

HOW DOES FORMAL LEADERSHIP INFLUENCE
A DISTRICT CONTENT COACHING PROGRAM?

by

SARAH E. HUDSON

B.S., Kansas State University, 1985
M.S., Kansas State University, 1991

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2010

Abstract

The titles of professional books on the topic of coaching are numerous, coaching professional development offerings are widespread and schools across the country are hiring teachers to serve in coaching roles. There is great interest around the topic of coaching and much is being written about the support that is needed for coaches as well. According to professional literature the few case studies that have been done address various types of coaching in different contexts—making it impossible to draw conclusions across them.

While there is an abundant amount of literature around the topics of the various coaching roles and support needed for coaching, a study of the implementation of a coaching approach and the role of leadership has not been conducted. We do not know about the range of coaching experiences, how those arrangements were enacted and the formal leadership features in these partnerships. This study provides information that addresses this gap in the literature.

This qualitative study used the path-goal theory of leadership and the 21 leadership responsibilities identified by the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning as a means to examine one school district's approach to implementing a content coaching program. Thirty-two participants including Central Office personnel, principals, and content coaches were interviewed.

The themes of this study suggest that it is important to establish goals and guidelines for a coaching program as foundational pieces. From these goals and guidelines, coaching roles and responsibilities can be clearly established and outcomes measured. In addition, the study suggests key pieces of good coaching partnerships to include support in many varieties and opportunities from strong professional development specific to coaching to networking with coaches. Further, the study identifies leadership responsibilities that impact second-order change

that can contribute to these coaching partnerships. Recommendations to implementing successful content coaching programs in this study are discussed.

HOW DOES FORMAL LEADERSHIP INFLUENCE
A DISTRICT CONTENT COACHING PROGRAM?

by

SARAH E. HUDSON

B.S., Kansas State University, 1985
M.S., Kansas State University, 1991

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2010

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Trudy A. Salsberry

Copyright

SARAH E. HUDSON

2010

Abstract

The titles of professional books on the topic of coaching are numerous, coaching professional development offerings are widespread and schools across the country are hiring teachers to serve in coaching roles. There is great interest around the topic of coaching and much is being written about the support that is needed for coaches as well. According to professional literature the few case studies that have been done address various types of coaching in different contexts—making it impossible to draw conclusions across them.

While there is an abundant amount of literature around the topics of the various coaching roles and support needed for coaching, a study of the implementation of a coaching approach and the role of leadership has not been conducted. We do not know about the range of coaching experiences, how those arrangements were enacted and the formal leadership features in these partnerships. This study provides information that addresses this gap in the literature.

This qualitative study used the path-goal theory of leadership and the 21 leadership responsibilities identified by the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning as a means to examine one school district's approach to implementing a content coaching program. Thirty-two participants including Central Office personnel, principals, and content coaches were interviewed.

The themes of this study suggest that it is important to establish goals and guidelines for a coaching program as foundational pieces. From these goals and guidelines, coaching roles and responsibilities can be clearly established and outcomes measured. In addition, the study suggests key pieces of good coaching partnerships to include support in many varieties and opportunities from strong professional development specific to coaching to networking with

coaches. Further, the study identifies leadership responsibilities that impact second-order change that can contribute to these coaching partnerships. Recommendations to implementing successful content coaching programs in this study are discussed.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	xii
Acknowledgements.....	xiii
CHAPTER 1 - Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Study	6
Research Questions.....	7
Conceptual Framework.....	8
Significance of the Study	10
Limitations of the Study	12
Delimitations of the Study	12
Definitions of Terms.....	13
Summary.....	15
CHAPTER 2 - Review of the Literature.....	16
Coaching	18
Forms of Coaching.....	18
The Evolution of Peer Coaching.....	19
Renewed Interest in Coaching	20
Coaching Roles and Skills	23
Supporting the Coach.....	29
Leadership.....	32
Theories and related literature.....	32
Path-goal Theory of Leadership.....	34
Balanced Leadership Framework	37
Teacher Leadership.....	40
Summary.....	45
CHAPTER 3 - Methodology	47
Research Questions.....	47
Research Design	48
Setting and Participants	50

Data Collection	55
Data Analysis	58
Background and Role of the Researcher.....	59
Trustworthiness.....	60
Summary.....	62
CHAPTER 4 - Analysis of the Data	63
Purpose Statement.....	63
Analyzing the Data	63
Field Notes and Journal	64
Findings from Field Notes and Journal.....	66
Interviews.....	67
Main Code (A).	68
Main Code (B).	69
Main Code (C).	70
Data Presentation	71
Program Organization.....	73
Structure.....	73
Coaching Defined	73
Evolution of Coaching	74
Goals and Guidelines for the Program.....	75
Importance of the Coaching Role Position	77
Evidence of Outcomes	78
Challenges.....	79
Findings for Structure	80
Central Office Perspectives on Structure	81
Position	91
Attributes and Qualifications for the Coaching Role.....	91
How the Coaches' Time is Spent.....	93
Coaching Responsibilities.....	95
Professional Development	96
Summary of Findings for Position.....	97

Central Office Perspectives on Position.....	98
Path-Goal Theory of Leadership.....	105
Path-goal Clarifying Behaviors.....	105
Achievement Oriented Leadership Behavior.....	107
Work Facilitation	107
Supportive Leader Behaviors.....	108
Interaction Facilitation/Group-Oriented Decision Process.....	109
Representation and Networking.....	111
Value-based Leader Behavior.....	112
Findings Related to the Path-goal Theory of Leadership Analysis	112
Data from Interviews with Central Office on Path-goal Theory of Leadership	115
McREL’s Leadership Responsibilities	121
Findings for McREL Leadership Responsibilities.....	124
Findings Disaggregated by Years of Experience and Levels	125
Data from Interviews with Central Office on McREL Leadership Responsibilities	126
Themes Across All Findings.....	133
CHAPTER 5 - Discussion and Recommendations.....	140
Findings and Interpretations	141
Theme One: Need for Clarity and Definition of Coaching.....	141
Theme Two: Leader Behaviors Create Supportive Coaching Environments	143
Theme Three: Leaders Use Certain Responsibilities More for Second-order Change (both positive and negative)	144
Results.....	145
Research Sub-Question 1: Using the path-goal theory as an analytic framework, how are these coaching relationships influenced by leader behavior?	146
Research Sub-Question 2: Using McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework, what are the leadership responsibilities manifested in these partnerships?.....	148
Research Sub-Question 3: In what ways does this formal leadership influence the outcomes of these coaching arrangements?	150
Recommendations.....	151
Recommendations for Future Research	153

Conclusions.....	155
References.....	158
Appendix A - The 21 Responsibilities and Their Correlations (r) with Student Academic Achievement.....	162
Appendix B - Participant Invitation Letter	163
Appendix C - Intent to Participate Form.....	164
Appendix D - Interview Protocol.....	165

List of Tables

Table 3-1 Principal and Coach Participant Demographics	51
Table 4-1 Summarization of Coding Categories	72
Table 4-2 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1).....	83
Table 4-3 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1).....	85
Table 4-4 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1).....	86
Table 4-5 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1)*.....	87
Table 4-6 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1).....	88
Table 4-7 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1).....	90
Table 4-8 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under Category of Position (A2)	99
Table 4-9 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Position (A2)	101
Table 4-10 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Position (A2)*	103
Table 4-11 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Position (A2)	104
Table 4-12 Codes and Patterns under the Category of Path-Goal Leadership Theory (B).....	116
Table 4-13 Path-Goal Theory of Leadership Disaggregated by Role.....	119
Table 4-14 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of McRel Leadership Responsibilities	127
Table 4-15 Coaches (8) with < 4 Years of Experience Compared to Those (7) with > 4 Years	129
Table 4-16 Principals (3) with < 4 Years of Experience Compared to Number of Responses ..	130
Table 4-17 Coaches (2) at the Secondary Level Compared to Elementary Level.....	131
Table 4-18 Principals (2) at the Secondary Level Compared to Elementary Level	132
Table 4-19 Themes Across All Findings	136
Table 4-20 A Summary of All Findings Leading to Themes	138

Acknowledgements

The goal of obtaining my doctorate of education is one that has been accomplished because of the encouragement, assistance, support, and patience of many others. I feel blessed to have reached this lifelong goal, but know that it would not have been possible without other individuals who came alongside me in this endeavor.

I express thanks to Dr. Trudy Salsberry for her patience and guidance as this work unfolded. She exemplifies the term “teacher” as she was teaching throughout this long process. She coached me, challenged me, corrected me, and encouraged me to stretch beyond my limits. As I look back at the earliest drafts, I realize how much I grew over the process. I am grateful for her efforts to assist me continually.

The encouragement of my colleagues and friends at work was a continual support to me. They listened to me, they wrote words of motivation, they acknowledged my frustrations, but never let me give up. I appreciate that they were my sounding board on many days. I don’t believe there could be a better group of colleagues and I am thankful for the privilege of working with them.

I thank my parents who modeled perseverance and determination in their own lives. They never discouraged me from trying anything I wanted to do in my life although there must have been times when they questioned my choices. I know that Dad and Geoffrey are smiling down at me today and I hope that my efforts honor their memory. There are not more important people in my life than my family and I know that there were occasions when time with them was not what it could have been because of my commitment to studies.

I want to express gratitude for my husband, Steve. While he has always been a model of love and support for me, he has sacrificed much on my behalf to allow me to accomplish my goal. He continually expressed his pride in me and encouraged me all along the way. He never spoke a word of complaint about late nights, long weekends where I was working and we weren't able to do things together, or the lack of meals. Instead, he worked on his own goals alongside me and patiently demonstrated his love for me. He is a gift from God.

Finally, I thank God for giving me this opportunity as I recognize not everyone has the same opportunity. I thank Him for the financial resources, the physical resources, the spiritual resources, and the support I have had through my husband and family, friends, and colleagues. He is the source of all these blessings.

CHAPTER 1 - Introduction

The work of school systems has historically been to offer an education for young people that would enable them to be both productive citizens and learners well prepared for the job force. Perhaps never as much as in this current environment has the focus been to provide a quality education *for all students* and such purposeful effort been directed at this focus. When the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110) was signed into law, the stakes for achievement at the highest levels for all students were established. Included in this federal law were requirements for the states to develop testing systems that met federal guidelines, academic benchmarks that increased incrementally each year, and sanctions for public schools not meeting these benchmarks. The sanctions in the law direct states to take action ranging from providing technical assistance to schools, requiring that students be offered a choice of public schools, replacing staff in some cases, to the extreme of states taking over entire school districts. As the NCLB mandates strengthen their hold on schools each year, teachers and principals readily admit to being overwhelmed by these requirements and are seeking assistance in both new and old ways. Resources provided by federal funds are limited, but the specifics of the law are clear (Sunderman & Orfield, 2007). With NCLB directing such attention to achievement, efforts to improve schools are under review.

The Center on Education Policy (CEP) conducted a “comprehensive and continuous review of NCLB” (Jennings & Rentner, 2006, p. 110) gathering information through surveys of state departments of education, questionnaires administered to a nationally representative sampling of school districts, and case studies of individual schools and districts. After a multi-year review and analysis of the information describing the influence of the NCLB policy, the authors suggest 10 major effects of NCLB on public schools. The effects include rising student

achievement on state tests, more time spent on reading and math, more attention to the alignment of curriculum and instruction, more attention paid to achievement gaps and the learning needs of particular groups of students, and students taking more tests. Jennings and Rentner (2006) report that in schools that have not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two years, the most common adjustments include improvement in the quality and quantity of professional development for teachers, and the provision of more intensive instruction to low-achieving students. NCLB is “clearly having a major impact on American public education” (Jennings & Rentner, 2006, p. 113).

