curriculum is, what the needs of the students are, and the background of these students, but also, they get to know me well enough. Not just as a person,…but also as a professional…”

The coaches’ experiences regarding openness and comfort level are similar to that of the classroom teachers. Coaches state they learn from the coaching experience and have grown in their ability to provide professional learning opportunities for teachers that impact student learning.

“…one of the things that I have found beneficial for myself as a coach, and I believe for the teachers, is that they’re more willing to take some risks if they
know that you’re right there beside them. And that you’re vulnerable there with
them.”

“You’re not telling them, ‘This is how it is going to be.’ It’s like, ‘Let’s
have a go and let’s see what it looks like.’”

People Skills of the Coach and Personality Match

Between Coach and Teacher

Teachers reported both positive and negative experiences with a coach.
Positive and negative experiences coalesced around a few themes:

1) Communication skills;
2) Knowledge level; and,
3) Personality fit of a coach to an individual or group of teachers.

It appears from the observations and the interviews that the ability of the
coach to build relationships with people was of utmost importance if the coach
was to develop positive experiences with teachers. In the East region of the United
States, one grade level of teachers revealed that they felt unsupported by the
coach, and that specifically, her manner was harsh. Other teachers from the same
school had the opposite experience with the coach and explained their coaching
experience as positive. The coach has a skill set that apparently worked with one
group of teachers more effectively than another group of teachers. In fact, the
teachers who experienced the negative situation with the coach expressed fear and
uncertainty about sharing their experiences. They talked in hushed tones, and
averted their eyes.

Interviews revealed specific actions that the coaches take to develop
relationships with teachers. These actions include the coaches’ ability to reach out
to others, make the coaching relationship about the teacher, and not about the ego
of the coach, and to be available intellectually and emotionally for the teachers.
One teacher believed that the personalities of people make some people better coaches, “But that was more of a personality thing than anything that’s inherited from being a coach, but I think that’s one of the challenges of being a coach. Your personality dictates how much you are willing, or want, to collaborate. It dictates how you are proactive in getting in the classrooms and how you go about doing it. I mean, it’s all about the relationship building really.” Comments from other teachers included:

“You can just go to her even as a teacher. She and I never taught on the same grade level… but I would just say, ‘hey, I like what I see you doing here, how’d you do it?’”

“You know the role of a coach was not a stretch for her and it is very comfortable knowing that she knows where I’m coming from as a teacher.”

“I think that last year there was a set scene: what you are to discuss, what to make sure you are talking about, to document it here, and this year it’s a little relaxed. You talk about what you need to talk about and think in that you build trust together…”

“I think one of the reasons that the literacy coach models failed a lot of times is because they [the coaches] aren’t …the whole relationship building is not the foundation to the way the job is constructed.”

The concept of fit between the personality and goals of the coach and those of the teacher furthered deepened the conversation around the coaches’ ability to build relationships. Fit is key according to the participating teachers. Many teachers shared heart wrenching stories about how they felt when fit between the coach and the teacher was not effective for the teacher. One teacher reported, “the first couple of years that I was with a trainer [coach], I wanted to run away and head for the hills because they were like little Hitlers. You had to do things a
certain way and I began to feel [unhappy]...but now... I feel like I can enjoy what
I’m doing again... So I think that this has really helped me to feel better about
what I am doing and helped me to enjoy myself better.”

One teacher stated the fit of the relationship and the respect that develops
from the fit as a game others describe the experience in ways that didn’t boost
their belief in themselves as teachers. Comments include:

“Otherwise we’re just playing a game so that you can do your thing until
I’m done with you and you’re out of my way and I can continue to do the real
education that I’m required to give those kids.”

“...I’ve had both positive and negative experiences with trainers [coaches].
I’ve had couple of trainers that made me feel kinda depressed about teaching,
because I felt they were leading me down the wrong road and giving me
misinformation. But then on the other side of it, when you have a good trainer,
it’s made me feel more excited about what I’m doing because I feel like some of
my ideas are worth and the kids are excited about what I’m doing.”

Teachers also reported many positive experiences between themselves and
the fit of their coaches. What was apparent in the field notes and transcripts is that
the feelings of teachers about the fit of the coach/teacher relationship fell on a
continuum with strong feelings on each polar end of the continuum. Those
teachers that experienced a poor fit described their situation with some indignence
in their voices and words. Individuals who reported having a good fit with their
coach often described the relationship in glowing terms. On the tapes of the
interviews the teachers voices would rise and be filled with positive emotion.
While this does not appear in the transcripts, the comments are positive.
“I identify with her because she was a classroom teacher first and we worked together… so by the time she got to be a coach it was like having someone you’re comfortable with and working with you.”

“She understands the stresses we’re going through as far as the day-to-day thing with the kids, as far as the paperwork…She sees the humor in the things that the kids do and if we’re frustrated, pulling our hair out, she understands what we’re talking about.”

“I felt really comfortable. Like I said, it’s your own colleague. You’re a team basically.”

“…making a difference between a really good coaching experience, which I think we have here, and a more negative one, which I’m sure is in our district, is just a match between the coach and the people at the school and that belief, that we can do this together.”

**Ability of Coach to Focus on Teacher Personal Development**

The coaches’ ability to focus on individual teacher needs impacted the openness of the coached teacher to the experience, increased the teacher’s ability to identify with the coach, and helped the teacher own the professional development experience. The focus group interviews and the observations supported this claim. The teachers in the eastern region did not feel a close connection with the coach. They stated that they felt the coach was there to implement her ideas of initiatives and not help them improve individually as a teacher.

The individual support coaches provided formed into four areas:

1) Emotional level of the teacher in relation to his or her knowledge and ability to teach effectively;
2) Narrowing the focus of individual growth goals;
3) Providing effective feedback for teacher reflection and improvement; and
4) Being a personal resource to the coached teachers.

Teachers reported the importance of coaches to know and understand their job was to develop each individual teacher. Coaches on the western region of the United States reported taking cognitive coaching training. Cognitive coaching training helps individuals learn to develop skills in listening and reflective practice. A teacher in the western region who had a coach trained in cognitive coaches described his coach’s skills in the following manner, “But the good thing about her if she did that [reacted very quickly] she would always revisit things, or apologize, or get more information.”

Coaches in the southern region of the United States also appeared to have training to effectively coach teachers although a specific training was not mentioned. Teachers in this region reported that their coach was focused on their personal development as teachers and the coach acted as a personal resource to them to help them improve practice. These ideas are apparent through some of the transcripted interviews.

“Maybe sometimes all you need is a little extra information or a little extra resource material.”

“… when I’ve been approached by this person they always would say, “Okay, so what do you want me to do; what do you need for me to do; and do you think this would work, should I try this?”

“So it’s much more of a collaborative collegial effort. It becomes more like; I know I’m being coached because this person has real good experience in this and
it’s real obvious from the minute they step into the room… so I tend to feel more relaxed.”

“…but maybe it’s because it’s just that I’m getting trained as the children are getting trained. I think that’s what it is. I’m getting something just for me that I can use and keep using…”

“Well, when you think you’re alone, you’re embarrassed to ask other people who you think may know. But you’re thinking, “Maybe I’m the only one who doesn’t understand this, you know. So you find out, wow, everybody else is in the same boat you’re in and it was kinda relieving to just realize that I wasn’t the only one who missed something or some foundational piece…”

“It’s like we had a fourth teacher. One who’s not encumbered with the classroom…so they’re not just a coach but a resource also, which is so important, I think.”

**Time Availability of Coach**

Time availability and use of the coach was an important factor in coaching which surfaced multiple times through the interviews and observations. Three areas surfaced as important in this theme:

1) Coaches sometimes act as administrators and not teacher support;
2) Effective coaches make time for teachers in multiple ways; and,
3) Coaches follow through with their commitment if assigned to a teacher.

In the focus group interviews and field observation, the lack of time the coach had for teachers due to administrative duties was an issue. For survey respondents who provided written input, it was the lack of time for the coach to complete coaching cycles. The coaches, who teachers discussed as being effective made more time for teachers, were available often outside of class time, would drop anything they were doing to discuss instruction or plan instruction with
requesting teachers, and provide support through their physical presence in classrooms. Comments included,

“Just knowing that she’s there…I know that she’s there. Anytime that I come into her office she’s always ready…”

“With some of them [coaches] it’s like you have to ask and you don’t know if you even want to ask ‘cause you don’t know what kind of reaction you’re going to get and others you can go quite openly and say, “I really need your help can you help me” and they will be there and they will do what you need and not what they think needs to be done…”

The observations in the eastern region revealed that the coach spent more time with some grade levels and not others. Second grade benefitted from the coach’s time as she scheduled multiple opportunities to visit their classrooms. In contrast, the fifth grade teachers did not feel the coach supported them through time and reported that she rarely, if ever, came into their room to model a lesson.

Teachers showed frustration when the coach was not available to them. This indicates that the teachers interviewed valued the coach and the coach’s role of guidance and help. The frustration over coaching availability is evidenced by comments made by the focus group participants. In some cases, teachers found other people to coach them when their coach was not available.

“When I used to teach in Arizona and my first year there, my coach was never around.” She was in and out. So my coach was actually the teacher next door who I would always go to.”

“I was assigned a coach but she never worked with me that first year. I think she was too busy.”
“A lot of times I’ve seen zero of that person. I’ve seen that person [coach] hide in an office. I’ve also seen a very effective person who will come in and collaboratively build lessons, deliver lessons, talk about what happens afterwards.”

**Expertise of Coach to Disseminate Data**

Participants discussed the role of the coach in helping them with these data. The duties of the coach in regards to working with teachers and data included:

1) Providing organized data for grade levels to examine;
2) Preparing data for professional team meetings, such as professional learning communities;
3) Helping teachers read data reports; and,
4) Facilitating discussions around teaching practices based on these data.

When teachers and coaches discussed these data, all individuals expressed the need to examine these data and improve instruction to meet student needs, but most of all to raise test scores. Teachers who had coaches who helped them in the data discussion points listed above were more positive about the use of data to improve student learning rather than only to focus on state testing. Teachers felt the latter issue was not helpful to them as teachers and that they were to have data discussions only because it was mandated from above by an administrator. On the other hand, teachers discussed data discussions positively if the discussions helped them understand the learning needs of their students.

“We also analyze test data and sometimes there is a group time … when there is someone in the building that is leading.”

“…she wasn’t just saying, they’re having a data team meeting (which we have now) and you know sometimes they’re just so contrite. She was actually collecting data with her frequent visits to the classroom.”
“Coaching has helped me with these data; having the data available. Without me having to go and gather it myself, the coach has it there for me. It makes it easier for me to look at the data and decide what I need to do …”

**Focus of Coaching Work in Schools**

Teachers discussed the work of the coach in schools, the focus on student achievement or the pressure to raise test scores, but an interesting idea surfaced as the true work of coaching work in schools. This emergent theme is *side-by-side* work. Being side-by-side was an emergent theme in multiple teacher comments, and coach comments from the interviews and the observations. This theme of the coach sitting side-by-side with the classroom teacher was present in multiple interviews. Sitting side-by-side could be defined from the transcripts and observations as coaches and teachers having:

1) Opportunities to learn something new together;

2) Reflecting on what is occurring during instruction openly;

3) Cooperation and teamwork; and,

4) Being equals.

It appears that when a coach makes himself or herself vulnerable and available to the teachers as a learner and as a colleague, they teach alongside the teacher, rather than being an authority figure. The second grade teachers in the eastern region felt their coach was *side-by-side* with them as they implemented a change in their reading workshop. The two teachers specifically stated, “I feel supported”, and “She is right there with me.” The interviews also revealed the importance of the coach being supportive and *side-by-side*.

“… I think the biggest thing is having somebody with expertise who knows the students, to sit *side-by-side* and take a look at what instruction looks like and help them [teachers] be reflective.”
“She is willing to work side-by-side with us to get done what’s best for kids.”

Sitting side-by-side appears to be a symbolic action of respect, care and equality. Teachers want their coaches to be equal with them and not above them. They appear to be willing to learn and try new instructional practices with a real person beside them and not a perfect person who will judge their teachers. They appear to need someone who encourages and accepts them as they are. Therefore, the action of sitting side-by-side makes the coach vulnerable to the teacher and the experience of coaching as well. One teacher stated “I don’t feel like she was the boss and she was in charge. She had an attitude of cooperating with us. For example, if she came in for a writing workshop she would actually sit down with the kids and helps them with their writing while I was going around and working with the kids also.” Another person described this as, “One of the things [coach] has done for me is the infinite amount of patience she has for me ‘cause we are adults, but were just like kids. We learn in different ways, some are slower and some are faster and I just happen to be one of those with a hard head. It takes me much longer to keep in my head [new information] and she doesn’t get upset or angry. She has the patience that helped us grow, and which we have. We have grown a lot.”

Coaches had a similar perspective about sitting side-by-side with teachers. It appeared that this form of guidance was powerful also for the coach. One coach described it as, “So I think the coaching, especially if you have the opportunity to coach the teacher side-by-side at the beginning to learn something new and then have those opportunities to stand back and reflect, I think it has great impact on driving instruction forward in positive ways.”
Summary of Qualitative Research

Coaching overall for all respondents was a positive activity and concept. While the teachers responded well to the idea of coaching, and how coaching could impact their professional lives, all participants did have concerns about the focus of coaches assigned to individual schools. It appears that coaches are often given administrative type duties in addition to their coaching responsibilities and this reduces the time they have available for coaching teachers. This was a concern to the teachers as many of them stated it impacted the time the coach had to devote to the teaching staff, and as recorded previously, effective coaches are in high demand by the teachers they work with.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION/SUMMARY/CONCLUSION

Introduction

Gaining insight into how coaching impacts academic optimism, teacher efficacy and student achievement was the focus of this study. The necessity for this empirical study was apparent as limited research on the construct of teacher academic optimism was available, and the inquiry into coaching on student achievement is imperative in this economic and political atmosphere where the public is demanding greater results from public education with fewer monies available.

An examination of the results determined if the study supports the constructs as proposed in the literature regarding change, professional development for teachers and impact of teacher ability on student achievement.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to investigate the connections between academic optimism, teacher efficacy, student achievement and professional development through coaching. The identification of the effect of embedded, personal professional development through coaching on teachers’ academic optimism and efficacy provides insight into school change and inform current practices, which includes increased accountability for teacher evaluation. The identification of possible connections between coaching and teacher academic optimism and teacher efficacy provides insight into high quality professional development structures. These connections were analyzed against student achievement data to understand any significance that exists between coaching, teacher self-perceptions and student achievement.
**Research Questions**

RQ1. Is academic optimism higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ2. Is teacher efficacy higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ3. Is student achievement higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached?

RQ4. Do teacher efficacy, trust in students and parents, academic emphasis and the presence of coaching predict student achievement?

RQ5. Do different coaching experiences predict student achievement?

RQ6. Is there a difference in teacher efficacy between teachers with different levels of coaching experiences?

RQ7. Is there a difference in student achievement between teachers with different levels of coaching experiences?

RQ8. What was coaching like and why did it make a difference?

**Summary of Findings**

Multiple analyses were conducted to answer research questions one through seven. The question number, variables, statistical tests completed, and results are displayed in Table 31. The results for each question are discussed briefly in this section.

A *t*-test was conducted to explore the first research question, which asked whether individual academic optimism is higher for teachers who are coached than for teachers who are not coached. The *t*-test showed no significant difference between coached and not coached groups on academic optimism. The analysis differed from the research by Hoy et al. (2008) on academic optimism as a new construct at the teacher level.
Table 31.