Consistent with the Jennings and Rentner (2006) report on the effect of increased attention to curriculum and instruction and improvements in the quantity and quality of professional development, the professional school leadership literature provides a look at approaches to improving teachers’ instructional strategies in the learning environment. In this study, a specific approach was examined. This approach involved schools hiring teachers as leaders in a coaching role to support their peers in improving teaching and learning (2007).

There is a growing body of professional school literature pertaining to the use of personnel to coach classroom teachers as a means of professional development. According to Hawley and Valli (1999), having master teachers working directly with teachers in their schools is an effective approach to ongoing professional development; thus instructional coaches are among the new personnel hired by schools in their efforts to help raise the achievement of students. In some school systems, these roles are established as a “way to address the weakness of professional development and to improve teacher and student learning” (Killion & Harrison, 2006, p. 8). The professional literature indicates that the hiring of instructional coaches is an attempt to provide professional development as a means to change teacher practice and content

knowledge (Dole, Liang, Watkins, & Wiggins, 2006; Killion & Harrison, 2006; Moran, 2007). The National Staff Development Council (NSDC) has even developed a model to describe how coaches' work impacts teaching and learning (Killion, 2007). Hiring an individual that can focus professional development for teachers, offer instructional and curriculum resources, supply insights into data used to make instructional decisions, and provide additional assistance in classrooms is appealing to schools working with limited resources.

The professional literature references the role of the school-based coach by many titles. Killion and Harrison (2006) note titles that include resource provider, data coach, instructional specialist, curriculum specialist, classroom supporter, learning facilitator, mentor, school leader, learner, and catalyst for change. These researchers also noted differences and similarities in job expectations from school to school. Upon a review of literature, Moran (2007) noted a literacy coach was called: "reading coach, expert coach, technical coach, cognitive coach, peer coach, collegial coach, content-focused coach, collaborative coach, design coach, instructional coach, academic coach and reflective coach" (p. 4). Although there are a variety of titles related to the coaching role, researchers again noted that coaching skills described are often similar (Feger, Wolcek, & Hickman, 2004; Knight, 2004; Kowal & Steiner, 2007; Norton, 2007).

Framing the coaching role, the knowledge and skills needed by coaches, and helping coaches build their repertoire of skills are discussed in recent literature (Feger et al., 2004). Walpole and Blamey (2008) argue that their experiences with coaches in schools reveal that the roles are not well defined. They indicate that "one potential reason for this is that the more defined roles in the literature and in the standards are only slowly making their way into the schools; in the meantime, many coaches are simply managing the multiple demands of principals and teachers in idiosyncratic ways" (Walpole & Blamey, 2008, p. 223).

Borman and Feger (2006) describe the research around the coaching role and its growing popularity among large districts and with particular reform model providers such as America's Choice (Poglinco et al., 2003), High Performing Learning Communities, and Breaking Ranks framework. They note that "if the coach role lacks definition even within a defined reformed model, it should not be surprising that it is variously interpreted and differently structured by other educators" (Borman & Feger, 2006, p. 1). They make no reference to the role of leadership in these coaching partnerships.

In a widely cited report on coaching, Neufeld and Roper (2003) differentiated between *change coaches* and *content coaches*. *Change coaches* were those individuals that addressed whole-school, organizational improvement, while *content coaches* directed a focus to improving teachers' instructional strategies in specific content areas. Neufeld and Roper (2003) write that there is evidence that coaching can produce "school cultures in which instruction is the focus of much teacher and principal discussion, and in which teachers and principals reflect on their practice and its impact on students and use achievement data to drive instructional improvement" (p. 27). They also speak to the promise that coaching can change professional practice and professional culture when teachers and principals work collaboratively.

Statement of the Problem

The titles of professional books on the topic of coaching are numerous, coaching professional development offerings are widespread, and schools across the country are hiring staff to serve in coaching roles. There is great interest around the topic of coaching (Cassidy & Cassidy, 2008). Much is written about the support that is needed for coaches as well (Killion, 2007; Knight, 2004; Norton, 2007; Pankake & Moller, 2007). Teachers engage in many leadership roles (Dozier, 2007), and coaching is another opportunity that provides for teacher

leadership experiences. According to the professional literature (Walpole & Blamey, 2008), the few case studies that have been done address “different types of coaching in different contexts—making it impossible to draw conclusions across them” (p. 223).

While there is a good amount of literature around the topics of the various coaching roles and support needed for coaching, a study of the implementation of a coaching approach and the role of leadership has not been conducted. We do not know about the range of coaching experiences, how those arrangements were enacted, and the formal and informal leadership features in these partnerships. This study provides information that addresses this gap in the literature. For the purposes of this study, the role is referred to as content coach and defined as the school-based individual whose primary responsibility is to improve teacher and student learning through direct contact with both groups, in their schools, and in their classrooms.

The Kansas school district selected for this study (hereafter referred to as District 101) implemented a form of instructional coaching more than 20 years ago as a way to improve teaching, according to interviews with principals currently employed with this district who were part of this project at that time. According to an unpublished interview, P.A. Gibson (personal communication, November 12, 2008) explained the approach in District 101 at that time was to form teams of expert teachers at the district level to assist their peers through providing resources, making informal classroom observations, and sometimes serving as co-teachers in the classroom. An instructional coach acted in a direct support role of the classroom teachers through tasks similar to those of a mentor, offering resources and support mostly for the newest teachers in the district. This strategy was not site based, but it did offer support to those teachers willing to ask for it or recommended for it. The approach, thought to be successful at the time, had to be eliminated when a reduction of funding occurred because of the loss of a major local

employer. With the pressures of NCLB to increase student achievement each year, many strategies are being reviewed for their potential impact on achievement and District 101 has implemented this approach once again, but with modifications from the way the model was previously delivered. The content coaching approach is viewed as a way to influence instruction more broadly and to move teachers toward using new instructional strategies and knowledge about teaching and learning.

In this quest for increased student achievement through the improvement of teaching and learning, teachers were hired to work directly with their peers through the placement of a coach in each of the district's school sites. Each school determined how to use this additional person at their site. In some cases, the staff member provides tutoring, working with students at the highest risk of performing poorly on critical assessments. In other cases, this individual's assignment focuses on providing feedback to teachers on their instruction. In most buildings, the content coach is also a resource provider and data manager. Based on the Showers and Joyce research (1996) indicating the transference of new learning for teachers is most effective when the new learning is followed up by coaching and other forms of support, District 101 is moving to change these positions to resemble true coaching roles in support of teachers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the ways in which one school district implemented a coaching approach in each of its schools. This case study documented how the coaching approach was implemented by examining how the coaching role was defined, what professional development for the content coach was provided, and leadership roles in the coaching partnership.

This investigation will help to understand how one district's approach to improving teaching through coaching was enacted: how the coach and principal functioned in each arrangement, how the players interacted, and their perceived outcomes for coaching. These were examined through the lens of the path-goal theory of leadership and the Balanced Leadership Framework (Waters & Cameron, 2007).

Research Questions

The proposed research study contained several research questions that provided the framework for investigation and exploration. The overarching question was: How does formal leadership influence a district content coaching program?

Subquestions:

1. Using the path-goal theory as an analytic framework, how are these coaching relationships influenced by leader behaviors?
 - What are the path-goal clarifying behaviors that materialize in this approach?
 - What are the areas for which the coach feels individual responsibility and control?
 - How is the coach's work planned, scheduled, and organized?
 - What supportive leader behaviors are manifested in the partnerships?
 - What are the leader behaviors that facilitate collaborative and positive interactions?
 - How are decisions for the work unit made?
 - What networking opportunities are available? How are the values of the leader communicated?
2. Using McREL's Balanced Leadership Framework, what are the leadership responsibilities that are manifested in these partnerships?

- What leader responsibilities and practices emerge across school levels?
 - What leader responsibilities and practices emerge when years of experience in the position is examined?
 - What leader responsibilities and practices emerge in these partnerships when position within the organization is examined?
3. In what ways does the formal leadership influence the outcomes of these coaching arrangements?

Conceptual Framework

In examining coaching partnerships, it is important to understand how leadership responsibilities are manifested in the coaching arrangements. The path-goal theory of leadership provided a means for examining the leadership in these coaching pairs; additionally research provided by the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) provided insight into leadership responsibilities associated with student achievement (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

The original path-goal theory of leadership was published in 1971, and there have since been between 40 and 50 studies designed to test propositions of the theory. The path-goal theory provided a set of assumptions about how various leadership styles will interact with characteristics of subordinates and the work setting (House, 1996). This theory emphasizes the relationship between the leader's style and the characteristics of the subordinates and the work setting, seeking to understand how leadership behaviors affect the satisfaction of subordinates, and help subordinates define their goals and the paths they take to achieve their goals. House (1996) indicated that the leader would be "effective to the extent that they complement the environment in which they work by providing necessary clarifications to ensure that subordinates

expect that they can attain work goals” (p. 326). This seminal work was helpful in providing a framework for leadership analysis and led House to a reformulated path-goal theory of work unit leadership presented in 1996. The reformulated path-goal theory specified eight leader behaviors that are satisfying, motivational, and facilitative for subordinates, and it proposes that effective leaders likely choose their behaviors based on the personality and skills of their subordinates. In the school setting, the building principal must understand the skills and needs of the coach in order to choose leadership behaviors that will best support the coach.

A second lens for examining these partnerships is through specifically identified leadership responsibilities. The leadership insight provided by McREL examined research from as far back as 25 years ago to the present, reviewing more than 5,000 studies that examine the effects of leadership on student achievement (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2004). From the data, they determined the following:

- “Leadership Matters. McREL found a significant, positive correlation between effective school leadership and school achievement.
- We can empirically define effective leadership. McREL identified 21 key areas of leadership responsibility that are significantly correlated with student achievement.
- Effective leaders not only know what to do, but how, when, and why to do it. McREL concluded that effective leaders understand which school changes are most likely to improve student achievement, what these changes imply for both staff and community, and how to tailor their leadership practices accordingly.” (Waters et al., 2004, p. 49)

In addition, McREL named 11 of the 21 leadership responsibilities as associated with order of change. Order of change has to do with the impact or magnitude change will have on those involved in the change. First order change is minor change requiring small, incremental, improvements. Second order change implies a significant break with the past and requires new knowledge and skills. All 21 of the leadership responsibilities were positively correlated with first order change. Seven of these responsibilities were positively correlated with second order change, and four were negatively correlated with second order change. Rank ordered from greatest to least according to their relationship with second order change, the seven that are positively correlated are as follows: knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment; flexibility; change agent; ideals and beliefs; monitor and evaluate; intellectual stimulation; and optimizer. The four responsibilities that were negatively correlated to change with second-order implications were culture, communication, input, and order. The four negatively correlated responsibilities are perceived by others as declining or as not being fulfilled as well as they could be (Waters & Cameron, 2007).

This study will seek to document and analyze what happened in one school district using a content coaching approach to improve instruction. The study documented the experiences of this approach and examined how the formal administrator role (principal) intersects with the teacher leadership role (content coach). The coaching approach in District 101 was studied through the lens of the path-goal theory of leadership and the leadership responsibilities identified in the McREL research.