Summary of Research Questions and Statistical Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher Academic Optimism</td>
<td>Presence of Coaching</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>Not Significant $p = .71$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>Presence of Coaching</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>Not Significant $p = .32$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>Presence of Coaching</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>Significant $p = .02$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>Teacher Efficacy, Trust Parents/Students, Academic Emphasis, and Coaching</td>
<td>Multiple Regression Analysis</td>
<td>Model Significant $p = &lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trust ($p = .02$) Coaching ($p = .01$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Teacher Academic Optimism</td>
<td>12 Measures of Coaching (questions)</td>
<td>Multiple Regression Analysis</td>
<td>Model Not Significant $p = .06$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 36 ($p = .02$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>12 Measures of Coaching (questions)</td>
<td>Multiple Regression Analysis</td>
<td>Model Not Significant $p = .09$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 36 ($p = .01$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>Teacher Trust in Parents and Students</td>
<td>12 Measures of Coaching (questions)</td>
<td>Multiple Regression Analysis</td>
<td>Model Not Significant $p = .06$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31 (cont).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td>Teacher Academic Emphasis</td>
<td>12 Measures of Coaching (questions)</td>
<td>Multiple Regression Analysis</td>
<td>Model Significant $p = .02$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>Levels of Coaching</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>Not Significant $P = .51$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>Levels of Coaching</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>Significant $p = .01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second research question explored the difference between those who were coached and not coached on teacher efficacy. The $t$-test showed no significant relationship for presence of coaching on teacher efficacy.

The third research question explored whether student achievement was different depending of presence of coaching. In this analysis student achievement was significantly higher for teachers who were coached.

Research question 4 asked whether student achievement is affected by teacher efficacy, trust, academic emphasis and presence of coaching. A multiple regression was conducted to answer this question. In this analysis the overall model was significant, and the variables of teacher trust in parents and students and coaching significantly predicted student achievement.

For research question 5, to detect the impact of quality and quantity of coaching on teacher academic optimism, teacher efficacy, teacher trust and academic emphasis, a series of regression analyses were conducted. Only the model for teacher academic emphasis was significantly predicted by coaching variables, though none of the independent variables was significant. The models
for teacher academic optimism, and teacher efficacy were not significant though the question, teachers’ belief that coaching affects student achievement (question 36), was a significant predictor for teacher academic optimism and teacher efficacy.

The sixth research question investigated the differences in teacher efficacy by the five levels of coaching experiences. A one-way ANOVA was conducted and the findings were not significant, indicating that teacher efficacy for the participants was similar for all levels of coaching and for uncoached teachers.

For research question 7, to detect the impact of the five levels of coaching on student achievement, a one-way ANOVA was conducted and revealed that student achievement differed by levels of coaching. The pairwise comparisons indicate that there was no significant difference between teachers who were never coached and teachers who were coached daily on student achievement results. Teachers who were never coached had lower student achievement than either teachers who were coached once per month or coached twice per month. On the other end of the scale, teachers who were coached daily had lower student achievement than teachers coached once or twice a month. This reinforces findings in the literature, which indicated that teachers who are coached have higher student achievement by school (Joyce & Showers, 2002). Additionally, these findings reveal an interesting perspective about what makes coaching effective and ineffective, particularly how too much coaching may not be effective professional development.

The eighth research question was qualitative and explored what the coaching experience was like and how it made a difference. The qualitative results indicate trends in several areas including the people skills of the coach, the match of the personality of the coach to the teacher, the ability of the coach to focus on
the personal development of each teacher versus rote implementation of programs, the amount of time the coach was available to teach teachers, and the focus of the coaching work in each school, including the lack of opportunity for the coach to complete coaching cycles.

**Discussion of Findings**

The findings of this study offer insight to school districts’ planning effective professional development for teachers and the impact of that professional development on student achievement. Professional development through coaching is significantly related to teacher efficacy, student achievement and teacher academic emphasis. Coaching is also related to teachers’ belief that coaching increases their ability to impact student achievement.

The study indicates that academic optimism is not significantly different by the presence of teacher coaching. This means that teachers who are coached do not have higher or lower means compared to teachers not coached, on the survey items measuring teacher academic optimism. Since academic optimism at the teacher level is a new construct, confirmed by the Beard et al. study (2010), extensive research on variables that affect teacher academic optimism has not been conducted. It appears from this study, with a smaller sample size and a sample developed from volunteers, that academic optimism is not affected by coaching as professional development.

Additionally, teacher efficacy was not found to be significantly different for or related to the presence of coaching. Berman et al. (1977) defined teacher efficacy as “the extent to which the teacher believes he can affect student achievement” (p. 137). While the construct of teacher efficacy was conceived in literature in 1976, it appears in this study that teacher efficacy is also not affected by coaching.
Based on qualitative data results, it appears that teacher efficacy may be positively affected by other variables. For example, this finding might indicate that the teachers in the sample had experienced positive professional relationships and learning opportunities which positively developed their belief in themselves to teach well. One of these positive relationships could be the coaching relationship and fit with the coach. Additionally, it could also indicate, as the research by Ross and Bruce (2007a) showed, teachers with higher teacher efficacy have a higher propensity to try new teaching methods and professional development methods. Coaching could be considered a new, innovative method. Teachers with high belief in their abilities may not require as much follow-up coaching as teachers without high beliefs in their teaching abilities. This finding is similar to the findings in the study by Tschannen-Moran and McMaster in 2009, which outlined the complexities of raising teacher efficacy.

While coaching was not significantly related to teacher academic optimism and teacher efficacy, it was significantly related to student achievement. Student achievement is higher in the presence of coaching. The relationship between coaching and student achievement has importance for the daily actions of school districts planning professional development opportunities and for teachers, districts can plan coaching as a way to help teachers positively impact student achievement. In this study, higher student achievement was defined by positive change in AYP results over a three-year time period. Student achievement was higher for coached teachers. Although change was not measured in this study, this finding may relate to Prochaska et al.’s, discussion of stages of change (2001). Perhaps teachers who are coached move through the stages of change and do not remain in the Contemplation stage as do up to 40% of most organizations’ populations do. If a teacher moves beyond the Contemplation stage, to
Implementation, they would be more likely to implement teaching methods which positively affect student achievement.

Findings indicate that teachers who are coached once or twice per month have higher student achievement as determined by school level measures. This finding is similar to Shidler’s findings in 2009 regarding teacher efficacy and student achievement. Shidler found that more specific coaching was related to higher student achievement than less specific coaching. The qualitative findings support Shidlers’ findings. Teachers discussed the amount of coaching they receive and stated that a coach who was ‘coaching too much’ seemed ineffective as they did not clearly focus their coaching goals and their actions became diffuse. It could be that teachers coached daily receive abundant and diverse feedback daily from the coach which makes it less likely for specificity in coaching to occur.

Terehoff (2002) stated that effective professional development for adults is not subject focused, but problem or performance focused. This finding is interesting in that it shows that teachers who need, or receive, daily coaching do not perceive they are more effective than those who receive no coaching at all. Terehoff stated that adults need to know why they are learning something and be treated by others as capable of self-direction. The quantitative and qualitative results indicate that daily coaching is less effective; this finding might be related to Terehoff’s findings that teachers coached daily do not perceive that the coach feels they are capable of self-direction due to the less amount of time that exists in-between coaching sessions for self-direction.

While significant results were not found for the presence of coaching on teacher academic optimism, or between the levels and type of coaching and teacher academic emphasis, significant findings were found between teacher
academic optimism and teacher efficacy for one question on the survey asking whether teachers believe coaching impacts student achievement. It is clear that teachers believe that coaching helps to increase student achievement. This finding relates to Bandura’s theory of triadic responsibility, where reciprocal determinism includes the personal factors of cognition, behavior, and environment (Bandura, 1986). In other words, what we believe in determines what we perceive. The findings of this study reinforce this theory in that teachers who were coached believed that the coaching helped them increase student achievement.

This study focused on teachers across the country; however, a larger sample of teachers responded from a school district in California, a region in South Carolina and two districts in New Mexico who serve diverse populations including students of poverty. Goodwin (2000) pointed out that a clear pattern exists that students from poverty backgrounds achieve lower levels in school performance than students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds. For these schools and regions, comprehensive professional development as coaching may not be sufficient to meet the complex demands of raising student achievement. However, both qualitative and quantitative results indicate that coaching matters and does impact change in student achievement. Perhaps what appears most important was the ability of the coach to focus on adult development and build relationships with teachers which strike a balance between individual teacher growth needs and initiative implementation. This supports the seminal research conducted by Showers (1984) who stated:

Teachers vary widely in their need for support and encouragement as they attempt to integrate new teaching behaviors into their existing repertoires. As a coach, it is wise to respond to teacher cues in providing support. If teachers express anxiety, disappoint and/or frustration with the process, the coach responds with reassurance, encouragement, suggestions, and offers of help. (p. 89)
Impact of Research

The findings of this study could possibly impact professional development occurring in school districts as districts continue to use shrinking resources effectively. The results indicate that coaching does matter for teachers and their belief that it helps them improve student achievement. Additionally, it appears that the amount and type of coaching an individual receives is important to the success of coaching as a professional development model. Because the ability of the coach to focus on adult development and build relationships with teachers is important, school districts using a coaching model may need to decide upon coach selection criteria, and a coach-teacher matching process. It appears from the results of the study that it is important to focus coaching on meeting the needs of the teacher. Teachers involved in coaching that focused on their individual growth needs may have more positive coaching experiences which ultimately affects student achievement.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study examined coaching as a professional development method for teachers and the effects of coaching on teacher academic optimism, teacher efficacy and student achievement. This study was based on implications for future research discussed in the literature about the relationship between high quality professional development as coaching and its effects on student achievement. Additionally, the literature called for further research to validate the new construct of teacher academic optimism, which was first researched through an empirical study in 2008. The results of this study also suggest some areas for future research.

One area for further examination is connecting teacher self-perception of teacher academic optimism and teacher efficacy to the teacher level, state test
scores. Examining school and teacher level data based on their specific state assessments to determine impact of coaching, if any, on individual student achievement of students assigned to teachers who have received coaching is needed. This study examined student achievement as a variable of the AYP as reported publically the NCLB edicts. This broad examination of these data makes it impossible to consider individual or group teacher effects on student achievement based on the quantity and quality of coaching the teachers received.

In addition to measurement of student achievement results at the teacher level, evaluating the effectiveness of a coaching initiative over time would be informative to the literature on coaching as a high quality professional development initiative. Examining the logistics and quality of a coaching initiative implementation in relationship to teacher level data in a multiyear study could inform professional development and change practices adopted by school districts in need of improving, or sustaining, student achievement, which are nearly all districts in the United States.

The coaching cycle consists of five actions: pre-observation conference, co-teaching where the coach demonstrates a teacher method or strategy, a post-observation conference, then a repeat of the cycle including a pre-conference, co-teaching where the teacher teaches and the coach observes and a post-observation conference. Both the qualitative and quantitative measures of this study revealed the limited time that the coach or the teacher spent in the coaching cycle as a development tool to improve the teacher’s practice. Further measuring the impact of coaching through the elements of the coaching cycle on teachers’ efficacy and academic optimism could provide insight into which coaching cycle activities that coaches and teachers participate in are most helpful in developing teacher efficacy and teacher academic optimism.
Limited research has been done regarding the relationships between the self-perceptions of academic optimism and teacher efficacy of teachers with the achievement of students, or how these constructs function for teachers who have not received coaching compared to teachers who received coaching. This study has added to this limited body of research. However, this study focused only on teachers in grades 3 through 6. Repeating this study with teachers in grades Kindergarten through grade 2 would further add insight to this research area. Additionally, understanding the impact of coaching on secondary teachers and examining if any relationship exists between coaching and student achievement for older students near graduation from the school system would be impactful for high schools involved in reform. Likewise, discovering what the impact of coaching on teacher academic optimism and teacher efficacy in secondary schools where teachers work in groups delineated by departments would be an interesting addition to the literature on high quality professional development.

Understanding the individual teacher’s need to improve performance and the relationship between amount of coaching the teacher receives and subsequent student achievement outcomes is another area for research. The post hoc analysis indicated a pairwise connection between the amount of coaching a person receives and subsequent student achievement at the school level. Teachers receiving no coaching or daily coaching have lower student achievement results and developing further understanding about this phenomena could be explored.

The qualitative results suggested another area for further research. There appears to be a connection between the selection of the coach and the training of the coach to best support classroom teachers. One theme that emerged from the qualitative results was the coach sitting side-by-side with the teacher. What side-by-side support looks like, how it can be effective and what actions should be
taken to increase the likelihood that side-by-side support occurs would be helpful in understanding effective professional development opportunities for teachers through coaching.

**Conclusion**

The quantitative and qualitative results suggest that coaching is an effective means of professional development for teachers, which supports research by Joyce and Showers seminal work in 1984. The findings of this study suggest optimal coaching situations, including the number of times a teacher is coached in a given time period, and the match between the personality of the coach and of the teacher. Additionally, coaching is positively related to student achievement and appears to reinforce teacher belief in their ability to increase student achievement. The empirical results of this study support the theory in that a teacher who has received more coaching than other teachers has statistically significant positive changes in student achievement. Additionally, teachers who have been coached believe that they affect student achievement at a greater rate than teachers who are not coached. This phenomenon is supported by theory as well as by the empirical results of this study. Research shows that teachers who receive high quality professional development, including coaching, have higher teacher efficacy and therefore believe that they have a positive impact on learning of their students (Joyce & Showers, 1995, 2002).

**Impact**

Teacher efficacy, framed by social cognitive theory, is a construct related to self-efficacy. While the empirical results did not support the relationship of coaching effecting teacher efficacy, the qualitative results do support the concept that coaching increases teacher efficacy. The change process and the effect of
adult learning theory within the change process were discussed as related to teacher professional development. Overall, the results of this study indicate that coaching by a peer, administrator or designated coach has a positive impact on a teacher’s ability and belief that they can impact student learning in a positive way.
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APPENDIX A: SAMPLE CONSENT LETTER

Dear Teacher Participant,

You are invited to participate in a study conducted by Nancy Akhavan, a doctoral candidate at California State University Fresno. We hope to learn how teacher efficacy, teacher academic optimism, and student achievement are affected by professional development, particularly coaching.

If you decide to participate, you will be interviewed in a small group to describe your teaching experiences. The focus of the group interview is to understand how coaching has affected your teaching practices. It will last approximately one hour and be held in your school district. If you choose to participate in the small group interview, you will be contacted by telephone. The interview will be taped and if you choose to participate in the interview, you are giving permission to be taped.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. If you give us your permission by signing this document, all information will remain anonymous and will only be reported through statistical analysis.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep.

YOU ARE MAKING A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO PARTICIPATE. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICIPATE, HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE.

Date

Signature

Signature of Witness (if any)

Signature of Investigator

If you choose to participate, you will receive an assortment of professional development books for a teacher library.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your future relations with California State University, Fresno. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation at any time without penalty. The Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects at California State University, Fresno has reviewed and approved the present research.
APPENDIX B: TEACHER SURVEY

Teachers’ Self Perception of Coaching, Efficacy and Academic Optimism Scale

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of how professional development promotes success for teachers in their classrooms. There are no right or wrong answers.

Your answers will not be reported on an individual basis. Please answer each of the questions based on your experience as a teacher.

Directions: Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by choosing the appropriate response.

---

Page 1 - Question 1 - Open Ended - One Line

How many years have you taught?

---

Page 1 - Question 2 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

In what type of area do you teach?

- Rural
- Urban
- Suburban
- Other, please specify

---

Page 1 - Question 3 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate your gender.

- Female
- Male

---

Page 1 - Question 4 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate your ethnicity.

- African American
- Asian
- Caucasian
- Hispanic
○ Native American
○ Other

Page 1 - Question 5 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)
Please indicate your grade level assignment in the 2009-10 school year.

○ Grade 3
○ Grade 4
○ Grade 5
○ Grade 6
○ Combination, please specify

Page 1 - Question 6 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)
To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 1 - Question 7 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)
To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 1 - Question 8 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)
To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 1 - Question 9 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)
How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 1 - Question 10 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)
How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in your classroom?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 1 - Question 11 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)
How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal
Page 1 - Question 12 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 1 - Question 13 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 1 - Question 14 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 1 - Question 15 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

How much can you do to help your students value learning?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 1 - Question 16 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 1 - Question 17 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

How much can you do to assist families in helping their children do well in school?

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

Page 2 - Heading

Part 2

Directions: Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by choosing the appropriate response.

Page 2 - Question 18 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I trust my students.

Strongly Disagree  2  3  4  5  Strongly Agree

Nothing  Very Little  Some Influence  Quite A Bit  A Great Deal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I trust the parents of my students.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree: 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ parents are reliable in their commitments.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree: 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my students are competent learners.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree: 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that most of my students’ parents do a good job raising their children.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree: 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students respect their classmates who get good grades.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree: 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students are cooperative during classroom instruction.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree: 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students seek extra work so they can get good grades.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree: 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in my classroom can achieve the goals that I set for them.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree: 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree: 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My students' parents press for classroom improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My students' parents exert pressure to maintain high academic standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3  You are close to the end of the survey. This section has five questions.
Directions: Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by choosing the appropriate response.

I have been coached by a peer, colleague, administrator, or assigned coach during the 2009-2010 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your answer is never, please skip to question 42. If your answer is yes, please continue to question 30.

How often did you plan instruction with your coach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often did the coach come to your classroom to model?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often did the coach watch you teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often did the coach reflect with you on your teaching?

- Never
- Once per month
- Twice per month
- Once per week
- More than once per week

To what degree has coaching changed your teaching?

- Not At All
- Somewhat
- A Lot
- A Great Deal
- Not Applicable

To what degree has coaching helped you become more confident as a teacher?

- Not At All
- Somewhat
- A Lot
- A Great Deal
- Not Applicable

Through coaching, to what degree have you improved student learning?

- Not At All
- Somewhat
- A Lot
- A Great Deal
- Not Applicable

To what degree did you plan instruction with your coach?

- Not At All
- Somewhat
- A Lot
- A Great Deal
- Not Applicable

To what degree did you watch the coach model teaching?

- Not At All
- Somewhat
- A Lot
- A Great Deal
- Not Applicable

To what degree did the coach watch you teach?

- Not Applicable
- Not At All
- Somewhat
- A Lot
- A Great Deal
Page 3 - Question 40 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

To what degree did you have a debriefing conference with the coach after teaching?

- Not At All
- Somewhat
- A Lot
- A Great Deal
- Not Applicable

Page 3 - Question 41 - Open Ended - Comments Box

INSTRUCTIONS - Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by writing your answer.

How did coaching impact you as a teacher?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Page 3 - Heading

Question 42 and 43 will be used for demographic information only. Your answers will not be reported on an individual basis.

Page 3 - Question 42 - Open Ended - One Line

Name of School

Page 3 - Question 43 - Open Ended - One Line

State where school is located.
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APPENDIX C: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW, CENTRAL UNITED STATES
FEBRUARY 2011

All names of interviewees have been changed.

Interviewer was Nancy Akhavan.

Nancy
In our email conversation you mention that you know that coaching goes on in the district for mentoring teachers?
Isabel
Yes I know that they do for reading and math. Peer coaching they call it and I don’t think it’s just restricted to the mentoring. Teachers who have been there for years that are seasoned educators are using this peer coaching model. I have not been fortunate enough to hear about it because it doesn’t happen in ESL. These are classroom teachers who are observed. They take turns. The third grade teachers will go today and all the third grade teachers have substitutes for their class. They will all go into a class and watch a teacher teach math and then will rotate and go into the next classroom and watch a lesson and the next one and they will then all go with the district leader, her position with the district and evaluate each other and make suggestions and comments. No one is one boss overseeing evaluators. They are all coaching each other. So that’s what’s happening in both reading and math.
Nancy
Do they do anything for you as an ESL teacher to support you?
Isabel
No, we don’t have a model of ESL teachers viewing each other’s work and coaching each other. Probably because we are not in the same building. It would be a little more disruptive to the general schedule, to have us travel city wide and all to sit in one room, my room which is 5 X 9 ft so this has not been suggested or possibly funded to set the start in ESL.
Nancy
But it could be a possibility.
Isabel
Maybe
Nancy
Have you had any opportunity to work with any teacher at least informally? Maybe someone that is not part of the program, maybe you and another teacher to plan and work together?
Isabel
Yes, but mostly it is just one way. She doesn’t make suggestions to me of how to teach ESL but for my students classroom teachers, yes, I meet with them during this collaboration time that we have weekly. And to cover my four schools I try to vary which collaboration time I go to. To sit in on their grade level meetings to get to know
what they’re doing in the classroom so I can better support those ESL students in that grade level with the goals and the things that are going on in their classrooms. Before we had this time, nothing was really clarified. If you could catch them in the hallways to find out what they were doing or needed help in. So this has been a great help. The professional learning community has created and our weekly collaboration time. To find out what they need help with and support them with what they are struggling with.

Nancy
So in a way the PLC becomes for you an opportunity to mentor and work with one another.

Isabel
Yes, that’s part of it. We also analyze test data and sometimes there is group time where we don’t get to talk to each other. There is something for the whole group, where there is someone in the building that is leading and it’s not conferring with each other.

Nancy
How long is granted for this.

Isabel
It’s on Wednesdays, I would say 2:30 – 2:57. We really have to watch the clock as there is piano or later.

Nancy
I understand that. You say you serve four different schools so you rotate between four different schools during the month?

Isabel
Yes, right. It’s very flexible as one school might have a very small amount of ESL population and another might have many more so I go there more often.

Nancy
I see. How many teachers do you collaborate with at each school?

Isabel
My students, I have 36 as I just did report cards. Sometimes there are 2 students in a room. I work with 30 teachers in the district over four schools.

Nancy
So in a way it is almost an opportunity for you to hear a coach or peer mentor than the classroom teachers.

Isabel
That is right because they can do some adapting in their room cause they have the students more time. I only see them 2-3 hours per a week. If their beginners, three and the rest of the time they are educated by the classroom teacher. So one of them I worked with and explained to her how she could adapt a test in a unit on a light shadow and showed her how she could allow him to show his understanding through a picture but you have to rewrite the test a little. A lot of times I will ask the teachers will do that and it’s wonderful if they will. They are kind of asking the same thing. In a simpler language. I point out to them complexities of questions to simplify and then allows them to draw to express themselves where they can connect matching phrases where they don’t have to prove through a grammatical phrase. It’s there but they have to know how to connect it on what’s happening. Now if they didn’t differentiate during their teaching the students
Nancy would still have trouble doing this during the test. Now I’m told to differentiate during the test and it would be the same for the teaching.

Nancy

That’s interesting. Now do you, it sounds like you value these collaborations. What do you value most about them?

Isabel

I guess hearing exactly what the student is doing in the classroom and what his particular challenges are and what is planned for next so I can plan ahead and support the classroom education in the ESL time. That has not been done and never had any time to talk to them. I would just teach good ESL lessons but I wasn’t that sure I was supporting the students very well cause we just couldn’t communicate all that information to that many people. So now there is a much better job of that going on.

Nancy

Do you have any ESL teacher meetings where all of you get together?

Isabel

Yes, last year once a month and this year twice a month, we have a PLC together. One of them is just split to just elementary and the other to middle and high and the other is everyone together providing a time where we can provide a time when we can coordinate our instruction city wide so that we can connect and just depending on emails. There was someone might be doing a lot of this and someone might be teaching lot of that. And also, we didn’t get to share successes and so now often we’re sharing things. Even the record keeping; look what I made for report cards; look how I used these MAP scores for a better effect on my progress; the computerized test that the district uses three times a year. Look how I log the students’ progress, log when they are high and low and I also use the template so other people can go, oh great now I see exactly what they need to work on. Um so this couldn’t be happening at our site before.

Nancy

So it sounds like when you come together for the teacher ESL PLC they’re really driven and directed by the participants maybe not by someone that’s just presenting?

Isabel

Right; and I think last year there was a set scene. What you are to discuss, what to make sure you are talking about, to document it here, and this year it’s a little relaxed. You talk about what you need to talk about and I think in that you built trust together in a professional and learning community. Administration and teachers included. We are given more freedom to choose the topics we need to look at. I really appreciate that.

Nancy

That’s good. Obviously that part of the meeting works very well for you in that where there’s a group of teachers are really coaching and mentoring one another to find things that work for students. I was going to ask you. How do you identify with the other teachers. You know, sometimes you get a group in a PLC and if there is not good identification like their teaching background or their years of experience, so I was wondering; do you have a group to work with that you could identify with personally?

Isabel

Well, I sit in on all kinds of different groups that I mentioned. I might have third grade and some schools that I sit in but often more like if someone didn’t go to school that day I
will try and touch bases with all of the grade levels where I have students for at least a portion of the time but I won’t get to sit in on everyone’s group the whole year and I might go to ESL group twice a month and three grade level meetings. And it kind of depends on personality. Some teachers are very willing to receive suggestions and collaborate with according to their ESL students. Others if I am in a PLC meeting but the grade level and I only have one child in that grade and they are there to talk about their district ready assessments, I might sit back a little and just kind of listen to find out what is happening in that grade level and think on my own; on how can I be supportive. Then later I might talk to that one particular classroom teacher about that one student. It wouldn’t concern the others although they might have ESL students the next year and its good for everybody to have them adapting things for them.

Nancy
One last question over all. Thinking of your work when you go to schools on Wednesdays or when you go to your ESL meetings. What is something that can be done differently to support you?

Isabel
Well, let me think, what could be done differently to support me? Just in the PLC meetings?

Nancy
Anything you could think of when they come to you.

Isabel
Two years ago I would have said: it’s too controlled. Now we are free to talk about what we need to talk about. I think we are at a very good place but I imagine it would need an adjustment.

Nancy
What I am trying to do in this research is make suggestions, that perhaps, but what you’re telling me is that they have already made the adjustments. I would need to make sure and write that it works better for people when you have the freedom the freedom to discuss what you want to discuss.

Isabel
Yes, I think they have definitely made some adjustments that are very helpful.

Nancy
Well it’s helpful for me because there are many people that I have been talking to and some are still involved in mentoring situations that are more controlling. That does help me hear about this because you’ve experienced the change.

Isabel
Yeah

Nancy
Having said that, before we end today is there anything you feel you would like to add?

Isabel
I don’t think so. Just because I am not in the Peer Coaching time, I don’t feel left out in the district and I don’t feel left out with other professionals and it is being provided.
Okay. Now before we hang up, I wanted to thank you so much for your time and your help and I am just wondering, I remember when we talked and I couldn’t remember if you had the vocabulary book. I was trying to decide which book would be best for you.

Isabel

Oh I don’t have the vocabulary book.

Nancy

Then I will send you the vocabulary book. I wanted to send you something that would help you with your teaching.

Isabel

Thank you very much, I appreciate anything that you would send my way.

Nancy

I will, and I want to wish you the best of luck on your own research with your masters degree.

Isabel

Well thank you very much. I appreciate being able to help.

Nancy

Thank you very much Isabel.

*Interview Ended*
FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW, SOUTH UNITED STATES
MARCH 2011

All names of interviewees have been changed.

Interviewer was Nancy Akhavan.

Nancy
You can go ahead now and tell me your names.
Sandra
Nancy
Nice to meet you Sandra.
Sandra
You too.
I’m Suzanne
Nancy
Nice to meet you Suzanne.
Karen
Nancy
Say your first name again.
Karen
Nancy
Karen, nice to meet you.
Ruby
Nancy
Hi Ruby, nice to meet you.
Ruby
Nice to meet you.
And then you have me, Heather.
Nancy
Well thank you so much and as I said, you guys, you’re helping me out tremendously. I feel kind of odd because many of the across the country interviews I’ve done, people have been to a session. Um, so, you know I appreciate this so much and you haven’t been to one of my sessions but because of your time today, you will be receiving one of my books.
All
Thank you.
Nancy
Heather, I’m going to send them to you. Would that be okay?
Heather
That will be fine.
Nancy
Okay, we have about seven formal questions today, but I might ask a few other questions. Just for some depth or deeper understanding. Okay?

All

Okay

Nancy

And I find it easier if when you respond, you could say your first name for me ’cause that just helps me track who said what and when.

All

Okay.

Nancy

So the first question is, how has coaching changed your teaching and Heather you can answer it from the a side of being a provider. Okay?

Heather

Okay

Nancy

’Cause you are a provider, right? A coaching provider?

Heather

Yeah, I am a coach, uh huh.

Nancy

Okay, so how has coaching changed your teaching?

Karen

I will try and start. I would say coaching has made me be a little bit more thoughtful and reflective as far as the follow up sessions after either a training or a demonstration lesson. Um, you know, how would you use this or what could you do this differently next time. So I would say a major um, benefit to me has been the reflection after the teaching or the learning on the part of the coaches.

Nancy

Okay

Sandra

I would say the reflective piece is certainly a biggie for me also, but um, returning to the data has been, I think coaching has helped me to pick up the data more often and try and make certain that I’m doing the differentiation piece. Um, I think that’s one of the biggest things that coaching has helped me with; look at the data on a more regular basis and regroup.

Nancy

So by regroup, you mean, um, regroup for your instruction?

Sandra

Right. You know, more like kids around more, like groups more.

Nancy

Got it; I didn’t want to make any assumptions so I thought I’d ask you.

Suzanne
Coaching has helped me with these data; having the data available. Without me having to go and gather it myself, the coach has it there for me. It makes it easier for me to look at the data and decide what I need to do and also the coach has made available specific things that we need to work on and she provides information, books and strategies. That has been very helpful.

Nancy
Okay
Ruby
I agree with all the others but it has also helped me to change my teaching. It showed me different ways of using the many lessons and using more literature in my reading and the way I use to group the kids and the way I group the kids now. So it has completely opened me up to new ideas on how I teach reading.

Nancy
Okay, go ahead.
Did you want to add anything Ruby?
Ruby
No, that’s it.
Nancy
Okay, that’s fine. Heather.
Heather
Yes
Nancy
Did you have any thoughts about how coaching or providing coaching has changed your teaching?
Heather
It’s given me a broader perspective of the continual learning that we see from kindergarten you know, up through the grades. I get the opportunity to work with all the different grade levels of teachers so, just to be able to see that, and see that developmental progression, um, and understand what I should be seeing with students you know, at a particular grade level um, that has helped me a lot and I think It’s helped me work with teachers um, at different grade levels because I can kinda tell them where the students are coming from and what they can expect.
Nancy
Okay. Thank you.
Nancy
The next question, so this will be for everybody but Heather this time. What has the coach done or Heather if she’s your coach or if Heather’s not your coach or any other coach. What has the coach done that’s made a difference for you? Now I know they provided these data, things like that but maybe just be a little bit more specific.
Suzanne
The coach has also come in and helped me to get started with lessons. It’s motivating and when she leaves it’s much easier to go about my job.

Nancy
Okay
Sandra
She’s also helped me to set up my library by genres and provided lots of research for us and one of the important things she did is helped me realize the many things I didn’t understand regarding teaching reading and helped me to see that I wasn’t in the shape I was in alone.

Nancy
So you’re thinking. If I was to say, why did that make a difference for you not realizing you were alone; what thoughts do you have about that?
Sandra
Well, when you think you’re alone, you’re embarrassed to ask other people who you think may know. But you’re thinking maybe I’m the only one who doesn’t understand this, you know. So you find out, wow, everybody else is in the same boat you’re in and it was kinda relieving to just realize that I wasn’t the only one who missed something or some foundational piece or something.
Nancy
That’s important. And Suzanne, I forgot to ask you when you said that she comes in; helps you get started with a lesson and when she leaves it’s easier to do the job. So I really understood that, when she came in, why this made a difference for you is when she leaves it was easier for you to do the job but I forgot to ask you if you wanted to add anything else.
Sandra
No, that’s it.
Nancy
Okay, just wanted to follow up. Okay, so for the question again is; what did the coach do that made a difference for you?
Karen
One of the big things that having a literacy coach has done is, she’s been able to narrow our focus a little bit. There’s so much literature both in book form and the internet as well as what teachers are doing in the district and around the country. It’s overwhelming at times, kinda like Orlanda said, realizing that you’re not the only one. But there’s so much good stuff out there and having a coach to kinda go through that and be able to say; hey this is a great book but if you only have five minutes, look at this c Chapter that will really help you. Um, as far as having somebody who knows our strengths and weaknesses as teachers. Kinda like we know our kids and can say; hey this reading strategy will help you become a better reader. The coach who knows me as a teacher has helped in that, she can say, hey, this is an area that you might want to look into. Here’s something good that you could read or follow up with. Sort of, like differentiated instruction for teachers.
Nancy
Okay. Thank you so I think you really answered both of my questions there. It’s making a difference because she’s differentiating for you.