Significance of the Study

With “schools and districts hiring teachers as leaders to support their peers in teaching and learning” (Killion, 2007, p. 11), it is important to learn more about the coaching approach

and how it is enacted. This study of one school district's efforts to increase student improvement through improved teaching and learning may help to inform our understanding of how to help administrators and coaches develop effective coaching models. Viewed through the lens of the path-goal leadership theory and the Balanced Leadership Framework, the research may help us to better understand how the principal can support the coach in this approach to school improvement.

The prospective benefits of this study include the potential to improve the coaching approach by understanding how these coaching arrangements are established, the leadership roles of the principal and coach, and the potential for improving the partnerships. Additionally, the study may offer a guide for school administrators and coaches in shaping the coaching role.

With so much interest at the local, state, and national level on coaching to improve teacher practice, this study can potentially provide insights to other agencies as they seek to fine-tune the coaching model to gain greater returns on the investment in these individuals. In reference to the *Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse* site (<http://www.literacycoachingonline.org/>), Walpole and Blamey (2008) noted, "a November 2007 review of the resources linked in the site's library yielded seven case studies, three randomized experiments, and two surveys-hardly the stuff of strong, replicative evidence to define the work or effects of coaching" (2008, p. 223). This was in reference to the *Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse*. Much of the professional literature has explored primarily the topic of literacy, and it is important to study coaching in other content areas, as well as the implementation of coaching. Kowal and Steiner (2007) conclude that "the emerging body of empirical research on coaching indicates that instructional coaching has great potential to influence teacher practice and, ultimately, student performance"

(p. 6). This study enhances coaching by adding research on the leadership role in coaching to what is currently available.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study were those related to data collection. Because interviews were conducted with both building principals and content coaches, reliance on self-disclosure was a factor. Since building principals could feel compelled to give responses not indicative of their true leadership style, their answers may have reflected this concern. The same limitation applies to the content coach.

Another limitation is that the interviews were all conducted within the same school district; therefore, the responses may be representative of the school district culture, which could be significantly different from that of other school districts. Factors such as prior leadership, context of the school district related to demographics, and professional development are unique to this district and may differ from others.

Finally, the study is only viewed through the lens of formal leadership. Not all issues that could be associated with coaching are studied.

Delimitations of the Study

Several parameters were established for this study. Those invited to participate were those currently serving in the role of building principal and content coach in District 101. Both partners had to agree to be part of the study to be included. There were 17 schools in the school district and every school has one instructional coach with the exception of one school, which has two coaching positions. Two of the schools share one principal, with the principal spending the majority of time in the larger of the two schools. In the smaller school, one person is assigned to

act as principal in the absence of the principal, but also serves as the coach; this school was not included in the study.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined as they are related in the context of this dissertation proposal. Some of the definitions are operational and some come from the professional literature. They are categorized as such:

Operational terms:

Building principal: The individual who is designated as building administrator for a school.

Content coach: An onsite teacher who works with other teachers in their respective buildings to share instructional practices, to provide professional development, to provide feedback to teachers, to review data, and to tutor students.

Content coaching approach: The strategy/program the district is using at school sites to improve student learning and teacher practice.

Professional terms:

First-order change: This type of change is viewed as an extension of the past and is implemented with existing skills and knowledge (Waters et al., 2004).

Second-order change: This is a type of change viewed as a break from the past, conflicting with prevailing norms and values, and requiring new skills and knowledge (Waters et al., 2004).

Path-goal theory of leadership: Theory published by Robert House in 1971 and reformulated in 1996. The original publication identified four leader behaviors (achievement-oriented, directed, participative, and supportive) that are contingent to the follower characteristics and the environmental factors of the workplace. This theory combines leadership

behaviors, the characteristics of followers and a task and the motivation of followers to do a task that they feel they are able to, for an expected outcome and a reward for the outcome. Key concepts associated with this theory (as defined by House, 1996) are:

Path-goal clarifying behaviors: the leader behaviors that metaphorically clarify subordinates' paths to goal accomplishment.

Achievement-oriented leader behavior: leader behavior that challenges subordinates to perform work at the highest level possible.

Work facilitation: leader behaviors consisting of planning, scheduling, and organizing the work of subordinates to a high degree.

Supportive leader behavior: leader behaviors that are friendly and approachable, attending to the well-being and human needs of the subordinate.

Interaction facilitation: leader behaviors that facilitate collaborative and positive interactions among members.

Group-oriented decision process: the manner by which decisions that affect the group are made.

Representation and networking: the leader behaviors that facilitate the communication by the work unit of the resources required for their work.

Value based leader behavior: leader behaviors that address subordinates' cherished values and identities, making their self-worth contingent on their contribution to the leaders' mission.

Work Unit: the collective group of individuals being managed.

Success For All: a comprehensive and highly structured reading curriculum developed at Johns Hopkins University's Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Summary

In this chapter, a brief discussion of the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act and its effect on schools was presented. NCLB's effects were studied by Jennings and Rentner (2006) and provided a rationale as to why the coaching approach is being implemented across the country. Coaching is one approach that schools are using to improve student performance through teacher professional development and improved teacher practice. While coaching is not an entirely new concept to the educational world, it is a concept being revisited with considerations about how it can be effective in the climate created and fostered by the NCLB legislation. The school district that was the focus of this study chose to hire content coaches as a way to improve student achievement. This study examined how coaching was enacted in this district. It examined how the principal and content coach arrangement was defined, how the two interacted, leadership roles, and the perceived outcomes from this approach. The research questions, purpose and significance of the study, delimitations and limitations are also addressed. This chapter introduced the path-goal theory of leadership and the McREL Balanced Leadership Framework as a lens to study the coaching arrangements in this school district. This is a different look at coaching from what is currently in the literature. Chapter 2 expands further on the topic of coaching and leadership. The body of literature around the topic of coaching is expansive, so the focus of the literature review will be on instructional coaching roles and skills and leadership theory. It is important to add the newer understandings of the importance of developing teacher leadership to this instructional coaching role model. This aspect can strengthen the coaching role and add new understandings of its role in the coaching arrangements.

CHAPTER 2 - Review of the Literature

This study examined coaching through a leadership lens making it important to understand what the professional literature reveals about coaching and leadership. The purpose of this chapter is to review current professional literature surrounding coaching and leadership. The key topics associated with both coaching and leadership are included to support the design and analysis of this study.

Knight (2007) suggests that hundreds of instructional coaches are being hired to improve professional practice in schools. Citing coaching's contribution to improved professional development, Russo (2004) notes that coaching has quickly been spreading around the nation. Several large-scale school reform models, such as America's Choice, High Performing Learning Communities, and the Breaking Ranks framework are using instructional coaching to support successful reforms (Borman & Feger, 2006).

The rationale for having a coach is informed by and rooted in research that effective professional development is characterized by ongoing feedback and follow-up to professional development (Neufeld & Roper, 2003; Poglinco et al., 2003; Russo, 2004). Coaching is a way to support professional growth and move teachers toward using new instructional strategies and teaching/learning.

Instructional coaches serve in a number of types of roles, and those roles may differ from one school site to another based on hiring needs and other contextual reasons. The literature reveals that instructional coaches must be recognized by their staff as leaders, must have strong communication skills, and must know their content well (Feger et al., 2004; Kowal & Steiner, 2007; Moran, 2007). Support for the instructional coach is of great importance if the coach is to be successful. The building principal must know the strengths and weaknesses of the

instructional coach well and must have the ability to provide the necessary support. Knight (2007) suggests that “when coaching programs are well-designed, the chances of making significant differences in teaching practices are greater and the potential of coaching can be realized” (p. 27). Current literature also reveals the emerging role of teacher leaders and communicates a need to promote and develop teacher leadership roles (Danielson, 2006; Dozier, 2007).

What is not clear from the professional literature around the instructional coaching model is how coaching arrangements are implemented, how the coaches’ assignments are determined, how the arrangement between coach and the building leader develops, or how the role of leadership is characterized in these coaching arrangements. As previously noted, the role of the instructional coach will look different from one site to another, but this study looked at schools in a particular district and documented the range of experiences related to this approach.

The research topic that was examined is broad in nature and new literature is continually emerging. While it is not possible to address all aspects of the interest in the instructional coaching role, the focus of this study centered on one district’s approach to improve instruction and learning through coaching by examining the coaching implementation through the leadership perspective (as portrayed by path-goal theory of leadership and McREL). House’s (1996) path-goal theory of leadership served as a lens to view the coaching approach as this theory notes the characteristics of both partners in the relationship and how it is that the leader specifically guides and shapes the behavior of the subordinate (coach). Additionally, the McREL Balanced Framework gave insight into research-based leadership responsibilities that are factors in improved student achievement, specifically those responsibilities associated with second-order change (Waters & Cameron, 2007).

The discussion in this chapter is organized into the following sections: (a) forms of coaching, the evolution of coaching (to include the renewed interest in the instructional coaching role), coaching roles and skills that are necessary for instructional coaches in the assignment, and support that must be provided for the instructional coach; (b) leadership theories and related literature; and (c) the emerging role of teacher leadership in schools.

Coaching

Forms of Coaching

Knight (2008) describes the four approaches to coaching most frequently mentioned in the literature: Peer Coaching, Cognitive Coaching, Literacy Coaching, and Instructional Coaching. They are listed in order from the oldest to the most recent forms of coaching.

Peer Coaching refers to the work of Showers and Joyce (1996) on professional development and the effect of follow-up coaching with teachers. This was one of the earliest coaching models and will be described in greater detail to follow.

Cognitive Coaching was first developed in the 1980s and has been the subject of numerous research studies. Edwards' study (as cited in Knight, 2008) describes nine outcomes from Cognitive Coaching as a result of numerous research studies. Those outcomes are: (1) increase in student test scores and "other benefits to students," (2) growth in teacher efficacy, (3) increase in reflective and complex thinking, (4) increase in teacher satisfaction with career and position, (5) increase in professional climate in schools, (6) increase in teacher collaboration, (7) increase in professional assistance to teachers, (8) increase in personal benefit to teachers, and (9) benefit to people in fields other than coaching (p. 199).

Knight (2008) describes Literacy Coaching as "anyone who supports teachers with the goal of increasing literacy" (p. 203). Because the definition is all encompassing, the role may

look very different from one place to another. It can describe many configurations of coaching as well. The causal relationship between receiving Literacy Coaching and changes in teacher behavior and student achievement need further exploration to determine effectiveness.

Instructional Coaching is the model developed at the University of Kansas by Jim Knight (2008) and was derived from several activities: (a) the development and study of the theoretical framework for this approach, (b) a teacher survey on modeling, (c) teacher interviews, (d) a study of teacher implementation, and (e) the iterative development of the instructional coaching model over several years (p. 205).

The research by Knight (2008) concludes that coaching does impact teacher practice by increasing job satisfaction. Coaching impacted teaching practices by leading to increased implementation of professional development, and increased teacher efficacy, and is a variable in affecting student achievement.