Nancy
Okay, did I miss anybody, Karen, Suzanne, Heather?

Ruby
Ruby
Ruby
Nancy
Ruby, Ruby.
Ruby
That’s alright I’m used to getting left out, no, I’m kidding, I’m kidding.

Nancy
No offense intended.

Ruby
I know, I’m kidding, I know I’m the last one. Um, I have to agree with all of it. She has come in and modeled lessons for writing and for reading and helped me set up centers for third grade which I was used to doing in kindergarten. But, I had never attempted that with an older group so that was very helpful. Um, providing resources, and going to her and saying this is what I want to do. I want to find a good story about making predictions with my class and I like to read out loud and about ten minutes later there is a book on desk. And um, asking her questions and receiving the help. It’s so necessary that we appreciate.

Nancy
And why do you think these things make a difference for you? So you named some things that she does. How did it make you feel?

Ruby
A resource that actually understands what you need and want and knows exactly where to find it and also, like Suzanne said, the time it takes looking into the chapter to finding exactly what we need. She knows it and she can put her fingers on it and she can hand it to us and then we can move on with it.

Nancy
So key is, I’m really hearing from all of you is what’s important is she really knows you as people and she can target your needs individually.

Nancy
Okay, so Heather, I’m gonna slightly change the question for you because I’m wondering if there’s been any time that you’ve been coach by someone even if they didn’t have the title of coach and um, what did that person do that made a difference for you and why did it make a difference for you?

Heather
Um, I have a lot of what I would consider mentor teachers that I go to a lot for just advise. They act as my sounding board. If I have something new, I will try it with them first and just kinda work out the kinks so, to me they give me that kind of
confidence to go back and either try something in a classroom or work with teachers which is part of my professional development. Um, so just acting as a mentor or a sounding board has been a big help to me.

Nancy
Okay, that’s going to take me right into the next question and I’m gonna ask it to you first ‘cause it kinda flows together here and yours is slightly different. So you said that you work with mentor teachers like peer coaches and as a coach. So with the people you work with; how do you identify with them and in what ways?

Heather
Often times its shared experiences. Um, you know we all face challenges everyday and just sharing those out we understand that what may not be the exact same thing, we understand and we can share those experiences and I can learn how they handle things and vice versa.

Nancy
Okay so ladies the question for you is how do you identify with your coach, Heather, and in what – excuse me; how do you identify with Heather and if you do in what ways?

Sandra
If I understand the question right, I feel that I identify with Heather and that I want the best for everyone of the learners and I want to learn everything that I can learn in an effort to help them to understand what they need to understand so that they can do their best. Am I understanding that question right?

Nancy
Yes you are, yes you are, and the research shows that when you’re working with a coach even if it is just a peer coach or peer mentor. If you identify with that person it’s usually a more positive experience then if you don’t identify. Um, but I have talked with many people that don’t identify with their coach. I’m thinking from the beginning of our interview already, you are all telling me you already identify with Heather.

All
Yeah.

Nancy
To make it easier, maybe you can tell me in what ways you identify for her. Sandra, you gave a great answer so I just need to hear from everybody else.

Suzanne
I identify with her because she was a classroom teacher first and we worked together and I didn’t work with her but I knew what she was doing and heard about the things she was doing, so by the time she got to be a coach it was like just having someone you’re comfortable with and working with you.

Nancy
It feels good and supportive huh?

Karen
I agree with what most of these women have said and knowing that Heather was a
teacher here and seeing the things she had done with her kids and hearing about
them in faculty meetings and just conversations in the hallway and realizing that
she knew her stuff when it came to literacy and knowing all the professional
development she sought out on her own and the fact that she was always
approachable. You could just go to her even as a teacher. She and I never taught
on the same grade level; like Suzanne said in different grade levels, but I would
just say hey, I like what I see you doing here, how’d you do it? Can you help me
and she was doing that even as a teacher. You know the role of a coach was not a
stretch for her and it is very comfortable knowing that she knows where I’m
coming from as a teacher.
Nancy
Okay, did I get everybody?
Sandra
I agree with everyone else I was thinking in my head; because she was a teacher
she knows exactly what we’re try to do and what goes on in the classroom so she
doesn’t come across as you could do this or you can’t do it. Everything is realistic
to her. She is just like one of us, not like a person coming in telling us what to do.
She is our co-worker and helping us do these things. Does that make sense?
Nancy
Yes it does. So when you said that she just knows you can do it, it sounds like she
has a belief in you?
Sandra
Oh, she does.
Nancy
That’s definitely making a difference for you?
Sandra
Yes.
Nancy
Okay.
Karen
The fact that she has been in our shoes and also is getting these mandates; that’s
what you had called it from above. It translates between the two. Yes we have
you know. We’ve got in these things so here’s a way we can accomplish together.
Let’s get this started, rather than making it seem overwhelming. There you go,
you have to do this now. Let me know when you’re done.
Nancy
So, she strikes a balance between the mandate and then knowing each one of you
and helping each one of you through differentiation.
Karen
Yes.
Nancy
Anything you want to add about that?
Karen
The only thing I want to say with that, is just working side by side with us. Rather than feeling like she’s quote, unquote, above us. She is willing to work side by side with us to get done for what’s best for kids.
Nancy
Okay, so what leads me to the sixth question and I think you’re flowing right into it so if you want to keep going you can. What is the best thing the coach has done for you?
Karen
Oh dear, um.
Nancy
Karen, I think it was Karen who was the last person talking right?
Karen
Right
Nancy
And Karen was saying that she sits with you side by side and it could be something along that line and it doesn’t have to be a particular activity she did. It could be her way of being.
Karen
I will continue with that like you said. I would agree that that’s it. Knowing that she comes from the same background we had and she is going to help us in any way, whether it was to sit in the classroom with us. Model lessons for us, watch us do it. Find us resources like Ruby mentioned earlier or professional literature. She’s right there beside us. Other than me feeling like, oh, the coach is coming in, it’s a bad thing; I’m gonna get in trouble. But no, she’s coming in; we’ll watch this, we’ll talk about it. It’ll be fine, not intimidating. It’s very much a comforting, welcoming relationship.
Nancy
So, I’ll go to Ruby. Ruby, if you could tell me the best thing Heather’s done; what would you name?
Ruby
Like Karen was saying, and we were saying earlier, feeling comfortable with her coming in and helping us. Feeling free to go to her with any questions, no matter how silly you might feel; you never feel like it was a silly question. She takes everything as important. She follows through on everything that she does and I really appreciate it. I know that this is a thing that she did and I appreciate her coming in and modeling some lessons for me. That was very important to me as well.
Nancy
You can tell me a thing. It’s just that when I asked the question, I could hear the hesitation in all of your voices, so I was trying to open it up for you.
Ruby
I think there are so many things that we weren’t sure which one to exactly pick so I that’s why the hesitation I do believe from all of us that we weren’t sure which to pick. This is Ruby still to narrow in on ‘cause she does so much.
Nancy
So Suzanne, what is the best thing that she’s done?
Suzanne
Be there.
Nancy
That’s good.
Nancy
Sandra, what are you thinking?
Sandra,
I’m thinking, um, like Suzanne said. Just knowing that she’s here for us. She’s one hallway away and organizing this material for us and ordering all the professional development as well as doing the classes with us. Just having that kind of personality, so that we wouldn’t have to feel intimidated. Just knowing that she’s there, even if I don’t come in, I know that she’s there. And dropping everything anytime. Anytime that I come in to her office she’s always ready to do it right then. Regarding her teaching classes with us. She always follows up and says if you need me to come in and show you how to do it I will be there. I can do this. Just this positive attitude that is just tremendous and a major piece for us.
Nancy
So Heather, I’m going to ask you the same question and you can think about it, um, as the coaches or peer mentors you work with. What’s the best thing that somebody or the group has done?
Heather
Um, for me it’s just offering experience that I didn’t necessarily have you know, but if I’d run into something that I hadn’t done before, I can go to my mentors and they can kinda offer suggestions. That helps a lot. Um, the same thing for me; offering up resources and how I can share them with my teachers so, um, just like I said, acting as a sounding board and offering suggestions that I can use and put into practice.
Nancy
Okay, thank you.
The last question I always like to ask; a question that relates to the continuance of improvement process. So maybe Heather, I could start with you. If you could change anything, if you could have your coaches to something different what would it be?
Heather
My coaches do something different or my teachers?
Nancy
Your coaches; the people that coach you or mentor you.

Heather
Um, wow. When I first began the coaching process we met monthly and due to all sort of concerns and budgets and yadi, yadi, yada that was drastically reduced this year and so if I could change that, that is what I would change because that camaraderie and that development that we do, that we take part in together has been really key.

Nancy
Okay, thank you. So, ladies I need you to think the same way. What could Heather have done differently that could help you? And it could be something just like Heather just responded. It could be a problematic issue, not necessarily her as a person, that’s not what I’m asking. I’m just asking in general. If you were to improve it what could be done to improve it?

All
One per grade level?

Nancy
Would it help if you had additional coaches in the building that would be like Heather?

Karen
Probably not, but I’m not sure if that would make a difference but it’s not something necessarily from Heather, but it’s frustrating that the time together as a grade level when we do get to meet during school time is dominated by, I guess I could call it stuff. Paperwork, we’ve got to do this report or we’ve got to discuss this or we go to read this article and it’s coming from somewhere else and not focus on us and what we might need to discuss. Not having time to sit together as a grade level and have some of that planning time or that discussion on, hey, I’m studying inference this week. What have you done well? Or are we meeting this week, might be dominated by this report we got to fill out.

Nancy
Okay, so what I’m hearing is one thing that could be done differently is, if you could drive your grade level meeting time a little bit more?

Karen
Yeah.

Nancy
And that’s something the coach could help you do if you were given that opportunity. I understand that.

Nancy
Any other thoughts or ideas? From anybody?

Sandra
I can’t think of anything.

Nancy
Is there anything that anybody would really like to add that I haven’t asked?
Karen
I don’t think so, I think you hit it earlier when you said about the research showing the sense of comfort and belief in you that makes a difference and I can definitely see that. Um, making a difference between a really good coaching experience which I really think we have here and a more negative one which I’m sure is our district. Just a match between the coach and the people at the school and that belief, that we can do this together.

Nancy
Okay. I thank all of you very, very much for your time.

All
Thank you.
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Nancy
I have you on speaker phone, I’m the only person in the room and I now have us recording with your permission. Can we start by going around and having you tell me your names?
Juana, Ann, Julie, Lynn, Maria
Nancy
It’s good to meet all of you. I don’t know if I met all of you in person before. You actually have met Ms. Juana and Ms. Ann
Nancy
Thank you again for all of your help. I really appreciate this. I don’t know if Julie described this to you but I am in my final throws of gathering my research for my dissertations so thank you so much.
All
You’re welcome
Nancy
Okay I am going to, ah, I have a series of questions but the most important thing is for you to elaborate and give me your thoughts and your answers. And, what might really help me is before you respond or after you respond so you could just say your name so I can kinda track who said what. I just need your first names. And that is to help me track. It’s not for me to write it down and say so and so said this okay?
All
Okay
Nancy
Alright, great, so, we’re um, my dissertation is on coaching and how coaching supports teachers in their efficacy, their academic optimism for students. So that’s what the questions are basically about.
All
Okay

Nancy
Alright, so the first question is, and Julie, I know you’re a coach, so you can respond by from your perspective of how you provide this service okay?
Julie
Okay
Nancy
So the first question is: how has coaching changed your teaching?

Maria
It’s helped me to stay focused. Sometimes you start to wonder off when try to teach kids. Other things pop in. For me, it’s helped me to stay focused on what’s being guided. Whatever the strategy is that we’re working on.

Nancy
Okay
Lynn
I tend to agree with that too, because sometimes you get stuck and you don’t know who, yes, you can go to your peers and everything, but sometimes it’s helpful to have somebody to send you to maybe read a book or maybe even go to different classroom to see how they are teaching that certain strategy. It’s been real beneficial.

Nancy
Okay
Juana
I agree with Lynn and I would like to add that it’s helped me to stay on top of up to date information regarding different ways to teach reading, writing, methodology.

Ann
I think for me, I’ve had both positive and negative experiences with trainers. I’ve had a couple of trainers that made me feel kinda depressed about teaching. Because I felt like they were leading me down the wrong road and giving me misinformation. But then on the other side of it when you have a good trainer it’s made me feel more excited about what I’m doing because I feel like some of my ideas are worthy and the kids are excited about what I’m doing.

Nancy
So, it really depends on the trainer who’s working with you?

Ann
Yes it does.

Nancy
Thank you.

Julie
I think looking at it from the coach’s perspective is that, what I’ve notice for the past six years exactly is that teacher’s don’t begin to understand what data means and how to use that to inform your instruction. So they’re looking at it like, how do I use the data and that usually brings up, how do I implement that data, how do I string this something in my classroom, how do I implement something new, how do take something deeper. So I think the coaching, especially if you have the opportunity to coach teacher side by side at the beginning to learn something new and then have those opportunities to stand back and reflect I think it has great impact on driving instruction forward in a positive way. To be able to try something side by side with a coach for that extra sampling and then that time to reflect and then think about well, this is work, do I need to refine something, um, am I ready to go forward, and so from the coach’s perspective that’s how I would look at it.

Nancy
Okay, thank you. Is that everybody?
Okay, another question I have, so Julie, this question you’ll have to reframe it in your lens but for those of you that are in the classroom and that have been coached; what is it that the coach has done that has made a difference for you?

Lynn
Our coach has come into our classroom and actually seen us in action and also the kids in action and the feedback from both the classroom teacher and the students and there’s been some readjustments of our way of thinking or sometimes there’s like aha’s or like oh, I didn’t know about this. And we just go and, ah, coming in to a classroom gives a whole different meaning to, sometimes what we might be writing on paper or having just a having him watch what the kids do. We conference afterward and then, ah, that’s when some of our best discussion come out.

Nancy
Okay, thank you.

Maria?
What’s helped me is that me is that Julie in this case has helped me interpret the data and get responses. Because I look at some of the student’s responses and I am just horrified and then I say no, no she helped me understand; they’re doing just fine and some of the data really helps us with instruction. So, learning that, I feel like I got some resource. How to, interpret instruction and then go from there.

Nancy
Okay, thank you.

Maria?
But it has been really helpful.

Nancy
Thank you.

Juana
I’d like to add in my situation when I wasn’t sure about I had to see just how to approach it. Julie would step in as my teacher and do the modeling and then I would follow which I found very helpful for me.

Ann
I think for me, when having Julie coming into my class. I didn’t feel like she was the boss and she was in charge. She had an attitude of cooperating us. For example if she came in for a writing workshops she would actually sit down with the kids and help them with their writing while I was going around and working with the kids also. So it was like teamwork, working together. So, I thought that was very positive.

Nancy
Okay.

Julie
I think from my perspective um, I think from my perspective again looking at it from my lens, one of the things that I have found beneficial for myself as a coach and I believe for the teachers is that they’re more willing to take some risks if they know that you’re there.
right beside them. And that you’re vulnerable there with them. You’re not telling them; this is how it’s going to be. It’s like let’s have a go and let’s see what it looks like. When we did a different approach to writer’s workshop some years ago, it was a big aha for the four of us. So we worked side by side trying to implement something from Ann’s workshop that is driven. So I think the opportunity to go in and work side by side or like Ann said in getting to work right along with the students, I learned a lot from being able to work along with the students because then I can confirm with Ann and say, this is what I noticed today during the writer’s workshop. What are you seeing overall of the class? And, it’s another point of these data. It’s nice to look at what the students are able to share out or evidence of their understanding or lack of understanding. So modeling, going in and working side by side with a teacher. It makes a difference. It’s not what we do a report for or finding the text or leading them in the right direction. I think we really have to go in there and work side by side with them because just telling them as I was telling Susan, them isn’t effective.