The Evolution of Peer Coaching

Beverly Showers and Bruce Joyce (1996), long-time researchers and advocates for systems of professional development that immerse teachers in learning as a means to improve student achievement, describe the evolution of peer coaching. The article, recently reprinted, recognizes the renewed and growing interest in coaching. Showers and Joyce (1996) noted as long ago as the early 1980s that professional development could change the nature of education as the implementation of teacher learning that followed training was at low levels prior to coaching. The coaching described in the early Showers and Joyce research (1996) was a model of teacher-based learning teams that used peer coaching as a follow-up to ensure greater transfer of the new training. Results consistently showed that when coaching followed the initial training, implementation of the new learning rose dramatically. Showers and Joyce (1996) suggested that

new models of teaching with a strong research base should be practiced and implemented by the teacher while simultaneously receiving coaching assistance for a greater student learning effect. The coaching research conducted by Showers and Joyce (1996) defined peer coaching as teachers working together in teams to practice the new learning, supporting one another through joint planning and observations, and collecting data about this implementation process. This peer-coaching model differs from many of the coaching models described in more recent literature in that it involved teacher groups or teams rather than a one-on-one coaching relationship. Coaching is not a term used interchangeably with training, but is viewed as a process of supplying responses to the teacher that help to change and improve instruction so that implementation of the learning is at the highest levels. This early 1980s seminal research has served as the foundation for an understanding of the importance of high-quality, ongoing professional development, but the potential of the coaching aspect has perhaps not been recognized until this recent resurgence of interest.

Renewed Interest in Coaching

A review of literature finds that the topic of instructional coaching is indeed of interest to educators. Evidence of this renewed interest is found in the abundance of articles in the education field currently available on the topic of instructional coaches in schools.

Jack Cassidy (2008, February/March), director of the Center for Educational Development, Evaluation and Research, and an associate dean at Texas A & M University Corpus Christi, along with Drew Cassidy, who also teaches at Texas A & M, conduct an annual survey of literacy leaders with the results published in the *Reading Today* newspaper. *Reading Today* is a publication of the International Reading Association (IRA), a nonprofit, global network of more than 90,000 members and institutions committed to worldwide literacy. The

association supports professionals through a wide range of resources, advocacy efforts, volunteerism, and professional development activities and is viewed by reading educators as an anchor organization.

The survey work by Cassidy and Cassidy has been conducted each year since 1996 with the purpose being to encourage more in-depth investigation of literacy topics. In 2008, between April and August, 25 literacy leaders were interviewed, either in person or by phone. All were read a standard 178-word paragraph defining “hot” and “not hot” topics. It is also explained that their ratings of “hot” and “not hot” should not necessarily reflect their personal interest, or lack thereof, in a given topic; the ratings refer to the level of attention a given topic is currently receiving. After hearing the introductory paragraph, each respondent is asked to rate a given topic as “hot” or “not hot.” Each respondent is then asked if the topic “should be hot” or “should not be hot.” (Discrepancies between the “hot” and “should be hot” lists can help educators more actively advocate for the best literacy practices.) According to *Reading Today*, the 2008 survey indicates that literacy coaching was again a “very hot” topic in the annual survey (Cassidy & Cassidy, 2008, p. 10). Coupled with the growing urgency to see that all students are learning related to the NCLB guidelines, the topic of coaching is being revisited.

The IRA recognizes the rapidly growing interest in coaching and, in response to this interest, initiated efforts in 2006 to provide support for literacy coaches through the inception of its own national clearinghouse (<http://www.literacycoachingonline.org>). The website describes the mission as one to enhance the work of these “new” school roles and offers tools in the form of resources, research, and information on coaching practices, forums, and blogs.

Coaching received a big boost through the Reading First Initiative of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Reading First is a federal initiative authorized by the amendments to Title

I, Part B, Subpart 1, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act through the NCLB Act of 2001, and made available to states \$900 million for the teaching of reading. The federal program seeks to enable children to become successful readers. It targets children in kindergarten through third grade, with a major part of the program involving professional development for teachers using scientifically based reading programs. “Job-embedded” professional development is seen as key, and as Reading First was being implemented about five years ago, a “first wave of reading coaches was sent into schools” according to Reading Today (2008, p. 10).

A project funded through the U.S. Department of Education’s GEAR UP program is an example of a coaching approach that included the placement of full-time instructional coaches in six middle schools and three high schools in the Topeka, Kansas, public school system (Knight, 2004). Pathways to Success, a whole-school improvement project developed and coordinated by the University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning, was a partnership between KU-CRT, the Topeka USD 501 school system, and the International Telementor Center lasting for more than five years. Students in the schools served by the project show encouraging gains in reading comprehension and writing skills as teachers, administrators, and KU-CRL project staff work together to help them develop the reading, writing, problem-solving, and motivational skills they need to succeed in school and beyond. The role of the instructional coach was central to the success of the project. “In four years, the coaches in the Pathways to Success project have had a significant impact on the schools in Topeka.” according to Knight (2004), a research associate and director of Instructional Coaching Institutes at the Kansas University Center for Research on Learning (p. 37).

While much of the research targets literacy coaching, there is research to suggest that it has spread to other curricular areas (Neufeld & Roper, 2003; Russo, 2004). Kowal and Steiner

(2007) note that in 2004-05, the Center on Education Policy found that 60% of districts had engaged “distinguished teachers” to assist struggling schools (as cited in Center for Education Policy, 2006). In recent years, several large districts have created coaching roles to support local reform. Reform model providers such as America’s Choice (Poglinco et al., 2003) rely on coaching to reform implementation, further supporting the belief that coaching is indeed on the rise.

Coaching Roles and Skills

The roles in which coaches are asked to serve may differ from school to school based on what the perceived needs of the school may be. The role that coaches assume in their school will determine the skills needed; thus, it is important to note both the roles and the skills may have similar themes in the literature. Oftentimes job expectations are not defined for newly hired coaches; more often than not, coaches may be serving in more than one of these roles simultaneously. In this section, the roles that coaches assume and accompanying necessary skills are explored.

If the goal of hiring instructional coaches is to improve student learning, first priority must be given to selecting individuals who have been successful teachers in their own classrooms. Along with demonstrating prior success with student learning, the instructional coach must possess other important qualities. According to Knight (2004), “Hiring the right instructional coach is important to successful implementation. In addition to being disciplined, organized, and professional, instructional coaches also must be flexible, likable, good listeners with great people skills, and committed to learning” (p. 35). What is it that we understand in selecting the *right* coach and what does the literature tell us about important coaching skills?

Rainville and Jones (2008) share the story of one literacy coach and her attempts to navigate the intricacies of a coaching context while trying to determine the role that she played in the setting. As they describe the position of coach and the skills needed, they note that “the field mostly includes ‘how-to’ books that describe the daily work of coaches and explore knowledge bases assumed essential for literacy coaching” (Rainville & Jones, 2008, p. 440).

“As schools and districts explore how coaching fits into their professional development plans, they must identify the essential skills and supports needed for this complex role. Teachers, school leaders, and coaches must begin by asking: ‘What skills are needed for coaching?’” (Feger et al., 2004, p. 14). The article articulated the knowledge and skills that coaches need to be successful, emphasizing the importance of having good interpersonal skills as they navigate the waters of many and varied personalities in the schools. Coaches must be able to build trusting relationships with their colleagues, to analytically observe, and to provide feedback while conducting themselves in a respectful and collaborative manner. Coaches will often serve as liaison between administration and teachers, which may be a difficult position to have. Content knowledge, understanding the “how-to’s” in teaching, and important pedagogical understanding are critical if the coach is to have credibility with peers. In addition, the authors emphasize the importance of knowing where to obtain coaching resources, knowing coaching practices, and learning how to help coaches build their repertoire of strategies.

Kowal and Steiner (2007) suggest three categories of skills that effective coaches possess: pedagogical knowledge, content expertise, and interpersonal skills. Coaches should come from the ranks of the experienced to provide support and understanding of the ways in which children learn. Content experience is needed to give thorough understanding of the subject areas in which the coach worked. Finally, the coach must come with interpersonal skills

that build connections with teachers. The researchers surveyed teachers and found that the skills most important to teachers were interpersonal ones; other skills could be taught or learned, but it was critical that the coach brought good interpersonal skills to the work environment. The writers also reiterate the importance of professional development for coaches in the areas of content related to literacy or mathematics, pedagogical techniques, and coaching strategies.

The International Reading Association published its criteria for an effective literacy coach in a position statement, *The Role and Qualifications of the Reading Coach in the United States* (2004). The International Reading Association strongly recommends that only teachers who meet five criteria be permitted to act as reading coaches. These criteria are: (1) documentation of successful teaching which has had a positive outcome on student achievement at all levels in which he/she will coach; (2) in-depth knowledge of reading gained through the completion of a master's degree in reading, reading specialist certification/license, and ongoing professional development; (3) experience in professional development and/or teacher study groups where he/she has worked to reflect and make adaptations to improve instruction; (4) excellent presentation skills in leading teacher groups to facilitate change; and (5) ability to develop open, trusting relationships with teachers (p. 2).

Possible roles that are often assigned to school-based coaches are described in detail in *Taking the Lead* (Killion & Harrison, 2006). The resource provider is viewed as a coach who offers resources to teachers, recommends resources, and shares research. The caution for the person who acts in this role is that teachers may begin to think of this person as a “gofer” for teachers, causing a dependence of sorts and perhaps not offering the opportunity to take the school coaching role beyond that of resource.

A data coach helps staff to examine data, analyze key areas of data, and make recommendations based on data. Skills that will be helpful in this role must include the ability to develop and maintain trust in sharing data in a risk-free environment. Coaches must understand the strengths of staff and their abilities to understand data.

Curriculum specialists work with teachers in strengthening knowledge of curriculum and other curriculum specific tasks. Competencies in knowing local, state, and national standards are important to this role and present a challenge if the coach does not come to the role adequately prepared.

An instructional specialist differs from the curriculum specialist in that the focus of the coach's work is the *instruction* in the classroom. As the instructional specialist, coaching strengths must be in the area of instructional strategies, with abilities to model good instruction for teachers and help them plan for their use.

Emphasized in the classroom supporter's role is modeling instructional practice for the classroom teacher and moving along a continuum, which includes co-teaching with the teacher, resulting in the teacher being fully responsible for instruction. The classroom supporter must have skills in curriculum knowledge and instructional strategy use while providing scaffolding structure for the classroom teacher. This is a model of gradual release, which gives the teacher an opportunity to learn on the job while working with the coach. Mentor coaches spend most of their work with beginning teachers, providing the new teacher with support.

Professional development is the focus for the learning facilitator-coaching role. The coach provides for, coordinates, and facilitates professional development opportunities for staff. Understanding the change process is key to the success of the coach as a school leader according to the authors. The coach serves in a leadership role both in the school and in the district. This

is similar to the final role described in *Taking the Lead* (Killion & Harrison, 2006), catalyst of change. Coaching strengths include the ability to help staff analyze the effectiveness of their practices and to provide possible alternatives for what is not working.

All of these roles reflect the many skills and abilities that an individual requires as a school-based coach. Clearly, when preparing to hire a coach, the district and school must have a sense of need that will determine the coach's assignments.

Moran's (2007) work suggests that coaches might be expected to do the following:

- Effectively use resources as necessary.
- Share knowledge of successful techniques in classroom management and instructional planning for effective literacy instruction.
- Assist teachers with the appropriate use of core and supplemental instructional materials that align with district and state curriculums.
- Help teachers select books and other instructional materials to meet individual literacy needs.
- Examine, evaluate, and recommend instructional methods, materials, and equipment, including technology.
- Maintain a bookroom or similar collection of resources for use in guided reading groups and other literacy strategies.
- Help set up a classroom environment that is conducive to effective literacy instruction (e.g. with centers, a classroom library, and bulletin boards at children's eye level for posting work).
- Identify needs and make recommendations for appropriate reading and writing intervention materials.

- Coordinate the inventory, ordering, and distribution of leveled texts.
- Use available guidance to review core, supplemental, and intensive intervention materials under consideration for purchase, looking for evidence that the materials are aligned with federal program requirements, such as those of Reading First (p. 33-34).

This list is detailed and explicit in its expectations, but there are again the common themes of knowing the content, knowing good instruction, and having the ability to share resources.

Also suggested by Moran (2007) are the components to coaching besides the resource management described. Literacy content presentation, focused classroom visits, co-planning with teachers, conducting study groups, demonstrating lessons for teachers, and co-teaching were also roles that a coach might assume.

According to Knight (2004), the coach must be able to manage the complexities of the school culture, often following similar procedures as the coach begins a new job. Those possible procedures include meeting with departments to assess knowledge and interest in particular practices, meeting one-on-one with interested teachers (which sometimes works better than with a group when implementing change) working on content together with teachers through professional reading or discussion, or modeling lessons in a teacher's classroom. Knight (2004) suggests that teachers should be paid for extra time and coaches should make the intervention as easy to implement as possible, along with providing a quick response to teacher requests.

Educators often lament that the ever-changing education landscape is strewn with new programs boasting their successes and new instructional strategies promising to improve student learning. This nonstop change cycle sometimes results in experienced educators resisting new

programs and strategies because they are untested or the educators feel it is an old program being recycled for another use; therefore, the instructional coach begins with the difficult task of meeting high expectations for their assignment, along with expectations of being able to serve in many different roles.

Each school might select an individual coach for many different reasons, but the literature supports common practices that are accepted and expected, and there were similar themes that emerge in what the roles for a coach might be. Those themes include the need for the coach to possess interpersonal skills; strong content, curriculum, and pedagogical knowledge; awareness of the practices of coaching; and capabilities to seek and use resources.

Supporting the Coach

Because of the growing increase in the number of coaching roles, there is also considerable information available regarding the support needed for the coaching position. In 1998, the Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI) attempted a multiyear approach to develop scientifically based reading programs that required the hiring of coaches for schools. According to Norton (2007), the Alabama Reading Initiative recognized the need for professional development for coaches and provided it through: (1) a weeklong summer academy for the entire school team that would be participating in the program, (2) ongoing professional development through a coach trainer who works with small schools and small groups of coaches at one time, and (3) a regional principal coach who works with both the coach and the principal. The ARI team training consisted of training sessions around structured time for reading, book studies on research based reading instruction, and observations of teachers with structured feedback and reflection time. The coach then also participates in a formal, intensive 2-day training with an ARI reading coach trainer. ARI state programs train these school coaches, and the state coaches

are housed in host schools so that they can offer more regionally based support for their trainees. Team members also participate in this training with the school coach so that knowledge does not become resident in a few select individuals. These trainings occur monthly along with school site visits. This model allows for ongoing professional development and a strong mentor relationship between school site coaches and the state program. It is training intensive but appeals to coaches because of the continuous training and support (Norton, 2007). It is apparent that the ARI recognized the need for ongoing professional support for instructional coaches by giving such attention and focus to this required training and support.

Professional organizations such as NSDC should provide appropriate support for school-based coaches, according to Killion (2007). In 2004, NSDC developed a National Coaches Academy that provided training to more than 50 school coaches in working with teachers. The training formed a national network that offered skills training focused on building relationships with peers. States should also shoulder responsibility for coaching support by holding those using state or federal funds to quality standards, but also providing access to information related to the knowledge base coaches must have around standards. Districts should offer the coaches support in the form of funding, guidance for the program, professional development, and defining clear parameters on expectations for coaches. Those parameters include clear boundaries for evaluations and issues of confidentiality. Issues of evaluation were noted since the teacher evaluation may not serve the purpose because an instructional coach no longer has the same classroom responsibilities that evaluations often address.

Professional development opportunities for development of the skills related to coaching are imperative, but support from the building principal also contributes to coaches' success and must also be a factor that is considered in supporting the coaching role. Knight (2007) noted that

“principals should support their onsite coaches by focusing school change initiatives to make it easier for teacher and coach to work together on interventions that have the highest possibility of impacting student achievement,” adding the concern that “schools will implement school-based coaching too simplistically, underestimating the complexity of change initiatives” (p. 27).

Principals support their coaches through recognition of the change process and its components giving the coach both resources and time to be successful. This support is accomplished by the principal and coach working in partnership on change initiatives.

It is important that the principal recognizes and plans for the support of the coach through a variety of approaches. Pankake and Moller (2007) offer suggestions for strategies that aid in the coaching success. Those strategies include building an action plan that includes monitoring of the plan. Key to this strategy is communication between the two leaders. “The principal must remain an integral part of the coach’s work. The principal and coach must communicate regularly. For example, one principal and coach use regular meetings, scheduled email, telephone calls, and memos to communicate. Meetings focus on success in moving toward defined goals, as well as problems that need to be solved to achieve the school’s mission” (Pankake & Moller, 2007, p. 33).

The principal must recognize the need to negotiate the relationship regularly; the coach will work closely with teachers who voice needs and the principal must position him or herself to be able to assist the coach in meeting the need. This includes giving the coach necessary opportunities to have others hear them or see them through faculty meetings or other similar venues. Other strategies that the principal may offer for support are making him or herself available, providing access to resources in the form of human and fiscal resources, maintaining a focus on instructional leadership, maintaining a balance of time so that the coach is neither

overloaded nor overwhelmed, protecting the relationships as best they can, and providing for leadership development opportunities.

Leadership

Theories and related literature

There are many forms of leadership mentioned in the literature today. “The public’s fascination with leadership has grown exponentially” (Northouse, 2004, p. 1) in recent years. New theories of leadership continue to evolve as job requirements and skills have undergone changes while various terms and the associated behaviors have been influential in identifying styles of leadership and types of decision-making. There are a number of different approaches, or “styles” to leadership and management based on different assumptions and theories. The styles that individuals choose are based on a combination of their beliefs, values, and preferences, and the culture and norms of organizations. These leadership approaches vary in the degree of control and influence that the leader exerts on its group members. How does the leadership expected from the instructional coach relate to the leadership of the building principal? “For the leader, the challenge is to use a leadership style that best meets subordinates’ motivational needs” (Northouse, 2004, p. 123).

Northouse (2004) describes the trait approach to leadership as one of the first attempts to study leadership systematically; this research focused on specific traits that “clearly differentiated leaders from nonleaders across a variety of situations” (p. 15). Stogdill (as cited by Northouse, 2004) suggested that there was not a common set of traits that distinguished leaders from non-leaders across all situations. His research included a survey of personality and situational factors. Examples of traits include intelligence, determination, self-confidence, and integrity. This approach was recognized as being well-researched and provided benchmarks for

identification of leaders, but was found lacking in objectiveness or ability to delimit a definitive list of leadership traits.

According to Katz (1955) technical skills, human skills, and conceptual skills are abilities that a leader should have. The skills approach to leadership provides a structure that is the basis for many leadership education programs, but is criticized because it is weak in predictive value as it cannot explain how these skills can lead to effective leadership performance.

Northouse (2004) details a styles approach to leadership. “The style approach emphasizes the behavior of the leader. This distinguishes it from the trait approach” (p. 65). These task and relationship dimensions provided a means for leaders to assess their action and decide how they might improve their leadership style.

Situational leadership approaches stress that leadership is “composed of both a directive and a supportive dimension, and each has to be applied appropriately in a given situation” (Northouse, 2004, p. 87). The situational leader treats subordinates differently based on the task at hand and works to help the subordinates become more confident in their work abilities.

The path-goal theory emphasizes the relationship between the leader’s style and the characteristics of the subordinates and the work setting (House, 1996). This study used the path-goal analytic framework to examine leadership in these coaching pairs. As the coaching arrangements in this district were examined, it was helpful to look at not just the traits of the leader, but how the leader and the coach interact. The path-goal theory provided the opportunity to view this relationship from both the building principal’s leadership and the needs of the coach.

This study narrowed the focus to one particular leadership approach (path-goal theory) because the path-goal theory of leadership addresses the effect of leaders on the motivation and abilities of immediate subordinates and the effects of leaders on work unit performance. The

study also used the Balanced Leadership Framework to view these coaching partnerships, as this framework clearly identified key leadership responsibilities and those responsibilities associated with second-order change, providing an appropriate means to study these coaching partnerships, alongside the path-goal theory of leadership.

Path-goal Theory of Leadership

The original publication of the path-goal theory of effective leadership occurred in 1971. The path-goal theory (so named because it explains how leaders can help subordinates along the path to their goals) acknowledges specific leader behaviors. According to House (1996), “path-goal theory is primarily a theory of task and person oriented supervisory behavior” (p. 32). The theory is described as dyadic because it looks at both sides of the relationship, examining the effects of superiors on subordinates.

According to Northouse (2004), the challenge for the leader is using “a leadership style that best meets subordinates’ motivational needs” (p. 123). The independent variables of path-goal theory are leader behaviors. This is a theory that provides an opportunity to look at the coaching relationship from what it is that the instructional coach needs and how the building principal meets or interacts with the needs of the coach for support. The original publication identified four leader behaviors: achievement-oriented, directive, participative, and supportive that are contingent to the environmental factors of the workplace and follower characteristics. The behaviors linked to the needs of the subordinates to complete the goal are detailed described below.

Directive path-goal clarifying leaders provide very clear structures for the subordinates, defining and describing the expectations, giving specific guidance, and reducing ambiguity as

much as possible. The path to the goal is clarified for the subordinate, helping the person to feel more secure.

Supportive leader behaviors create a friendly and psychologically supportive work environment. The leader is friendly and approachable and supports the subordinate by making this environment a pleasant one. The subordinate who is motivated by affiliation prefers this type of leadership.

Participative leader behavior invites the subordinate to be a participant in decision making, consulting with the subordinate and using their suggestions as part of the decision-making process. Subordinates with a strong internal locus of control are motivated by their ability to be part of this process.

Achievement oriented behavior describes the leader that recognizes that their subordinates are motivated by the challenge of performance at the highest levels. The leader sets goals, emphasizes excellence in the performance, and communicates confidence in the subordinate's ability to achieve at these high levels (House, 1996).

In the path-goal theory, the leader may choose the approach to leadership based on the perceived needs of their subordinates. Rather than being locked into any one particular style or approach, the leader recognizes how the subordinate is motivated and provides support for the individual based on their motivational needs (House, 1996).

House (1996) notes that there have been between 40 and 50 studies designed to test propositions of the path-goal theory, with mixed results. The empirical research conducted indicated a need for a reformulated theory that specifies "leader behaviors that enhance subordinate empowerment and satisfaction and work unit and subordinate effectiveness. It

addresses the effects of leaders on the motivation and abilities of immediate subordinates and the effects of leaders on work unit performance” (House, 1996, p. 335).

The seminal theory focused on the effects of leaders on subordinates’ motivation, satisfaction, and performance. The reformulated theory was broadened to include the effects of leaders on the subordinates’ ability to perform effectively and the effect of leaders on work unit performance, as well as performance of individual subordinates.

Key concepts associated with the reformulated theory are (House, 1996):

1. Path-goal clarifying behaviors: the leader behaviors that help clarify subordinates’ paths to goal accomplishment (p. 336).
2. Achievement-oriented leader behavior: leader behavior that challenges subordinates to perform work at the highest level possible (p. 338).
3. Work facilitation: leader behaviors consisting of planning, scheduling, and organizing the work of subordinates to a high degree (p. 338).
4. Supportive leader behavior: leader behaviors that are friendly and approachable, attending to the well-being and human needs of the subordinate (p. 340).
5. Interaction facilitation: leader behaviors that facilitate collaborative and positive interactions among members (p. 341).
6. Group-oriented decision process: the manner in which the leader determines how decisions are made, requiring leader skills that are different from participative leadership (p. 341).
7. Representation and networking: the leader behaviors that facilitate the communication by the work unit of the resources required for their work (p. 342).