Nancy
Got it. So you’re leading me to something I hadn’t thought of asking but I’m gonna ask it to you because all of you have hinted to it a little bit. You’ve each mentioned similar but different things, so I’m wondering why did the actions that Julie took or another coach that you might have worked with take. Why did they make a difference for you?

All
Could you reframe the question?

Nancy
Yeah, I’m just probing a little bit deeper. It wasn’t in the planned question but I hear you talking about the fact that, you told me what they did that really made a difference but I’m wondering why. Why did those things make a difference for you? I really heard Julie talk about it; it’s like going in and working side by side and not just telling teachers what to do but teaching alongside them. So, I’m wondering what, the others of you thought.

Person?
I’m gonna ask a clarifying question. Am I hearing you ask, what I did with them as a coach or what another coach did with them in the classroom; how that had an impact?

Nancy
Why it had an impact.

Person?
Got it.

Nancy, are you there? You’re buzzing in and out.

All
We’re here.

Nancy
Okay, and you don’t all have to answer. Julie really gave me a why in her response, so I was wondering if anyone else thought, wow, this is why this made a difference for me.

Ann
I think the reason is because you know you’re working with another person and it’s important enough for Julie to come in and help me so it made me really pleased about
what I was doing a little harder and it made me scrutinize my teaching and try to make it better. So I think that’s why it helped.

Nancy
Okay, anybody else want to respond?
Juana
I think Julie summarized it perfectly. Everything she mentioned is what we do in our classroom. For me it has made me a much better teacher.
Nancy
Okay.
Juana
I’m thinking too, one of the reasons, the why. If we close our doors and we remain anonymous and we have somebody who works alongside of us and ask us those questions. I wonder, hum, what if, or hum, why didn’t we do it that way? The approach if that’s wrong then change it, but it’s like, hum, I wonder if we try this how the students would respond or how the students response look like. But I think, the why is, because somebody is there with them to coach them along. They didn’t just get trained but off you go just happy teaching, so, there is somebody here still that can go again and work alongside of them. I think having somebody there helping them with what and somebody to look at their teaching because one of the things I do is I take notes. If I’m doing an observation, I take notes on student responses so, they get to see and we get to see the why is because we’re working towards something or toward a new implementation but my thinking is ‘cause I feel I like they can take that chance and get their toes in if you will, and try something because then they can sit back and reflect.

Nancy
Yes, now I have another question for the teachers in the classroom. What do you value about the coach’s expertise? It could be Julie, or it could be any other coach that you’ve worked with before. What do you value about their expertise?
Maria
I think that her expertise helped me to be a more effective teacher. Because doing stuff in the classroom you try and it’s not working and it’s not working. You’re frustrated because the kids aren’t getting it, but looking at it from somebody else’s perspective and now I can help you be a more effective teacher with your frustrations because now I can consider being there.
Nancy
Anybody else think about that. What do you value about the coach’s expertise?
Lynn
Our coach is so knowledgeable in all these different strategies so I feel very comfortable that if I ask her for help; she is not going to say: Oh my goodness you’re barely there and thinking about that now, how long has it been. I feel that sometimes I do get in ruts because sometimes I feel like everybody knows this except me. But every year you get a different set of kids you think, they should be knowing this and you go back and I know with our coach, with Julie I can go back and ask her, what can I do to make this better or what strategies so, she knows a lot of these different strategies and that’s wonderful.
‘cause sometimes you get coaches like what was said prior, they send you on a wild goose chase and you think, okay, I didn’t really ask that but maybe I need to be checking that also. You know, we are really blessed to have someone who is so knowledgeable in all these different areas of strategies on reading and writing.

Nancy
So I hear you saying a little bit, that Julie can listen and hear you so that way she doesn’t just blow smoke for a lack of a better term.

All
Exactly
Nancy
Got it. In a way you identify with her ‘cause she’s a real person I’m hearing.

All
Exactly
Nancy
What else do you know about Julie? She doesn’t blow smoke, she’s got a lot of expertise; is there anything else?

Ann
I think she understands what we’re going through. She understands the stresses we’re going through as far as the day to day thing with the kids as far as the paperwork. As far as getting the kids ready to take tests. She understands that. Not only that but she understands the kids ‘cause she’s in the classroom with the kids a lot. She see’s humor in the things that the kid do and if we’re frustrated, pulling our hair out, she understands what we’re talking about. I think that’s the big thing, she understands what we’re going through.

Nancy
Okay, any other thoughts?

Juana
Prior to teaching fourth grade, I taught first and second grade for many, many years and I think that Julie has helped me understand the mind of a fourth grader. Kinda like Ann said, some of the things that I don’t find so humorous, she helps me to understand, ‘cause she taught fourth grade for many years, so she kinda helped me learn the nature of a fourth grader.

Nancy
Okay, are you still there? It beeped a little bit and I want to make sure you’re still there. You told me what she’s done that’s made a difference for you; what do you think has been the best thing that Julie’s done as a coach?

Lynn
She has done a lot with us. I like the book talks that we’ve had. I think that gives us a chance to not only implement some of these strategies in our classroom but we also have the opportunity to come back and discuss with our colleagues things that work, things that might not have worked. Discuss strategies and ways of doing things that we didn’t even think of before. So I like that we’ve had book talks and different ways of doing things and not just from our classroom but from our colleagues also.
Nancy
Okay.
Maria
One of the things that I think that Julie’s done for me is the infinite amount of patience she has for me ‘cause we are adults but we’re just like kids. We learn in different ways. Some are slower and some are faster and I just happen to be one of those with a hard head. It takes so much longer to keep in my head and she doesn’t get upset or angry. She has the patience that helped us grow and which we have. We grown a lot.

Nancy
That’s great.

Juana
She does the research. She brings all the new ideas ‘cause quite honestly, I would like to be able to be reading all the professional journals but quite honestly, I don’t have the time. She comes up with something new. She comes and we share and we implement so I appreciate that very much about her.

Ann
I think I mentioned earlier that I had those positive and negative experiences with trainers.

Nancy
Yes

The first couple years that I was with a trainer, I wanted to run away and head for hills, because they were like little Hitlers. You had to do things a certain way and I began to feel; and we were very happy about teaching for a long time but I began to feel insecure about what I was doing and whenever a trainer came in the room, I would say; oh no here we go, a dog and poodle show again. But now with Julie, I feel like I can enjoy what I’m doing again and I’ve loosened up back to the old way that I was before we first started having trainers or coaches. So I think that this has really helped me to feel better about what I am doing and helped me to enjoy myself better.

Nancy
Okay, thank you. I appreciate your honesty too. Julie, do you have any thoughts about what you think you’ve done which has been the most helpful or the best thing for teachers?

Julie
I think at least for this school, I think probably; the biggest thing is being that reflective mirror. Here’s what your classroom looks like. Because I think you get so embroiled and for those of you who not, that would be, how do you say schooled? Embroiled, so immersed in what there’re doing, I don’t think they step back to reflect on; is this appropriate for what I should be doing? Am I asking enough of my students? Am I choosing on the foots and strategies to address the things that they need and I really think the biggest thing, the thing that has made the most change here that I feel most comfortable saying out loud in front of the teachers that: I believe the fact that I’m willing to listen, I’m willing to get into the classrooms and pay attention to the students as well as the teachers. I think that’s the best thing that I brought. Yes, I know it’s school and I’m well read and I’m a research nut and yet I get in there and tackle it and
we’ve had book studies, but I think the biggest thing is having somebody with expertise who knows the students, to sit side by side and take a look at what instruction looks like and help them be reflective because I don’t think you move as an educator if you don’t take the time to be reflective and that’s the core thing that I have been able to do is make them very reflective practitioners.

Nancy

Ladies, do you agree? Do you feel like you learned some reflective skills?

All

Yes

Nancy

So my last question is really always. ‘cause when you reflect you have to reflect too on what could be done to improve the process. So, I have really heard Ann say that probably your improvements have already been made because the trainer s’ been changed. The trainer needs to have a focus on helping people grow rather than being a mini Hitler and that; I’m using your words and it rings true. I’ve experienced that myself. Um, so is there anything else that could be done differently and it may not be with Julie at your school, but the program over all of coaching. Is it, screening for coaches, personable skills, as well as knowledge skills, or, what are your thoughts?

Ann

I think the expertise of the trainer. ‘cause we’ve had those that were experts and they do make your life miserable and what I’ve learned by them is I it either. What you do is just shut down and don’t go for help. So that person really needs to be screened properly and to make sure that person is knowledgeable.

Nancy

Okay, that helps. Thank you. Any other thoughts from anyone?

Lynn

On that same note, the person might be very knowledgeable but doesn’t know how to bring down that knowledge to the classroom. Maybe they just, maybe they don’t know how to help or how to direct you to the proper deals that you need or strategies.

Nancy

To reality.

Lynn

Yes.

Juana

I think what Lynn is trying to say is that the person who has the people skills that can reach the teachers. I agree with Ann, that some of the former coaches, boy! They had us do things by the book and you had to be on a strict schedule and you don’t feel like you have any control.

Maria

I think they have to be organized too. Because they’re dealing with so many teachers you know. We stop them in the hall, we ask them so many questions. You have to be organized to be getting back to the teachers and following up on what they say they’re gonna do. That to me, that’s important.

Nancy
Okay, wonderful. Is there anything I haven’t asked that one of you is dying to tell me?
All
Laughter, we love Julie.
Nancy
I really thank you for your time, that’s the end of the interview and you have no idea how much this means to me and I’m really so sorry we couldn’t meet in person last month when I was coming to New Mexico.

Julie
I know exactly what you’re going through so, you’re quite welcome.
Nancy
Probably the end of next week I will have everything organized to send the books out so I’ll send you all an extra book for participating with me today. Thank you.
All
You’re welcome and good luck!
Nancy
Thank you and have a good evening.
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Nancy
We are here at Balderas school and I have your agreement that you will be interviewed by me and taped by me.
All
Yes
Nancy
Can you go around and state your name for me?
Removed for confidentiality
Nancy
Okay, I appreciate you doing this interview here with me and we’re going to talk about coaching. Um, have all of you been coached at some time?
All – Yes
Nancy
Can you talk about the coaching experience and if coaching has changed your teaching if at all?
Tom
How about we go in a circle, I’ll start.
Nancy
Okay that’s fine. Getting us organized.
Tom
I might as well. Overall there’s been a real mix bag with coaching it depends so much on the personality, the person and the effectiveness of that person.
Nancy
Are you talking about the coach?

Tom
I’m talking about the coach and I’m talking about what’s been going on over the past 4, 5 years with the coaching cycle at different sites at different times as it’s related to myself and the classroom. A lot of times I’ve seen zero of that person. I’ve seen that person hide in an office. I’ve also seen a very effective person who will come in and collaboratively build lessons, deliver lessons, talk about what happens afterwards. How do we then transfer those skills into main teacher and
then I’ve had the turnover with the coaches because then the cycle starts to get mixed up as the jobs come and go. And then I’ve got an ineffective one who wants to go hide in the office and hide and surf the web again and so it depends so much on the person as to what I get out of it, and those that are sensitive to what’s going on in my classroom with my kids and the curriculum and the demands that I have are really effective because they duck tail into what I am already doing.

Julianne
My feelings are pretty much the same as Tom’s is. We had some varying coaching that are very effective and some that literally hide in their office and don’t come out. They are very nice people but not very effective as coaches and others who really come and observe in your classroom to see what works in your classroom; see how they can help you. With some of them it’s like you have to ask and you don’t know if you even want to ask cause you don’t know what kind of reaction you’re going to get and others you can go quite openly and say, “I really need your help, can you help me” and they will be there and they will do what you need and not what they think needs to be done or if there is something they think needs to be done they will ask you about it first before they bring it in the classroom.

Nancy
So I’m hearing that the key is the personality of the person and their expertise and then they realize it is really about what you need and not what they need.

Julianne
Yeah

Nhia
I do agree with Tom and Julianne but my experience has been pretty positive and I don’t know if it’s because I’ve only been here teaching for four years so being the new teacher, the coaches were right there with you, like my first year of teaching, I could not have made it through that year without my coach. She was in the classroom with me. Especially coming from a different district, the curriculum is different. So my coach was in my classroom with me for that entire week until I felt comfortable enough to do some of the lessons on my own.

Marcy
Pretty much what everybody said. We’ve had some very positive people here and I don’t know If it was necessarily their personality but being part of administration not coaches and so, at least I felt like I was being critiqued in a way like a stull or something like that. Not a person coming in and saying, hey how can I help you.

Julianne
It’s almost like sometimes you get them like they appear to be almost administrative and others when they appear to be a teacher and it’s when they operate as a teacher and they appear to be a teacher that I think they are most effective.
Nancy
Have any of you ever experienced someone coaching you that wasn’t a coach?
All
Yeah
Nancy
So tell me about that a little bit.
Julianne
Well, if you remember Tom, was it last year or a couple of years ago. Maybe you weren’t even with us. This person came in to coach and after this person finished the lesson and left we all looked at each other and said we could have done it better without any kind of training or help at all. The lesson in itself was miserable and she didn’t get the kids excited about what they were doing you know. It’s always nice when you have a new person in class and they really like that. They think it’s fun and this just wasn’t that kind of experience.
Nancy
Got it. Nhia, what kind of experience did you have?
Nhia
When I use to teach in Arizona and my first year there; my coach was never around. She was in and out. So my coach was actually the teacher next door who I would always go to. She was one with her door wide open and I could easily go in there. It felt really comfortable. Like I said, it’s your own colleagues. You’re a team basically.
Nancy
What did you gain from the peer coaching experience?
Nhia
Um, we would try things out together and the nice part is, I guess she can see the frustrations that I’m dealing with ‘cause she’s also a teacher and our failures and our success, we could easily share that together and going back to not feeling that someone is critiquing you ‘cause we’re doing it together we’re both teachers so you don’t feel like someone is doing an evaluation on you.
Nancy
So, I’m gonna go to the second question, so you see I ask one and I kinda probe for a little bit more. When the coaching has been positive so we’ve been real clear that some have been positive and some haven’t been positive experiences. When the coach or the coach that was working with you, was effective for you what did the coach do that made a difference? You talked about that a little bit Julianne.
Julianne
Usually the coach will approach you not saying I’m coming in to coach your class but its; would you like me to help you with this or I know you’re going to be preparing for this. Would you like some help with this? Would you like supplies? Would you like resources or would you like me to come in and teach? There’s more of an openness and a possibility for other things other than maybe a
physical body coming in. Maybe sometimes all you need is a little extra information or a little extra resource material. Um, and when I’ve been approached by this person they always would say, okay so what do you want me to do; what do you need for me to do and do you think this would work, should I try this? So it’s much more of a collaborate collegial effort. It becomes more like; I know I’m being coached because this person has real good experience in this and it’s real obvious from when the minute they step in the room that there’s experience there. What you don’t get with some coaches. So already, I tend to feel more relaxed. And then the other thing, is, it’s more like this person’s helping me but at the same time I don’t know that I’m helping him but maybe its because it’s just that I’m getting trained as the children are getting trained, I think that’s what it is. I’m getting something just for me that I can use and keep using and the children themselves can use it because it’s coming from a different person a different voice so it becomes more than just this person coaching me. It becomes a whole experience thing for the whole classroom. I think that’s one of the big values of it when you have a good coach.

Nancy
Any thoughts?