8. Value based leader behavior: leader behaviors that address subordinates' cherished values and identities, making their self-worth contingent on their contribution to the leaders' mission (p. 343).

The path-goal reformulated theory combines leadership behaviors, the characteristics of followers and a task, and the motivation of followers to do a task that they feel they are able to, for an expected outcome and a reward for the outcome.

Balanced Leadership Framework

Today's leaders may require leadership skills that take a different approach than in the past, requiring a strong knowledge base specific to effective leadership skills. The Balanced Leadership Framework (Waters & Cameron, 2007) ties specific leadership responsibilities to student achievement making leadership in this era more important than ever. Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) notes important insights into the role of leadership and leadership theories related to student achievement and describes leadership theories and theorists in their studies of leadership (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Their research into these leadership theories comes from the meta-analysis conducted on leadership, and they examine a few of the theories that "were foundational to our analysis of the research" (Marzano et al., p. 13).

The McREL work discusses Burns' theories of transformational and transactional leadership as foundational pieces to leadership theories. Building on Burns' work, Bass (1985) cites four factors that "characterize the behavior of transformational leaders: individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence" (as cited in Marzano et al., 2005, p. 14).

Robert K. Greenleaf (as cited in Marzano et al., 2005) was noted as the author of the term “servant leadership” from an essay that he first published in 1970. This form of leadership is seen as centrally leading instead of leading from “the top.” This leadership role takes its name from being a leadership that works closely with those within the organization, relating closely to the needs of the followers and developing skills of those within. The servant leader is persuasive, yet often seeks to influence one person at a time rather than an entire group. The servant leader is empathetic, tolerates imperfection, and is a listener. Serving the needs of others is the highest priority.

Marzano et al. (2005) also describe prominent theorists such as Warren Bennis, Peter Block, Stephen Covey, Richard Elmore, and Michael Fullan. Fullan’s work is perhaps known best for its focus on the theory of change and leadership for change. Edward Deming and his work related to the theory of total quality management are also considered in the McREL literature (Marzano et al., 2005). Each of the theorists noted is mentioned as foundational to the McREL meta-analysis on leadership conducted by the McREL group (Marzano, et al., 2005).

While McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework is not recognized as a theory, it does provide a conceptual framework for viewing leadership related to the principal and coaching arrangements. Their work was conducted using a quantitative, meta-analytic approach. Their meta-analysis reviewed more than 5,000 studies from 1970 to the present that purported to examine the effect of leadership on student achievement. The intent of the research study was to show that research in the last 35 years does give clear and strong guidance on those leadership behaviors that influence school and student achievement positively. Sixty-nine of these 5,000 studies met the qualifiers that were outlined prior to the review of research:

- The study involved K-12 students.
- The study involved schools in the United States or situations that closely mirrored the culture of U.S. schools.
- The study directly or indirectly examined the relationship between the leadership of the building principal and student academic achievement.
- Academic achievement was measured by a standardized achievement test, a state test, or a composite index based on one or both of these.
- Effect sizes in correlation were reported or could be computed (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 28).

The 69 studies used in the meta-analysis research represented 2,802 schools at various grade levels. The estimated number of teachers involved in the study was 14,000 (Marzano et al., 2005). The overall impact of leadership was determined based on the correlations for the study. The correlations that came from the studies showed a relationship between general leadership behavior and student academic achievement. The average correlation was .25, indicating that the correlation between student performance and the effective school leader was positive. “We found that the average effect size (expressed as a correlation) between leadership and student achievement is .25, which means that as leadership improves, so does the student achievement” (Waters, 2004, p. 49). The significance of leadership based on this meta-analysis indicates that the effect of the principal on student achievement is enormously important to schools.

This comprehensive analysis of schools’ leadership and student achievement is grounded in evidence. After analyzing the studies that were conducted over a 30-year period, McREL (Waters et al., 2004) identified 21 leadership responsibilities that are significantly associated

with student achievement. These results were then translated into a framework that describes the knowledge, skills, strategies, and tools that leaders need to positively impact student achievement (see Appendix A, p. 162). Additionally, McREL identified those responsibilities associated with first-and second-order change, which provided another look at leadership roles. Leadership based on this framework is described as the Balanced Leadership Framework (Waters & Cameron, 2007) and provides a way to view these coaching partnerships relative to the leadership aspect.

Teacher Leadership

“If principals expect to reap the full benefits of having teacher leaders in coaching positions, they should create working conditions that encourage positive relationships, reduce risk, and provide leadership development (Pankake & Moller, 2007, p. 32). While the first mention of leadership may bring to the mind’s eye the image of the building principal, the literature reveals that leadership across areas such as teacher leadership and school leadership are also of keen interest and may have a significant effect on school goals. The relationship established between the qualities of leadership and the role of the content coach must be considered. When exploring the roles those coaches may be asked to assume, it should be acknowledged that not all teachers possess either the skills needed for the coaching role or the desire to take responsibility for what this position offers. Many of the skills that characterize the effective coach are the skills that an effective leader brings to their work. The skills are not the same as content and pedagogy skills. The ability to collaborate with others, strong interpersonal capabilities, the willingness and capacity to lead in the change process, and expertise in curriculum and instruction are hallmarks of teacher leaders.

Danielson (2007) explains that the need for teacher leadership is critical today more than ever. In most circumstances, teachers enter the teaching profession with few opportunities for advancement within the teaching ranks; thus the term “flat” profession is used. The number of teacher positions relative to the number of administrative positions is small, and the teacher profession is considered flat since the responsibilities of the novice teacher are often the same or similar to those of the veteran teacher. Teachers who had an interest in leadership opportunities most often applied for administrative roles or for positions within their own union. The tenure of the administrator compared to that of a teacher is much shorter; the demands of the administrator’s time are greater than one person can meet thus increasing the need for more teacher leaders. The instructional coach is an example of a formal teacher leader as compared to that of the informal teacher leader that may be called upon for short-term roles or experiences. “Whether they are selected for a formal leadership role or spontaneously assume an informal role, effective teacher leaders exhibit important skills, value, and dispositions. Teacher leaders call others to action and energize them with the aim of improving teaching and learning” (Danielson, 2007, p. 16).

Ingersol (as cited in Dozier, 2007) reported on the results of a 2003 survey by the Center for Teacher Leadership at the Virginia Commonwealth University School of Education. Ninety-eight percent of those responding to the survey had received awards for excellence in the classroom. Survey respondents indicated that teachers viewed themselves as leaders and believed that others saw them as leaders as well. The leadership roles that were reported by the survey were many and varied, confirming that teacher leaders are needed. A lack of training for the roles they assume was indicated by 82% of participants. Teachers also indicated that they wanted additional training in the area of policy recognizing that this is an area where assistance

is needed. The report indicated that teachers do view themselves as leaders and have desires related to wanting to serve in leadership roles (Dozier, 2007).

The view of teacher leadership as presented by Danielson (2006) is an informal role of leadership gained through work with students and colleagues and is a voluntary effort by the individual. Examples include those of the teacher who starts a study group around a topic of interest or one who recognizes the need for change in practice or procedure and organizes others around the cause. Descriptors of such informal leaders include the ability to mobilize or energize others, or those with passion and the courage to attempt change processes. “The popular concept of leadership, whether in the business world, the military, or an educational setting, is that of a lone ranger, a strong individual who works against long odds to accomplish challenging feats” (Danielson, 2006, p. 13). Danielson instead proposes teacher leadership based on collaborative efforts. She envisions the teacher leader as one who has skills in using evidence and data in making decisions, recognizes opportunity and taking initiative, mobilizes people around a common purpose, marshaling resources and taking action, monitoring progress and adjusting the approach as conditions change, sustaining the commitment of others and anticipating negativity, and contributing to a learning organization (Danielson, 2006). These are skills that have typically been associated with the school principal, but Danielson (2006) suggests that many teachers have these skills and need to be willing to assume a leadership role.

Lambert (2003) discusses the need to build leadership capacity to strengthen the ability for the school community to work together and share leadership responsibilities. “Leadership is about contributing to, learning from, and influencing the learning of others” (Lambert, 2003, p. vii). Furthermore, Lambert also stated,

“Learning and leading are deeply intertwined, and we need to regard each other as worthy of attention, caring, and involvement if we are to learn together. Indeed, leadership can be understood as reciprocal, purposeful learning in a community. Reciprocity helps us build relationships of mutual regard, thereby enabling us to become colearners. In addition, as colearners, we are also coteachers, engaging each other through our teaching and learning approaches. Adults as well as children learn through the processes of inquiry, participation, meaning and knowledge construction, and reflection.” (2003, p. 2)

Lambert (2003) argues the importance of bringing a breadth of participation and high degree of skill to the leadership work and achievement of high leadership capacity. She presents these features in a matrix composed of four quadrants that indicate the relationship between the skills and degree of participation by the school community (Lambert, 2003, p. 5). The need for principals, parents, teachers, and students to become skillful leaders is articulated through this matrix. A shared vision is another criterion for building principalship capacity; instead of acting on the principal’s vision for the school, the vision must be one that is embraced and understood by all. Inquiry-based use of information to inform decisions and practice is another hallmark of the school operating at high levels of participation and skill, as is reflective practice, broad involvement, collaboration and collective responsibility reflected in roles and actions, all of which should lead to steadily improving student achievement (Lambert, 2003). “High leadership capacity schools provide teachers with opportunities for skillful participation, which in turn allows their leadership skills to flourish” (Lambert, 2003, p. 33). Teachers want more leadership roles and with the demands on administrators being at such high levels because of NCLB requirements, administrators are asked to do more than ever.

“A bottom-up approach that does not have the principal’s guiding hand as the instructional leader will lead to teachers adopting new teaching practices, but unsystematically—with some and not others implementing the change so school improvement may progress incoherently” (Knight, 2007, p. 27). The need to have initiatives that come from within the ranks is described as from the “bottom up” and is frequently cited as a means for change initiatives to take strongest hold. The view of the role of the principal from Knight’s perspective makes clear an expectation that the principal must act as the leader in times of change rather than relying on the initiative to take effect simply because it originated from the teachers.

As part of this study of coaching arrangements in a school district, the specific leadership behaviors that the building principal exhibits are examined using the Balanced Leadership Framework and the path-goal theory of leadership. Leadership responsibilities provide important insights into these coaching partnerships and are considered as part of this study.

Summary

The literature review provided a perspective of the work of instructional coaches, the support needed by the coaches, leadership related to the teacher and leadership related to the principal. The review included an historical review of coaching, why coaching has been revisited in this new era of NCLB, and the literature's discussion of coaching roles and coaching support. The literature review offered a broad look at coaching assignments and responsibilities as part of the understanding of how these assignments may factor into the coaching arrangements in the school district studied.

The literature review also reported on theories and related literature specific to leadership. It provided a general description of theories related to leadership, and then leadership theories were narrowed to focus on the path-goal theory of leadership as this was the specific theory shaping this study. The Balanced Leadership Framework was also considered for its research related to leadership responsibilities and their effects on student achievement as part of this study as these responsibilities shaped this study of coaching arrangements. The literature review included an examination of the expanding role of teacher leadership as its relationship to these coaching partnerships is also important.

As was described, each of these components to the coaching arrangement influences the others. The skills needed for coaching and the skills that the coach brings to the assignment determine the support needed. The leadership provided is related to the leadership skills of the teacher and the perceived level of support the principal feels the coach needs. The path-goal theory and Balanced Leadership Framework were detailed to provide an understanding of how both contribute to the coaching arrangements.