Tom
Yeah, my thoughts about it are that the coaches that I have had come in so often have not had the skills set that I need. They come from backgrounds of lower grades and they have a lower grade approach that they really don’t understand the curriculum, the rigor that’s required. When the coach is effective it is someone that not only looks at what the curriculum is, what the needs of the students are and the background of the students, but also, they get to know me well enough. Not just as person as somebody he sees in the halls but also as a professional in the classroom so they get a sense of; here’s my style; here’s how I work and they say, okay here’s what fits into that so that it compliments it and it furthers the learning and it pushes what my agenda in the classroom is. Otherwise we’re just playing a game so that you can do your thing until I’m done with you and you’re out of my way and I can continue to do the real education that I’m required to give those kids. When it has turned into that, I’ve just said no thank you and when it can be something that furthers it, I have a conversation with that coach and I direct what it is that they are going to come in and do. I also put a time stamp on it and say, look you can’t be here longer than thirty minutes. Whatever you’re going to pull out; whatever you’re going to do is a thirty minute thing, because I’m going to take what you do and then I’m going to take it to the next level. So they’ll usually come in with me and say, okay here is what I was thinking and here’s what I’m doing and I will give back some feedback and say look that’s not going to work for them, it needs to be like this. Here’s what I’ve done in the past. Let’s build
something together that you can present that I can then take off with; keep moving with.  Writing samples are often like this as well.
Nancy
Thank you, that’s helpful, thank you.
Nhia
Um,
You want to hear the question again?
Nhia
Yes.
Nancy
When the coaching experience was positive; so you can talk about it here or you can talk about Arizona experience whatever you would like.  What did the coach do that made a difference?
Nhia
Sitting down together.  Planning together, um, wanting my input as well and then afterwards like after a lesson sitting down together again and talking about what worked and what didn’t work and the next steps and just to add, I’m not sure if it was Julianne or Tom ‘cause here, it’s my first year teaching sixth grade and it was so nice that Mr. Simpson our RS coach has also in the past taught sixth grade and for him to know the curriculum of sixth grade makes it really helpful for me.
Yeah.
Marcy
Yeah, and coming in treating me like a professional.  Like a person, equal and yet there are so much more areas of expertise that he does have and I recognize that but I don’t feel like he’s lording it over like “I’m the big coach” and “I know all the answers”, and that’s not the way our current coach is.
Nancy
And I’m taking it as that’s how your past coaches were.
Marcy
Yeah, that has happened in the past.  Not all of them we had, um when we had coaches that we had actually one math coach and one.  We had two very good coaches.  One’s expertise was in math and one in language arts and that was a very positive experience but unfortunately, things changed our district and we ended up with one for two years and that was not positive and then we had another one for a year and a half or two and that was not positive.  But now we’re back to positive.
Julianne
It’s interesting because of those two two coaches you’re talking about.  I know who you’re talking about; they came from the classroom and they went back to the classroom.  Here at this school, so they were great teachers and we knew when going into it we were getting something really good.  When they went up to the coaching positions they didn’t forget what it was like in being a classroom teacher.  So that was really nice.  So they treated us like professionals.
Nancy
Yeah. It’s so important isn’t it.
Julianne
Yeah.
Nancy
So my third question, which I think you all have already answered ‘cause you elaborated it is, “why did this make a difference for you”. You all answered that. So I’m going to go on to the fourth question. You alluded to it just a little bit so you can think deeper about it okay Julianne and then everyone can talk about it. So I want you to think about the positive but if you have some things to say on improvement we can go there too. What do you value about the coaches expertise? So obviously I’m talking about the positive coaching experiences, but what did you value about their expertise? Obviously that they treated you like a professional and a person, I heard that.
Marcy
Just showing me a different way. ‘Cause I’m definitely not an expert you know, but especially with all the new things that have come through with the frontloading and all that and showing me in a different way and a different light. So I was able to take that and put that into my own teaching and sometimes it works well and other times but it was really good getting a different perspective. For me, I’m just like the kids. I need to see it modeled for me. Reading it out of a book is a little different for me or even seeing it on a video is a little different for me and seeing it first hand in front of my own kids who react a whole different way than those kids on the videos. Just seeing how they react.
Nancy
Has there been learning that didn’t go well?
Marcy?
Oh yeah, there always is, definitely.
Nancy
So who else would like to speak?
Julianne
What was the question?
Nancy
What do you value about the coach’s expertise?
Julianne
I’m thinking about that and I’m thinking about what I really like is the way that this coach has the opportunity to set up the lesson, to get it organized, package it and then be able to walk in and deliver it where a lot of times in my classroom everything is happening at once from this to discipline to this subject to that; to all the emotions of the kids.
Nancy
Not just your classroom; classroom.
Julianne
Are you sure it’s not just mine?
Nancy
From my experience, that’s happening.
Tom
That’s happening in the same room in all this organized chaos. So they got this opportunity to come in and deliver. The voice modulation they have no matter who they are. They got this opportunity to grab the kids attention because they’re not me. They tune me out to certain degree. So they got that as well. Then, I’m reflecting way back to when I started teaching, which, is not that long ago. But I have one really good coach experience when I was starting out and I didn’t have all the things that I have at this time but I remember that that coach and I won’t forget her because she would come in and she would give me a fifteen minute power lesson on doing certain kinds of reading groups and certain kinds of whole language lessons that were very pointed, they were very directed and they were progressive so each third day that she came in she would do that and she would follow up with me informally and ask hey Tom how did that work? We would just walk in the halls, we didn’t sit down and do all this so my effective filter went down, not feeling threatened and I was more like; this went well and that went well. So I try this one too ‘cause this turned conversational rather than, “Oh this is a test”. And now at this point the one thing that I’m finding is that, I’m looking to get a package delivered and I want that lesson delivered in a twenty to thirty minute block, and at this point in my career, I’m skilled enough to where it didn’t work and it was kind of a flop lesson, that’s still a good lesson cause I’m gonna take and show the kids why it was a flop lesson. I’m gonna pull it all apart, throw the parts everywhere and pull out anything that was good and bring it back and make an effective kind of lesson from it and turn it to the direction of my classroom and that’s really important and that’s the same thing I do with the kids; just because you didn’t get it right, doesn’t mean you didn’t learn from the experience’. So anyhow I think that is what’s been positive, is that opportunity for those coaches to deliver in a very synch way.
Julianne
Yeah. I have to go along with what everybody said so far. Absolutely. But another thing if I could word this right, it’s kind of floating around in my head. It’s not just that the coach comes in and presents the package it’s that he then will have a follow up package that you can do on your own. So you watch him do it and then he gives you a similar lesson and you can do that. That’s what I like because I’m left hanging thinking I’ve got to do all this other planning and how can I plan for this thing which I really was hoping it would already be done. So it’s very, very helpful more than helpful it’s sometimes the only way you can operate to have that done for you.
Tom
One of the things we were just talking about. Myself and the coach was that I wanted to make sure, cause he was saying, well, I’ve got this one lesson that I can present. And, that is what has come through our classroom and I’m like, one’s not enough. The rigor that the children are expected to do one won’t do it and I said, we got to have four or five so what can you give me? Can you give me two or three? And if we can get those ideas out to do that and so what you’re saying is right. I’m at the point where now I’ve gone through the one and I’ve gone through the two; I got the idea for the third and know he’s gone and floated to other classrooms so I know we are on our own. It’s something you and I are going to be talking about soon. I just need help getting that package that package together then we will float it between all of us.

Julianne
It’s like we had a fourth teacher. One who’s not encumbered with the classroom because if I ever say to him do you have anything on this? Next time I turn around he’s got all the resources and if he doesn’t; he knows where I can go to find it so it cuts that down and that is very helpful. So they’re not just a coach but a resource also which is so important I think.

Nancy
Do you want to say anything about what you value about the coach’s expertise?

Nhia
I think we pretty much said it all. Yeah.

Nancy
Okay, something else that I’m interested in. Maybe you can think about your current coach right now; if you identify with him in anyway?

Julianne
Could you elaborate on that?

Tom
He’s a man. I’m a man. You’re asking something more complex than that?

Nancy
Well, not really. So I’ll prefix it for you. The research shows that if you identify with the coach. So it might be from their expertise or maybe their personality or maybe something else that it is a more quality coaching experience.

Marcy
Yeah. I will start. The coach that I talked about that saved me that year. You know, I’m from San Diego originally and it just so happened; she was also from San Diego. We just clicked right away. We were talking about school we were talking about the curriculum but now and again we would throw in San Diego stuff. Do you remember that place and that place and she’s now back in San Diego and we still keep in contact. We’re definitely having something else outside of school, just to have that connection with her.
Nancy
I think you can’t pass up Tom gender. I think that’s important. Especially from
you guys ‘cause you are surrounded by us women all the time.
Tom
Okay and you what lets really qualify that.
Nancy
Okay
Tom
Without me being rude that actually isn’t a factor here. Our current coach and I
are different kinds of guys with different kinds of interests. I’ve talked to him
several times and he is a wonderful guy. But it’s like; look, the truth is um, I got
other friends who are my buddies and stuff and we probably wouldn’t be buddies
but I mean it just that obvious thing. Even our styles as teachers are very different
really because his style is always like very polite and everything else. So is mine;
but, as the ladies here know.
Nancy
You could tell by the laughing. (All laughing)
Tom
You can tell. It’s like this monster inside that it’s like you really don’t want to go
there. When the coach was in my room some of the kids started to get unsettled
and it’s like, sorry, you don’t get the warning. It’s like you’re just being pounced
upon. He kind of jumped a little and he kinda um; it’s going to be handled this
way, the first time. So there are those things and you know, I’ve never really felt
that nice person connection with the coach and not that many and don’t take it
personally ‘cause I actually connect with you guys but not that many other
teachers in fact a lot of my and sometime mentioned earlier we’re talking about
colleagues because those are our coaches before formal coaching.
Nancy
And you can talk about that, because I define coaching as anything as you define it
because I’ve actually spoke with a lot of people across the nation and it’s; the
person doesn’t have to have a title of coach. It’s the action of coaching.
Tom
Well, here’s the thing. Since it relates back to; tell me the first experience and all
that. I came in to a school and first year teacher and um, all the colleagues at the
grade level and won’t speak to each other, and I’m like; help me and they’re like
no, go figure it out yourself and I’m like; thanks. So from that to turn it over, I
say, I won’t ever do that to anyone again and I’ll make sure that I’m always there
to help my colleagues or anybody else. So the bad example can actually motivate.
Let’s do the right thing in the future. And then, except for those two who are
always fighting, it’s like, well then later when you want to come and get ideas I’m
like, well, go figure it out yourself. (Laughter) Because I’m sorry you know, that
was really mean thing to do to a first year teacher. But it really has always led all
my teaching experiences and colleague relationships is that no one should ever feel alone or unsupported, and we have most of the answers sitting around the table if we care to look, listen and try. So, that’s been the biggest thing to help and then, as far as like, connection to a coach. People are people and like that gender issue. I’ve had to just say look; people are people; Gender aside, race aside, anything aside. It’s like, teachers are those special people who care enough about kids to do whatever it takes and that’s what we have to focus on. And then the struggles that go with, bonds us all together. So, gender, who cares, color; who cares, sides, blah blah, whatever, whatever.

Nancy
Do you have some thoughts about it? The question was, how do you identify with the coach and in what ways or do you identify with the coach and in what ways?

Marcy
Um, gosh.

Nancy
It could be a no, cause the question.

Marcy?
I mean, well he’s just another teacher here. I feel like, yes I know he has the title, I know he has more expertise but I feel like you know he’s just another teacher that if I want to, I can say, hey can you look at this or whatever. Not even just as a coach but just as a friend; a teaching friend. A colleague that I would feel comfortable, doing that. I feel comfortable with this person doing anything like that.

Nancy
Okay, thank you.

What is the, and you can talk about any one of the coaching or coaching experiences you’ve had, but what is the best thing that coaches done? You’ve all alluded to a little bit. What’s the best thing the coaches done?

Julianne
I’ll tell you and this may sound really stupid but yesterday, somebody, I guess one of the teachers down our hallway called because they had a bathroom emergency; they needed to use the restroom. So he came in to my room and said, would you like a restroom break and I said, oh I’d love one and then he left but he said, ah, something, oh my gosh this is room whatever it is. He said this is 22 and I said yes. He said, oh my gosh, I’m sorry and I said that’s alright, we had a rainy day schedule. So he left and came back 5 minutes later and he said, okay, now, I’m gonna give you a break ‘cause I promised you one. And I thought, wow! That’s swell! And he’s done that before. It’s that personal consideration. You know, it’s treating you like a buddy; like a friend.

Nancy
Amber son
Julianne
Yeah, and to go back to the question you asked before, do you bond?
Nancy
Identify
Julianne
Yeah, I would have to say yes, that’s makes a big difference. Um, and it’s kinda funny and this doesn’t leave the room. He reminds me a little bit like my husband in the way he reacts socially to things. The other thing that I really find special about him is that I know he loves children the same way I do. He just loves the children and he loves his job. And to me, that’s it. When he comes in you can tell he’s accepting of all the children. He’s not going to stand for any garbage but he really, really is enjoying himself and the fact that I feel kind of the same way you know, sometimes I beat my head against the wall but as I tell the children: I would rather be driven crazy by you than anybody else in the world. And I kinda feel like he feels the same way.

Nancy
So we’re down to the last question; this wasn’t too bad I hope? And you can talk about; and you guys all mentioned this since the beginning. So you can talk about this coach or you could just talk about coaching in general, um but how could it be improved, or what could a coach do differently.
Julianne
Have two of him (laughter)
Nancy
If it’s him, have two of them.
All
Yeah
Nhia
When they had the two coaches at the sites; that was really helpful; one for math and one for language arts.
Nancy
So having a specialization makes a difference in the content.
Julianne
Yeah.
Sanray
Yeah, because I think with the size of the staff; he can’t get to everybody.
Julianne
And he’s more than willing; I’ve never had to ask him anything for math. I usually go to Tom for that, he coaches me in math or Kurt does; my husband. So um, really, that’s all he can handle, really. I think is just one of them. I’m sure if you went to him and asked him he would be more than forthcoming.
Tom
I’m thinking there’s a trend in education because there’s so much emphasis on testing that that’s really what we’re teaching too, all the time. And that I think is becoming nationwide and you may be noticing that, more than ever. That those things that we’ve done five and ten years ago that were very enriching in my opinion, very necessary as far as science and social studies; all of the arts. Um, there’s been a few opportunities like when I’ve had a student teacher and it’s given me an opportunity to grade level to prepare these similar package lessons and say hey guys, I got a student teacher, I’m free. Let me come on over and set up a band to get a rough generator; let’s build some motors and stuff. I’m only going to take fifteen or twenty minutes and let me come on and put on a show that no one else has time to generate and do that, so I say, how would I say that the coach could improve is that, coming in to show me something that I already know how to do because it’s my turn to have the coach isn’t helpful. What I want to see is that you’re going to get to know me well enough and my expertise and background, and say here’s what I can offer you above and beyond what you already do. Don’t duplicate my efforts, I’ve already done those jobs, and I’m capable of doing them. Show me or do something that I can’t do or don’t have time for or I want and wish to do. Plus those things that the children need; right now the science curriculum and this is to fault my colleagues. My colleagues do excellent and they do everything they can do but the pressures are so great and the time constraints. They have science testing; they’re not prepared. You know, you can’t each those science lessons and do that. So if somebody can come in and package it and just say look fifteen minutes, boom, science experience, what did you guys get out of it? We can follow up as teachers. We can use those experiences as teachable moments. But without those experiences as teachers, we don’t have time to do all the background and preparation even as simple as it might sound. We just are at a time crunched terribly. So I think that’s how I would try to say to suggest improvement. And I think; here’s the other thing. The cycle that we use in our district: The cycle of continuous improvement, you know. All these words that are used and I’m thinking, I was at a site where before it became the buzz word we were testing it. And so we sat down with administration, and as leadership teams and grade level teams. We all came in and we actually did it because the administration didn’t even know what it was. So we all said, what are we supposed here and so we led it. As a Nancy
A cycle inquiry. Yeah.
Tom
Yeah, so we did it and then we said; we don’t even understand it. Let’s not do that. Let’s just do this and prepare the lessons and let’s reflect afterwards and we really worked that through and as grade levels we started to make our own improvements, but, because we were driving it. Then the next year they were like
oh, from up high, you must do this and do it this way and we all kind of went there and went okay here we go. And then all creativity left the room, because it was just here, do this, do that. We couldn’t even design our instruments to respond anymore. It was already made for you. And they continued to be made for us. We were like; I don’t even know what to write.
Julianne
We feel like the kids.
Tom
Write something, I don’t know; so we do and unfortunately all of our goals being that we really want our kids to be successful and sometimes that’s measured by test. Other times it’s measured by the ability to think so now I’m digressing. The coaches need to be able to bring back some of those experiences that enrich the children’s lives to get them inspired about education because their done trodden right now. They’re not interested in school. All it is, is we’re just prepping for the test, prepping for the test. Their lives are not good. They’re not inspired and we’re in a similar boat. We need to be inspired. And they have this opportunity by being free of all the constraints of the daily classrooms and say, what can I do and generate? It’s a gift, and for those who take advantage of it is awesome and for those who don’t it’s kinda like shame on you, get out of the way. It’s kind of like my perspective.
Julianne
Well you know, one thing that Roger did when he came in to do that writing thing, what did he bring in? How to mummify a body. The kids were thrilled because he pulled something they knew they would like. That’s the kind of stuff.
Tom
Thank you Julianne, that’s Roger and my conversation about driving for where we’re gonna go. Our next one is going to be about platonic’s so that’s one we got to get going. So you’re right.
Julianne
Anyway you can fit it in.
Tom
And the one after that if we have time I want it to be about the rock cycle. Okay because there are three different elements and we have to do three body paragraphs and that’s how we have to drive it in. And it’s complicating complex but trust me, the expectation.
Julianne
I know it is, but did you see Chuck Berry, you could go all the way to metallica. Tom
I know you can do it that way too. And so, that’s the direction we’re going and if we do about five or six before the test will be great.
Nhia
At one of the sites I was at there was five of us that were new that year and so this coach, she would meet with us. Just the five of us you know, besides having the two days meeting. It was like during the week we would just meet. It would be like you know ‘cause sometimes in a large group you don’t feel comfortable asking questions at the meetings and she would hold like mini workshops almost every week and I guess at some schools you don’t see too many like that and I would hope for more like afterschool you know kind of thing ‘cause I think that really helps for support.

Nancy
For support, yeah. Any thoughts for improvement?
Marcy,
I think, really, just having those extra things that we lost out on for the kids and not for us but for the kids ‘cause we don’t have time to teach science or social studies effectively. We’re doing some stuff but really not to the rigor of the test. In fifth grade they have science with CST and the problem is that we try to cram a bunch of stuff into them in just those little moments that we have. But, unfortunately the prior grades have not been able to do that either. They haven’t been teaching science the way it should be, so just having a coach to be able to do something like maybe once a week but, I don’t know how that would work but something that would be enriching is my idea.

Tom
In my past I’ve always had about two thirds of my class that are EL learners. Some are straight from Mexico somewhere to where they are non English speakers and it’s been those science things I’ve done in my classroom that are hands on that lead them with experience. They now have a background, they now draw from that for their speaking and their interaction and I’ve watch growth from this six month period that they’ve been in my classroom and like oh my gosh, you didn’t speak any English and now you use simple sentences. You have English friends; you only speak English at school even though, limited. It’s tremendous and then when they do get to that test, and then later on I believe it’s eighth. At least when you’re re teaching it’s like; hey remember when, instead of like no I don’t remember anything. So, it makes your job easier too.

Marcy
It’s something that they’ve had the opportunity to do that and I don’t know how directed their job is cause as far as you’re supposed to do this and this so if they were give a little lee way to be able to and I know that the coach now if we approached him, he would be excited to do it.

Julianne
He’ll take it anyway, he can get it.

Nancy
Thank you, I appreciate your time, all of you. Interview ended.
INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW, WESTERN UNITED STATES
FEBRUARY 2011

All names of interviewees have been changed.
Interviewer was Nancy Akhavan.

Nancy
I appreciate you taking the time to talk with me today about your experience with coaching. So I thought maybe you could start by you just giving me a little bit of background on your experience with coaching.

Ray
Most of my experience has been working with coaches rather than being an official coach although I have been a consultant which is a coaching role which I have gone into the school and worked side by side giving them feedback. The model I like to use is giving teachers the options of me observing them and giving feedback as well as them observing me teaching their class and then discussing or team teaching. The more self-conscious teachers have you do the demonstration. It gives teachers the greatest sense of control. The times that we’ve done work with officials and called a literacy coach and then for three of the five years that I was in elementary school from 2003 (Left Lewis & Clark) and in 2005-2008 and then the past 2.5 years at this elementary school. So I’ve worked with 3 people that were designated as literacy coaches as their job half time in HK. I’ve seen that literacy failed miserably because the literacy coach was just assigned to do so many things but the district is finally backing off a little bit from having the literacy coach be the literacy police, which is the problem in a lot of cases. The person I am working with now is very good. She has a lot of strength. I think she has seen in some ways that she has spend quite a lot of time that she feels she is not exactly in equal relationships; she’s learning from me cause she’s not that confident but she has excellent strategies. I think there are several reasons for that. One I have more of a theoretical background, two, I’m used to managing a huge class and she’s not and three, um, well those are the main reasons those two reasons.

Nancy
So, just to make sure I am recapping; you have experienced coaching and being coached.

Ray
Yeah but coaching is more of a consulting role for example a couple years ago I was invited by a school in Bend Oregon to spend several days at the school giving workshops, observing classes, doing demonstrations, I used models I mentioned and I had a follow up visit with a Saturday workshop and was kind of an unofficial coach for a year or two at my second year at Fairview for the year 2004-2005 where the Principal asked me lead the Professional Development and Writing and the things we did there was, she gave us a lot of sub days where we could visit
each others’ writing workshop classes and give feedback and have discussions. It was almost like a study group format which was great and I was collaborating at the time I was teaching fifth and I was collaborating with third grade when we were teaching our writing class together and also sharing with the rest of the staff. So again that was the year before they funded our school literacy coach.

Nancy

So you know for the content of the study I am working on this is great information and the context is good so I wanted to reinforce it so when we go forward with the questions. I am really defining in this study I am defining coaching as anything defined by the participant because I really believe in the action of coaching but I realize that often times I believe we receive our best coaching not from the person who has the title literacy coach but someone who acts as a peer mentor or peer coach in our lives. So that’s perfect. All of these experiences you’ve had fit that definition so I am going to go through about five or six questions and feel free to answer on any of the context from the experience you’ve had in the past being coach or the current coach that you are working with or your experience as coaching when you were working as a consultant cause definitely you are a coach and then also as a peer coach as all of you were collaborating and working together on the writing. So feel free to respond on any one of those contacts.

Ray

Great, this is a great summary for a strand you are a good listener.

Nancy

Thank you, but it’s ‘cause I am not having to write since we’re taping I can really listen to what you’re saying. So for the first question; how do you believe coaching has changed your teaching overall?

Ray

I think in the best coaching model there is ample time to those to observe each other teaching and for all participants to actually see each other teaching or teach together and also plenty of time to debrief as well as share ideas. In some ways I feel like I am in mutual coaching situation now because the other person who I am teaching fourth grade with is somebody whom I have known for years who was a supervisor for me when I was running it; student teaching or running the math program in elementary education at Lewis and Clark so I’ve known her for years and it is just like a dream working with her. We learn things from each other all the time and we are constantly talking about what we do in class and now that we have the patience we pop into each other’s class a lot and when one of us in the middle of teaching we just sit there for about 10 minutes and participate or observe and I feel like I learn something from her every day and she does as much as well. Did I answer your question? I got a little off the topic perhaps.

Nancy

No, it’s fine. We can continue with this peer experience if you like or if you want to add from something else, your other experiences that’s fine too with the next
question. What do you think the coach did or the peer did that really made a difference for you?

**Ray**

Well I think first of all the starting point this is true when I’m mentoring interns and when I’m mentoring student teachers. I think a really important starting point is to record observations and give those back. The way I typically give feedback to student teachers is I’ll have a three column table. The first one is the time and second one is the observation and the last one is for questions and comments and sometimes observations speak for themselves as folks can see what the kids are doing when they are really engaged or not engaged or what comments I hear that might indicate learning. All the things are really informative and then the questions and comments quite often I think, there may be some better decisions or better reactions to situations that a student teacher could have had. I will form a question with “What do you think could have had a different outcome or what if blah blah blah.” I think that’s a real open ended way to review something if you are actually in a valued situation. I know that one of the difficulties in coaching is you want to be a support but as in teaching there is always a balance between supporting or augmenting or pushing someone to a higher level so I think that is a delicate balance, but I think from where I began just providing the feedback is a crucial starting point. You just have to supply from observation. I have a great example of it too. I had a wonderful principal. One of the reasons I went back to the classroom is the main reason; I really miss the impact. Particularly kids in high poverty. I had the luxury of being able to choose from several great principals that were interested in hiring me. The one I worked for for two years left because of the lack of support from the district. She was such a leader in this area, I really consider her key because one, she was in classes every day and she knew what teachers were doing. Two, she’d had a healthy balance between observation and participation. Perfect example, I was doing a Math imitations where there were different stations that had some measure that was open ended as to what students did with the materials but it also has some guidelines so some has more instruction than others but basically the kids were doing different activities at different tables and part of the time she was circulating and part of the time she was joining the kids and having conversations and afterwards, they said oh I thought this was great or I thought that was great and she said have you ever thought about having experts when you do the invitation the second time and I said tell me more about that. She said when you have somebody who has already gone through it and that person volunteers to be an expert the second go around then there doesn’t have to be as much explanation and the kid who’s experienced can push the rest of the kids up to a higher level and whatever the activity is. I thought it was brilliant and have pretty much done it ever since. That’s a good
example of somebody who does both observe and participate and also goes back to discuss debrief, whatever. It was very effective, I thought.

**Nancy**

Why do you think it was so effective? How do you think it made a difference for you?

**Ray**

Well because I always find that if you have really motivated kids or really bright kids. The kids with a lot of experience or whatever; the ones that are less tend to rise to the higher level so in this particular case having somebody having the experience guide the second go around made it much smoother and made the kids want to do better because they knew they knew what they were painting for.

**Nancy**

So what I hear you saying is having her ask you the thoughtful question and then have you guys digging into that together as an answer helped you push your students to a way you hadn’t thought of before?

**Ray**

Yeah but it was more of a suggestion, she just phrased it “have you thought about that” and obviously she’d done that before in her own teaching but because I respected her, because I knew how good she was with kids, and because I thought it was a good idea, I was just ready to go for it and I have used it a lot ever since.

**Nancy**

That’s exciting. It’s good when you can augment your work with kids and see results like that. What kinds of things have you valued about the coach’s experience that you worked with? You’ve talked a little about your principal and that situation and what you valued with her. What have you valued in some of your other experiences?

**Ray**

Well

**Nancy**

About their expertise, I’m sorry I wasn’t clear. You told me you valued her expertise because of her background how she worked with students how she worked with teachers so I understand how you valued her expertise, I ‘m wondering if there is any other coach you worked with and how you valued their expertise.

**Ray**

Well I will talk about my current coach because she’s actually very intellectual which I really like. She can come up with theoretical and philosophical questions which I just find refreshing. She is just a genuine inquiry because she’ll say I wonder if, or I wonder why, I wonder how and those statements lead to some really good conversations. She just collaborated with me, really it was a collaboration with the literacy coach the student teacher and the experienced core
volunteer who comes in. An elderly woman who is very spirited, and first very involved in the class. We just produced two plays and one was the story about Faith Zaharias, the female sports figure who was the first Olympic gold scholar I don’t know if you know about her but anyway she was very important in the history of women’s sports in the 30’s and afterwards and the musical version of Macbeth. It started because the kids were writing a lot of dialogue in their writing workshop back in December and I was saying since you are writing so much dialogue you might as well write plays but they weren’t writing plays very well so my student teacher and I started pulling together a lot of plays and then I got the Babe play we adapted from one that a third grade teacher lent us. She had a book of plays. Macbeth is the one I found. It was adapted for high school students but we were just running them all through in reading class. Six of them got really excited about Babe and wanted to do that and then when we read Macbeth the rest of the class got so excited that we produced it. The literacy coach was very instrumental because I would say she is not maybe as proactive as I am because I just jumped in and directed it but behind the scenes she was reminding the kids, she was thinking of the next steps and she was very instrumental with the costumes. I mean she went home one weekend; I had bought a bunch of material and we went on the web and the kids had looked at all the different clothing that was worn from the 1100’s and they came up with some ideas and she came back with so many phenomenal costumes within a week. So from the thinking perspective with those questions that she asked about, I wonder if the reason this student is making those errors or using these patterns in this writing is because what he’s heard at home, or whatever. It is those kinds of questions I find stimulating and the second is that she’s willing to go with the flow of what we’re doing in here and she likes the inquiry, she likes the planning based on what kids need so that support is just so tremendous. I really like that, you know, that was what was missing. Even though I respected the first literacy coach I worked with as an educator. He just didn’t know how to propose collaboration in the way that would make it work.

Nancy
So that’s something that you would identify with, with her that you have something in common.

Ray
Yes

Nancy
So in thinking of the principal that you discussed because she really acted as a coach for you too; In what ways did you identify with her as a coach?

Ray
Well one like I mentioned before, she wasn’t just saying; they’re having a data team meeting which we have now and you know sometimes they’re just so contrive. She was actually collecting data with her frequent visits to classrooms.
So the fact that she knew what was going on and two, she saw herself as an educator. She saw herself as somebody who could go in and join in on the teaching at anytime. Some people feel more comfortable with it than others but people got used to it and it became the norm. She had a little bit of leverage as a principal compared to as a literacy coach. She would just barge in the room but I think it was great.

**Nancy**

She was still coaching though wasn’t she? In that role?

**Nancy**

What do you think are some of the best things she did?

**Ray**

The best things she did, was, that she led both through example and suggestion. She might just sit down with a small group and just start having the conversations that I like to have and with some of the other teachers who weren’t having those conversations I think started having them.

**Nancy**

What are some things you think she could have done differently?

**Ray**

Well, she shot from the hip a lot. She reacted very quickly. She decided that something was happening without getting all the facts. But the good thing about her if she did that she would always revisit things or apologize or get more information later. But that was more of a personality thing than anything that’s inherited from being a coach but I think that’s one of the charges of being coach. Your personality dictates how much you are willing or want to collaborate. It dictates how you are proactive in getting in the classrooms and how you go about doing it. I mean, it’s all about relationship building really.

**Nancy**

It truly is. Now that’s the end of the my exact questions I need to ask you so I’m wondering if there is anything else you wanted to share that you haven’t had a chance to discuss.

**Ray**

Well, I think maybe just a few more thoughts on sort of where we ended up. I think one of the reasons that literacy coach models have failed a lot of times is because they aren’t um, the whole relationship building is not foundation to the way the job is construed. You get in there and you raise test scores by making sure people are, even ours are to a certain extent. Her Fridays are totally wasted by dibbling everybody. I mean every two weeks anybody who is not a passing benchmark and the whole school has to be dibbled. It is just absolutely just wasting her time. She is somebody who is really a thinker and she has to go around testing every Friday. And it is also disruptive because if I am counting on her. It would be nicer to have her in a classroom every day which is a pushing model which she has with me. So I think there is sort of a result oriented approach
that is taken a lot with literacy coaches where the process is not dutifully attended to in particular, the whole process of getting to know teachers and having the time to really discuss things. The first literacy coach, I thought was not that effective but one effective thing she did do is she started a book study group. That was a way for her to get to know people and have a little bit more access and a little more collaboration so realizing what a literacy coach really needs to do first of all is build bridges through sharing ideas and sharing experiences.

Nancy
I appreciate your time and your thoughts very much Ray.

Ray
It’s really great talking to you.

INTERVIEW OVER
APPENDIX D: NOTES FROM NORTHEAST REGION OBSERVATION

The observation occurred in spring 2011. The researcher arrived at the school at 10:00 am and left at 4:00 pm.

The researcher had the opportunity to spend time talking to teachers as well as meet with teachers throughout the day. The building is large and self-contained. As one walks into the building, you pass through an outer door that is painted in bright colors and welcomes all children, staff and visitors to the school. Once you walk through the outer doors, the foyer guides you to a colorful hallway trimmed in posters and pictures designed to welcome all to the building. The mood of the foyer and hall is joyous; the atmosphere makes me want to stay as long as I can. I begin my visit by going to the office and meeting the secretary and waiting for the employee who will be working with me during the day.