Through a case study approach, the research examined the coaching approach to improve student learning in one school district. The path-goal leadership perspective and the Balanced Leadership Framework were the principal tools used to study the approach.

In the next chapter, the research questions and design are discussed. The setting and participants section will describe the population studied. Data collection and data analysis are reviewed. Finally, the role of the researcher and the issue of trustworthiness are presented.

CHAPTER 3 - Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore the enactment of content coaching in one Kansas school district. Specifically, the study focused on how the coaching process was structured, characteristics of the coach, the work setting and tasks assigned to the coach, leadership behaviors of the principal and the coach, and the perceptions of the outcomes based on the coaching arrangement. To document how content coaching was used in one district, a qualitative case study approach was conducted. The ability to present multiple forms of data through a case study presents a story much more clearly detailed than through other research methods. This case study documented how the coaching approach was implemented by examining how the coaching role was defined, leadership roles in the coaching partnership, professional development for the content coach, and the experiences of both the content coach and the principal in this approach. All aspects of the research methodology used in this study are reported in this chapter. The information is organized into the following sections: (1) research questions, (2) research design, (3) setting and participants, (4) data collection, (5) data analysis, (6) background and role of the researcher, (7) trustworthiness, and (8) ethical considerations.

Research Questions

The proposed research study contained several research questions that provided the framework for investigation and exploration. The overarching question was: How does formal leadership influence a district content coaching program?

Subquestions:

1. Using the path-goal theory as an analytic framework, how are these coaching relationships influenced by leader behaviors?
 - What are the path-goal clarifying behaviors that materialize in this approach?

- What are the areas for which the coach feels individual responsibility and control?
 - How is the coach’s work planned, scheduled, and organized?
 - What supportive leader behaviors are manifested in the partnerships?
 - What are the leader behaviors that facilitate collaborative and positive interactions?
 - How are decisions for the work unit made?
 - What networking opportunities are available? How are the values of the leader communicated?
2. Using McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework, what leadership responsibilities are manifested in these partnerships?
- What leader responsibilities and practices emerge across school levels?
 - What leader responsibilities and practices emerge when years of experience in the position is examined?
 - What leader responsibilities and practices emerge in these partnerships when position within the organization is examined?
3. In what ways does this formal leadership influence outcomes of these coaching arrangements?

Research Design

The design and approach of this study included qualitative research using a case study design approach that results in a description of how one Kansas school district enacted a content coaching approach. The overarching question, *how does formal leadership influence a district content coaching program?* led to a qualitative study. According to Creswell (2007), “qualitative research begins with assumptions, a worldview, the possible use of a theoretical lens, and the

study of research problems inquiring into the meaning individuals ascribe to a social or a human problem. To study this problem, qualitative researchers use an emerging qualitative approach to inquiry, the collection of data in a natural setting sensitive to the people and places under study, and data analysis that is inductive and establishes patterns or themes” (p. 37). The study design and process of conducting the investigation were both informed by the path-goal theory of leadership and the Balanced Leadership Framework. The path-goal theory of leadership examined the approach the leader chose based on the perceived needs of the subordinate with a reformulated theory that also takes into account the effect that leaders also have on the work unit performance. The 21 leadership responsibilities identified in the Balanced Leadership Framework specified leadership qualities and responsibilities related to second-order change that are associated with effective leaders, thus providing a supportive lens to examine these coaching approaches from a leadership perspective.

Creswell (2007) states that “case study research involves the study of an issue explored through one or more cases within a bounded system (i.e., a setting, a context)” (p. 73). Case study research is a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system through multiple sources of information; a case study involves the study of an issue within a setting or a context, and this precisely described the coaching arrangements in the school settings in this study of one school district (Creswell, 2007). The case study approach in this research explored content coaching in school settings and offered the opportunity to document how others perceive it to improve teaching and learning. According to Stake (1995), the first criterion for using case studies is that we maximize what we can learn. “We want to seek greater understanding of the case. We want to appreciate the uniqueness and complexity, its embeddedness and interaction with its contexts” (Stake, 1995, p. 16). This study sought to

maximize what could be learned from the content coaching arrangements in one school district. Because the content coaching arrangements are at individual school sites, a case study allowed for their uniqueness, and at the same time, the complexity of each. Coaching arrangements are embedded as they are a function of each school setting and the context was important to the study.

Setting and Participants

There are 17 schools in District 101: 14 elementary schools that include grades kindergarten through fifth grade; two middle schools that include grades six through eight; and one high school with ninth through 12th grades. With the exception of one building that has two coaches, all buildings have only one content coach. At one of the schools, the lead teacher also serves as the content coach; her supervising principal is the principal for two schools. The lead teacher was not part of the study since her role is administrative and her duties would not be assigned by the principal, but rather self-directed. One elementary building and one secondary building chose not to participate in the study, leaving 14 buildings with coaching arrangements that were part of the study (See Table 3-1, p. 51).

Table 3-1 Principal and Coach Participant Demographics

School	Building Level	Principal	Principal	Race	Gender	School	Coach	Race	Gender
		Years of experience in this position	Years of experience with any coach				Years of experience in this position		
#1	Elem.	3	3	W	F	#1	3	W	F
#2	Elem.	22	3	W	F	#2	4	W	F
#3	Elem.	18	10	W	F	#3	10	W	F
#4	Elem.	15	5	W	F	#4	5	W	F
#5	Elem.	3	3	W	F	#5	4	W	F
#6	Elem.	4	4	W	M	#6	2	W	F
#7	Elem.	9	6	W	F	#7	6	W	F
#8	Elem.	16	3	W	M	#8	7	W	F
#9	Elem.	22	5	W	F	#9	5	W	F
#10	Elem.	15	8	W	F	#10	8	W	F
#11	Elem.	18	9	W	F	#11	2	W	F
#11	Elem.	18	9	W	F	#12	10	W	F
#12	Elem.	12	12	W	F	#13	3	W	F
#13	Middle School	1	1	W	F	#14	2	W	F
#14	High School	17	4	W	M	#15	4	W	F

The school district in this study has demographics like those of small urban districts, and yet the district is considered a rural district. The enrollment for 2008 was approximately 7,052 students, ranking it among the smaller “large” districts in the state. In the fall of 2009, enrollment climbed by approximately 700 students because of the nearby military base. Compared to the state average of 38.7% of students considered economically disadvantaged, the district has 51.7% of its students that meet the economically disadvantaged criteria (qualifying for free lunches). The state student minority population stands at 26.82% while this district has a population of 51.2% minority students. Of the 17 schools in the district, eight are designated as Title I buildings, indicating a high percentage of the student population qualifies for free or reduced price lunches. The district has had as many as 11 schools designated as Title I buildings within the last 5 years, but the designation changes based on the economic status of the students and, with active-duty military parents deployed overseas, the income of the family is impacted. The district also has a high student mobility rate. It is located close to a university, giving it the benefit of accessibility to a new pool of teachers each year. This means, moreover, that there is high mobility for teachers as well because often the spouse is either a student at the university or the spouse of a military individual. Because of the mobility of both students and staff and because of high poverty issues, the district regards professional development as an important opportunity to improve student performance. The district has had a focus on quality professional development for many years as evidenced by the eight professional days built into the school calendar. Other surrounding districts range from four to six days of professional development for a school year.

A form of coaching implemented in the mid-1980s was a way to support teachers by improving their performance through observations and frequent meetings with coaches. This

coaching was in the form of a team of highly qualified and respected teachers who established an “instructional cadre.” This cadre focused on new teachers, but offered services to experienced teachers through resources and professional development. With budget cuts imposed because of a loss of military troops on the military base, the cadre was one of the budget casualties.

In approximately 1998, a new reading program, Success For All, was introduced in several of the Title I buildings in the district and a facilitator had to be hired as part of the implementation of the program. The main duties of the individual were to gather resources for the teachers, observe in classrooms, provide feedback to teachers after those observations, and hold trainings for teachers around specific topics. The five schools showed good progress in student achievement, arousing interest in other schools regarding this Success For All (SFA) reading program. As the benchmarks continued to rise with NCLB, schools began to think more about how to make improvements in their student performance and the non-Title I schools began to petition the superintendent for staff that could help with the same kinds of tasks that the SFA reading facilitators were assigned. With little discussion or planning for how these staff might work in these other sites, all of the non-Title I schools were also granted permission to hire this instructional person designated as a non-classroom teacher. There were not specifications as to coaching skills, and a bachelor of science degree was sufficient for this position. The responsibilities and functions of the role vary from school to school as each school was allowed to determine how they would use this new position/role. All of the coaching positions are full-time positions with no classroom responsibilities. In recent months, the district has been attempting to move all of the roles to more of the coaching role functioning to provide instructional feedback and support to the classroom teacher.

Those individuals that were selected initially to serve as reading facilitators and those that have since been added to the coaching pool were mostly experienced teachers thought to be exemplary teaching models in their respective buildings. Many also served and continue to serve in leadership roles both in the district and at the building level. Current roles include representation on curriculum committees, school improvement teams, and sometimes serving in the principal's absence as principal designee. Only one of the participants was hired with no experience in teaching. The group collectively has a range of years of experience in teaching from 2-25. All of the members of the group are females ranging in age from 26 to 50 years of age.

The principal group has a great deal of experience as a whole. Two of the group of 17 have 3 years of experience in the building leader role; the remainder range from 8-22 years of experience. All but one of the principals had several years of teaching in District 101 before moving into building leadership, which would mean that the group collectively may have a cultural mindset instilled by number of years of teaching and years as a building principal in this district. Because of a district commitment to professional development, each administrator is provided a membership to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). Each administrator receives the ASCD publications and often study the publications as an administrative team. The McREL work is published through ASCD and administrators in this district had studied the McREL work (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005), thus they were familiar with the McREL leadership responsibilities. Coaches would have not have had the same widespread exposure to this research, but some would have been familiar with it based on sharing by their respective building leaders. In the principal group, there are two males at the elementary level and two of the three principals at the secondary level are male. The age range

for the administrative group is an older group ranging from 40 years of age to approximately 60 years of age.

A total of 36 participants were invited to be part of this study, representing a range of teaching and leadership experiences. Because the coaching pair had to agree to participate in order to have data representative of coaching arrangements in buildings, the ending number was 29 participants (14 principals, 15 coaches). In addition, three Central Office administrators are included in the interviews. Responsibilities for these three Central Office administrators include the supervision and evaluation of all building level administrators, supervision of curriculum and instruction, and responsibilities for secondary buildings in the district.

Data Collection

Creswell (2007) describes forms of qualitative data in the literature: observations, interviews, documents, and audiovisual materials. He notes that observations may range from nonparticipant to participant; interviews run the gamut from close-ended to open-ended; documents may be of the private and public variety, and audiovisual materials include such things as photographs, compact discs, and videotapes.

Patton (1990) identifies three types of qualitative interviewing for research or evaluation: the informal conversational interview, the interview guide approach, and the standardized open-ended interview. The common strand for all three is the provision for open-ended participant responses. Each type of interviewing offers particular advantages and disadvantages. The informal conversational interview may occur spontaneously in the course of the field-work, often times without the participant knowing that an interview is taking place. The interview is not systematic or comprehensive, leading to difficulties in analyzing the data. The interview guide approach is more systematic than the conversational interview, with the interviewer presenting

an outline of topics or issues to be discussed. Skills of the interviewer are important in this approach to facilitate probing for in-depth responses. The interview guide approach is thought to be the most commonly used format for qualitative interviewing. The final approach is the standardized open-ended interview with the interviewer following a very strict script with rigid adherence to the questions. The responses are open-ended, which keeps the format qualitative in nature. This format works well when volunteer interviewers are going to be used as it holds the person to a consistent format.