I am guided to a medium sized office to settle myself. The office is filled with books for students and teachers. The room is clearly a resource as the walls are lined with bookshelves and the bookshelves are full of texts of differing reading levels and various professional development areas. While sitting in the room I can hear the happy voices of children in the hall. I step into the hall and see the children lined up following their teacher to another area of the school. The children are dressed in uniform (blue pants and white shirts) and represent a variety of ethnic backgrounds. As I am observing the children a staff member signals me that the first teacher group is ready to talk with me.

The first group of teachers met with me in a classroom. There were three teachers in the group. The teachers were focused on discussing their reading program and invited me into their conversation. The teachers shared various problems they are having with writing and evaluating their students writing with a rubric. The teachers discussed how they have worked with their coach to develop a rubric. Teacher one related her experiences with rubric development with her coach. She discussed how the coach has helped her including coming into her classroom and working with her, by her side, to examine the student writing and determine how they could best evaluate the work. Teacher two agreed and related her story of how the coach would teach a mini-lesson if necessary to help the students understand the writing technique. Both teachers reported feeling supported by the coach and pleased with how she is there to help them anytime they need her. They described her as having an open-door policy and while some meetings are set up ahead of time, they can also meet with her on an impromptu basis. For most of the conversation, the teachers focused not on the coaching work, but on the growth of their students writing abilities. They believed that their work as a team helped their students improve in writing and also in reading.
The second meeting with teachers was a staff development opportunity held for all teachers in the building. I was able to settle into the room and mingle with the teachers as they entered the room and sat in grade level groups. The teachers were warm and friendly and interested in my work as an educator. The teachers were going to meet for the afternoon to plan instructional units for reading and writing units based on standards.

The teachers met in grade level groups with the special education teachers grouped together. The English as a Second Language teachers sat with the upper grade teacher which include fourth and fifth grade. I joined a few of the teacher groups as they worked together to complete the task at hand. Some of the teachers in the upper grade group expressed distress over the creation of the unit. I observed that the group of teachers leaned in to talk with one another and appeared to be close in a collegial relationship. I joined the group and began to listen to the conversation. The teachers discussed how they feel a lack of connection to the support team at the school, including their coach. They didn’t feel their grade level was as important to her as other grade levels. They stated that they didn’t feel connected to the coach, however, felt very connected to one another. One teacher spoke highly of his connection with fellow grade level teachers and how they help and coach one another routinely on reading and writing lessons. The second upper grade group had a different experience. I listened in to the conversation that group had while they were working together to plan a unit. This team referred often to how they check in often with the coach to get her opinion on lessons and student work. This team talked highly of their work with the coach. They discussed with one another how they would like her to review their unit planning and to watch them teach one of the lessons they were planning. The team clearly worked well together and also connected to the coach as support for them in their classroom and as a group.

Once this meeting adjourned, I spent time in building observing the culture of the building, the interactions of adults and reading the walls. The interior walls of the school are covered in student work. All the work and interactions were supportive of the people working within the school.
### APPENDIX E: QUALITATIVE SURVEY RESULTS

#### 41. INSTRUCTIONS - Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by writing your answer. How did coaching impact you as a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>reflecting and planning are directly connected to improving my craft...when I do this with someone else (a coach/colleague) it is done a much deeper level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nancy: I liked the comments above the numbers in part three; made it very clear to choose a number. This was very easy to take and took me 5 minutes. Questions were easy to understand Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coach was driven by the program, not the learner!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>no impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It provided me with a better way of tailoring my instruction. I feel I have a better way to empower my students and I have seen tremendous growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>This often challenged me to research further and question the methods we were encouraged to utilize in our classroom to enhance student achievement. Often, this made me a stronger teacher because of the fact that I found alternative methods to implement strategies or ideas that the coach was asked by the district to teach us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coaching has impacted me a great deal as a teacher. I have become more confident of my teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>using assessments to plan instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unfortunately we did not have a full time coach. When we were able to meet with a coach it was great. I know most of the coaches and I know that they are great. Our school system last year was hit or miss. I wish that we had had a full time coach last year to help. I would have made a great school if teachers had used them and what they learned with fidelity. This year we do. It is wonderful. It has made a major difference in our school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Helped me to better understand what it was that I was needing to do and how to do it in a way that my students would understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The coaching is not the problem. It's the attitude of some students and some parents that impact or affect your teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I allowed me to see things through someone else's eyes. Which meant I would be able to assist my students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I think it's great to have a mentor to turn to when you are in need of a multitude of things during that crucial first year. It's been a great help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I like that I can watch them teach and feel confident that I am doing things correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Elin is very helpful. She is always available to demo a lesson when asked. She does a very thorough job. She is the best LA coach I've worked with. The others were useless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I don't feel it had much impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Coaching from my administrative team was helpful and had a large impact. Coaching from district coaches was ineffectual and a waste of my time. I was particularly disappointed by coaches implementing new instructional strategies who were unprepared and who changed the content of their program AFTER their demonstration lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>In writing, student's scores went up. I was given good training, tips, strategies, and ideas by my coach on how to teach writing. Very valuable training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>It helped me to see through another teacher's eyes different ways for me to help reach my students and to help them to practice collaboration and presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>It brought into focus what the district expectations were.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Our literacy coach and I have formed a collaborative relationship in which we frequently plan reading instruction together. In many ways I am more confident and experienced than she is, and have served in a coach/consultant role before, so she often seeks my advice more than I seek hers. More often, I go to my 4th-grade team colleague for advice, as she is a more seasoned teacher. That said, the literacy coach is a smart, reflective teacher and I value my collaboration with her as well as the small-group leadership she provides during literacy groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I did have coaches in previous years and I felt that they were very effective in giving you fresh ideas and strategies and that they even reminded you of a strategy you may have used in the past and forgot about. I like to see a coach teach a lesson. I think if they planned with us it would also be helpful. A good coach that knows many strategies would be beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I don't believe coaching has improved the effectiveness of my teaching. I think coaches need to be more direct with their professional feedback and not worry about whether he/she is hurting a teacher's feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>It showed me that the school district doesn't know how to spend its money wisely. It also doesn't care about the students or teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I got good strategies to practice in my classroom but would have like some modeling, especially when I first began. Coaching lead the direction to my teaching but never showed me how to implement it to my students(modeling).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>When I have requested coaching I didn't receive it. Coaches are part time at our school and stretched too thinly and were directed to work with teachers who were underperforming. I think this is a big mistake, coaches should be used by people who want to improve and will value the opportunity, then the success might lead others to value coaching instead of resenting it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>It made me feel more assured in the coached techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2009-2010 year had very little impact; not consistent &amp; no follow through. This year, 2010-2011, has had much more impact and has been consistently available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I believe there is always room for improvement regardless of the amount anyone has been in education. My observations are that some coaches have been more helpful and more effective than others. Overall coaching has been beneficial and I feel very confident in delivering lessons with Direct Instruction and Math/ELA Lesson Design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Prior to 2009, there used to be more coaching and observations conducted. Our district needs have grown and our coaches have been pulled into too many other areas. So prior to 2009, I found coaching to be extremely helpful toward my teaching with fidelity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>We are very supported by the literacy coach with planning more than anything else. She is also available to bounce ideas around when I'm considering doing something differently. This helps me to think through instruction more thoroughly and keeps me on track.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During this school year, I only met with the coach once and she modeled and watched me once. I don't feel like that's an impact on me as a teacher. The coach rarely came into my class.  

It verified my opinion that I knew what I was doing. Our coach was available whenever we wanted or asked for her.  

District goals implemented  

In the past I had more help but this year my coach was willing to help but I didn't need as much help. She is always willing to help. She has worked with other teachers on a daily basis.  

Seeing a model of what it's supposed to look like has helped me.  

I am able to throw ideas out to my coach and she will give me realistic feedback about how she thinks that will work. She is a support and will go the extra mile to help. I love having a coach full time to help model new lesson ideas and give advice for things that can be improved.  

Coaching helped to affirm the things I already do well.  

Coaching allowed me to see things in myself and my students that I wasn't able to see without her support in helping me reflect. Spending time with a coach has helped me to see the need for daily reflection to determine what should change in my instruction. Also, I now see reflection as more than simply looking back on what went as I had expected and what didn't. Reflection now means, analyzing exactly what happened without judgement to gain insight into what the causes could be, so that I could adapt my instruction to better support my students.  

Coaching was off and on last year. It made me feel worthless. It was not her fault, it was just that the new way of teaching was not a good fit with me.  

I felt more empowered having a coach at my school. Unfortunately, our coach was pulled out to go to another school, so when I saw her, it was after school about once a month. Therefore she didn't see me teach and I saw her via videos. But what she taught me prior to 09-10 had quite an impact. I am more reflective and purposeful as a teacher. I think more about what my students CAN do instead of what they cannot do. I really miss that contact with a coach. They are so important for schools to have - for instruction, to help problem-solve, to help rejuvenate teachers, and to help teachers stay abreast of best practices.  

It slightly impacted my teaching. I understood 3 phase lesson design a bit better.  

Coaching made what seemed like an overwhelming task very attainable. My coach has a way of simplifying the needs of the students into groups that are very understandable and manageable. I saw my students attain great success through my small group instruction that was planned with the help of my coach.  

It has made me more aware of my students’ learning. I also do more check for understanding to adjust my instructions.  

Our Literacy coach did not come on a regular schedule, but came as needed. She came in each day for a month to coteach a writing unit with me. She taught and observed. This was extremely helpful for me to evaluate what I was doing well and how I could improve. She shared strategies and management skills with me.  

My literacy coach helped me reach students in a variety of ways. She helped me become more reflective in my teaching and helped me do the same with my students. She encouraged me to try new things with support every step of the way.  

Coaching has had some impact on me but not as much as it could if we had more coaches. I feel that our staff is too large for the coach to meet or watch us teach every week or month. We had a cycle
where the coach met with the grade level for a period of time. The coach went through the coaching cycle with me once during the time indicated. We did not meet monthly. It helped me somewhat, but it did not have a big impact on me.

My coach made such a significant impact on my teaching last year. She helped me to maintain a focus and work to achieve one goal at a time. My coach verified that learning is social. I really grew from being able to talk about my new learning with her. Having a clear plan significantly helped my teaching and then in turn helped my students. I value my coach very much.

My coach made such a significant impact on my teaching last year. She helped me to maintain a focus and work to achieve one goal at a time. My coach verified that learning is social. I really grew from being able to talk about my new learning with her. Having a clear plan significantly helped my teaching and then in turn helped my students. I value my coach very much.

it is always beneficial to watch someone else teach. I can learn a lot from that experience.

I wish I had a literacy coach again.

Just by the information given and the strategies taught have informed me a great deal. Putting them to use and seeing the success has been great.

I have a colleague that I talk with at least once a week. We coach each other through conversation. We reflect on our practice and have dialogue that supports each other. We do not have a coach in our building anymore because of budget cuts, so my colleague I referred to earlier has moved into that role. However when we did have a coach-she made an enormous impact on my reflective process. Through reflective dialogue, with someone who has a strong foundational knowledge, my teaching life will always be positively impacted.

Coaching from the district or on site. On site has not made a difference. At the district level-coached in frontloading lessons has made a difference.

She helped me get by with some classroom management issues, help with SmartBoard lessons and how to navigate it. She reminded me of workshops to attend and got some materials to use from colleagues and other mentors.

It is very useful to see someone else's teaching style and strategies used with your students. This shows you what other strategies work with them.

The first year our coach had only taught for approximately 4-5 years, she was timid, and withdrawn, seemed very inexperienced. She never taught a lesson in my class, observed me, offered help or seemed interested in my students. I tried to bring these issues to the attention of our Principal, and FUSD "Administration" but they seemed to be defensive re the situation--and I simply said nothing. It seemed like a real waste of resources. She behaved the same way all year, with all of our teachers. Some resented that she seemed to have no real job, or accountability. Another year we had a .50 "coach", he truly did not seem to be a good communicator, or have helpful ideas on how to improve my teaching. Again, he seemed very inexperienced. Coaches seem to have as a primary goal and training to promote, FUSD "mandates", and required programs--not a depth of experience, and education to help improve your instruction, or content knowledge.

I served as an administrator during the 2009-2010 school year. However, coaching helped me in the past with my classroom instruction. Coaching helped me reflect about best practices in my classroom.

WHEN we had a coach, I met with her weekly and she pushed me to question myself and so what is best for students. Losing our coach was a tremendous loss. Our administrators try but they can't do it all.

Our coach showed us viseos of best practices with Regie Routman and provided some training in miscue analysis.

I am able to talk to her about issues I come across in my teaching and she gives suggestions and resources. I also go to her to hear her thoughts about things I am trying in my room. It is great to have someone to reflect with to make sure what I am doing truly matches my beliefs. She is great about sharing new professional development books with me or read alouds she thinks I may never have seen. My kids love when she stops by to share a book (sometimes fun personal reading). They see that I am a reader too and that I have friends that recomend books just like I encourage them to do with eachother.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>She gave us ideas, encouragement, and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Lots of professional development, books, ideas, and encouragement!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>I feel more confident in the areas I have been coached (and validated with the strategies I was already using).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Helped me a lot in reading!!!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>It has not impacted my teaching. They have become secretaries for the district because of all the &quot;business&quot; the district has them take back to their sights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Coaching has helped me a lot this year because I am in a new grade level. My coach really helped by modeling and offering suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Coaching helped me learn other strategies to help my teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Helped me look at assessments with a different lens. Also helped me focus on the students not my lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Sometimes it was more of a hinderance because the coach was not available or willing to help with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>The information that the coaches presented at the meetings were very beneficial to my teaching. Although I never sat down to plan, during staff meetings I felt the coaches presented me with strategies that I could take back to the classroom and try to reach the struggling students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>I have learned a lot from our coaches and my peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>I think it is helpful to get new strategies but I think you have to allow teachers to have their own personal style and not make everyone cookie cutter images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Provides resources on a need basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>I am lucky to have a fantastic coach at my school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>I was learning a new way of teaching and it helped me learn how to do cooperative teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Since I have been teaching for 35 years, the coaching did not impact me in a great way. I did receive new ideas to implement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>I'm a fairly new teacher and coaching really helps. They gave me different strategies to teach as well as helping me find the right resources to help with my teachings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Not at all. I identified a peer as my coach here. I find that valuable work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>It impacted me very much. Discussing and working with a peer motivates and encourages me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Coaching, mostly with my peers, has been very helpful. With coaching, I feel more confident and believe it has helped us be more cohesive and creative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>I value her experience and opinion. She makes time for me and it is appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>It allowed me insight into a few good ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Coaching has helped me to improve my craft tremendously. My coach is available all the time even when I am not on a coaching cycle. She gives me constant feedback in a nontreating way. I trust her and know that she cares for my students as much as I do. We work together always with the best interest of all my students even those that are hard to reach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>It helped me analyze my effectiveness with whole class and small group teaching. It also helped me plan for instruction based on the results of assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>look at assessments to create strategy groups to differentiate instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>It provided good examples about what efficient teaching looked like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Coaching can be a great tool if it is done right. I usually do my own research and guide myself, so coaching has done little to nothing to help me in my class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Coaching has given me the opportunity to acquire different strategies and methods of teaching and has changed the way I used to teach. It has given me new tools to implement with my students, who have also benefit from this coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>She has helped me use the standards better to meet the differentiated needs of my students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>It helped evolve my teaching to a higher level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>We never had one in the past that was able to stay long enough to help since 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>I did not receive coaching in the 2009-2010 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>I'm currently teaching a &quot;new&quot; grade, so any coaching I received was beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Coaching has been impactful as a support as I try new teaching strategies, as a resource for better meeting student needs, and ultimately with the planning and looking at student work for next steps of instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Continues to provide professional literature for me to keep growing and applying in classroom. She modeled application of good strategies. She brought teams together to share knowledge. Just great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Made me realize the different methods available to students that I was not aware of before. I became a better student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>It has made me a better teacher. It has taught me to be reflective and look at data to make instructional decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>