For this study, data were collected through the interview guide approach (Patton, 1990), interviewing key players on how coaching evolved in this district. The semi-structured interviews used a specified set of questions that were asked of each participant, but also added probing questions to further understand key issues. These principals and instructional coaches were interviewed on-site, face-to-face, in their natural setting: their respective schools. Proximity of the schools to the researcher facilitated this possibility. The anticipated length of the interview was approximately 45 minutes each, although time spent with principals tended to be a bit longer because they wanted to discuss other matters. Four of the interviews required rescheduling and in the interest of convenience for participants, these four interviews were conducted at the district office. The interview questions were taken from the research questions addressed in Chapter 1 giving insights into how direction was provided to the content coach by the building principal, leadership skills of both partners in the coaching arrangement and their perceptions of the outcomes of this coaching approach. The interviews were all tape recorded so that a verbatim account could be secured. A transcript was created that was reviewed and coded for themes and other critical research data. Some notes were taken during the interview, but in order to remain unobtrusive, field notes were recorded following the observations and interviews.

In addition, a reflection journal was kept to record personal reflection and comments about the interviewee/interview. This reflection journal provided a way to process the experience and added additional documentation of the interview experience.

An invitation letter was sent to the prospective participants describing the study (see Appendix B, p. 163). In the letter, participants were informed of the nature of the study, the purpose of the study, what would be done during the research study, and the amount of time needed for the study. The letter included the discussion of measures that ensured anonymity of the participants. Participants that elected to be part of the study were asked to complete an informational background form (see Appendix C, p. 164). The researcher also obtained informed consent from the participants before engaging them in the collection of data. Participants were provided with interview questions in advance when they chose to participate (see Appendix D, p. 165). Additionally, each participant was mailed the McREL leadership responsibilities along with the interview questions. The participants interviewed were from the elementary (12), middle (1), and high school (1) levels with a range of years of experience.

In addition to interviewing coaching partners at 14 schools, three Central Office administrators were consulted (interviewed) to establish contextual factors affecting the interpretation of the results. These three Central Office administrators were selected because they were instrumental in the decision making around the coaching program and its development. Their input included decisions about adding these positions and professional development. Interviews with the three Central Office administrators included many of the same questions asked of the principal and coach participants, but because of their specific roles, not all questions were applicable and some questions were not asked. The information from the

interviews was studied to note patterns that gave additional insight into the coaching implementation and partnerships.

Data Analysis

Qualitative analysis is based on data reduction and interpretation aimed at identifying categories and themes. Gay et. al (2006) suggest steps to follow as part of the data analysis process. Those steps include reading through the data to become familiar with the setting, identifying possible themes, examining the data to describe the participants, and finally categorizing and coding pieces of data and grouping them into themes. The process of reading, describing, classifying, and interpreting was conducted using the interview transcripts. The field notes, the reflections, and the administrator interviews provided additional information.

Potential coding categories were established as the data were reviewed in the first part of the analysis. Interview transcripts were analyzed systematically: phrases, patterns, and events were examined. Coding, “the process of categorically marking or referencing units of text (e.g., words, sentences, paragraphs, and quotations) with codes and labels as a way to indicate patterns and meaning” (Gay et al., 2006, p. 471) was used to analyze the data. Field notes and the reflection journal provided support for interpretation of the interview questions during each step of the analysis.

Data interpretation questions that were considered included: what was important about the data, why was it important, and what can be learned from it? Links between data collection, analysis and interpretation are provided. Tables 4-3 through 4-24 establish the connections between the data sources, analytic codes, and subsequent findings.

Background and Role of the Researcher

Lincoln and Guba (1985), in a seminal piece about the importance of research, suggest that before conducting a qualitative research study, the researcher must do three things: adopt the stance suggested by the characteristics of the naturalist paradigm, develop the skill level appropriate for a human instrument, and prepare a research design that utilizes accepted strategies for naturalistic inquiry. Further, they identify the characteristics that make humans the “instrument of choice” in naturalistic inquiry. Those characteristics include the ability to respond to environmental cues, interact with the situation, to collect information at several levels simultaneously, they can perceive situations holistically, they are able to process data as soon as it comes available to provide immediate feedback and request verification of data, and they can explore unexpected responses. The ability to use humans as a source for data collection can strengthen quality research.

For this study, the researcher was an educational leadership doctoral student currently employed as the director of elementary education in the Curriculum and Instruction Division of the district’s central office. She is responsible for elementary curriculum and instruction for a school district of approximately 6,800 students. Her professional background included 8 years in the elementary classroom before moving into a role as assistant principal in an elementary school for 4 years. In the role of elementary director, the researcher interacts with teachers and principals as part of her regular assignment. Her assignment includes the facilitation of monthly principal meetings for which she sets the agenda and gathers any needed resources. Responsibilities of the role include communicating curriculum, instruction and assessment issues to both teachers and principals. This is often facilitated through these monthly principal meetings where new programs are discussed and feedback is sought before proceeding to implementation with teachers in any form. The job entails involving staff in the selection and

purchase of new instructional materials. It also includes reviewing and developing assessments that match state and local standards. Currently, her involvement also includes participating in the hiring of both teachers and principals for their respective roles, giving her a perspective from both aspects of the school setting. Coaches are part of the groups that she comes into regular contact with, and relationships there have been established over time. Personal and professional relationships with principals are also part of the researcher's background. The researcher has no evaluative role with the individuals in the study. Because of the relationships established with both groups, the researcher feels that access to participants was enhanced and the credibility of the research was possibly strengthened. Interaction between the participants and the researcher occurred in a more natural setting since the researcher and participants were familiar with each other and the building.

Trustworthiness

Creswell (2007) indicates that the goal for qualitative research is to achieve, as best as possible, understanding what he describes as a deep knowledge of some social setting or phenomenon. Striving for understanding requires spending extensive time in the field. He believes that **verification** is critical to evaluating the quality of qualitative research, and he identifies eight procedures for verifying qualitative research findings: (1) prolonged engagement and persistent observation; (2) triangulation; (3) peer review or debriefing; (4) negative case analysis; (5) clarifying research bias; (6) member-checking; (7) rich, thick description; and (8) external audits. He recommends that qualitative researchers engage in at least two of these procedures in any given study. The researcher used two of the procedures. Multiple perspectives are gained through the many interviews (32) with coaches, principals, and Central Office administrators. The 800 pages of transcripts yielded rich, thick descriptions of coaching

(Creswell, 2007), providing details of this picture of a coaching implementation and perceptions of these partnerships.

In addition, Creswell (2007) believes that Lincoln and Guba's criteria of trustworthiness, credibility and authenticity should be employed when evaluating qualitative research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) conjecture that trustworthiness of a research study is important to evaluating its worth and that there are important criteria involved in establishing trustworthiness: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility is having confidence in the truth of the findings; transferability is the ability to show that the findings may be applicable to other settings; dependability indicates that the findings are consistent and could be replicated; and confirmability describes the degree to which the findings of a study are shaped by the respondents and not researcher bias, motivation or interest. Techniques for establishing credibility included peer debriefing, " a process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer in a manner paralleling an analytical session and for the purpose of exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise remain only implicit within the inquirer's mind" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 308). The researcher spent time sharing data with a colleague, sharing thinking about the data and what it means, and asking for the perspective of the outsider. The peer debriefer worked with the researcher to establish coder consensus. Creswell (2007) indicates that detailed description regarding the participants and setting will allow readers to transfer information to other settings.

Summary

This study used a qualitative case study research design that included semi-structured interviews as the primary source of data. Participants from 17 of the district schools were invited to participate, 14 of the schools elected to participate. Three Central Office administrators were also consulted (interviewed).

The researcher used field notes and a reflection journal to record notes about the settings and environment in which the interviews took place. The interviews comprised the bulk of the data for the study. Upon the completion of the interviews, all interviews were transcribed. The process for reviewing all of the interviews is detailed in Chapter 4. The researcher used information from field notes and a reflection journal to help understand the development of themes across the findings. Three different analytic frameworks (organization, path-goal theory of leadership, and McREL leadership responsibilities) were used to examine data. Thirty-five findings emerged that were translated into three themes across all findings. Chapter 4 presents the findings for this study.

CHAPTER 4 - Analysis of the Data

Professional literature around the topic of coaching in school settings is a body of work that is growing rapidly with the increased interest in the topic, but studies specific to how coaching arrangements were enacted and the informal and formal leadership features in these partnerships are few. Instead, much of the research has focused on the range of coaching roles and responsibilities and the types of support important to the success of coaching. This study analyzed the way in which one school district implemented a coaching approach.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the study was to explore one school district's implementation of a content coaching approach. The schools, all in the same district, provided data in the form of interviews describing how coaching was defined and how it evolved, important components of the coaching program, and related challenges. At the same time, the leadership roles in this coaching program were studied using the lens of the path-goal theory and McREL's leadership responsibilities.

Analyzing the Data

Data sources for this study came primarily from interviews and field notes and a reflection journal were used to interpret data during the analysis as well as provide understanding of the findings. Each step involved in analysis will be addressed next.

Following each participant interview, field notes about the observations were recorded to reflect the researcher's understanding of the setting and the participants. Descriptive information that detailed the school setting, along with dates and times, were recorded.

Reflections regarding the researcher's perception of the setting, environment, and participant interactions were also recorded as information about the context of the case and

process of analysis and interpretation. The intent was to note relationship indicators between the coach and the principal. This information is discussed in a contextual manner following the interview findings in each section.

The primary source of data came from interviews with participants and represents the bulk of this analysis. Interviews were conducted with 14 principals and 15 coaches. The three Central Office administrators were interviewed as well to extend the case description but were not systematically analyzed. Approximately 800 pages of transcripts were derived from the total of 32 interviews.

Field Notes and Journal

Field notes were recorded immediately following the interview to avoid unnecessary distractions for both the participant and the researcher. The distinction between field notes and the reflection journal is that the field notes detailed the physical setting and environment. The reflection journal contained the researcher's thoughts and perceptions of the interviewees and the process. Before beginning a first read of transcribed interviews, the field notes and the journal reflections were reviewed. Upon the completion of analysis of the interview data, these entries were reread to assist with the development of the themes threaded across the findings.

It was important for the researcher to visit school sites as part of the data collection process to gain a better sense of the physical setting in which the participants work. The physical setting adds understanding of the expectations and insight into coaching roles based partly on room arrangement and space in which the coach works. The field notes helped provide information specific to the settings for the interviews and information that provided these glimpses into the setting and the environment where the coaches and principals enacted the program. All but four of the interviews were conducted in the respective schools and mostly in

the participant's office, classroom, or space. Four of the interviews had to be rescheduled and were conducted at the district office because it was more convenient for participants.

Five elementary level coaches had entire classrooms designated for their use, and the remainder used what appeared to be any available nook or cranny. It was noted that both secondary coaches had a space that could be termed an actual office and not a classroom, in contrast to the elementary coaches. Space seemed to be an issue in many of the buildings. Coaches' spaces were shared with itinerant staff (speech teachers, interrelated teachers, social workers) in several cases. In one interview, the coach and researcher had to move to a new location midway through the interview because the room needed to be used for another purpose. Some of the coaches cited their primary responsibilities as a tutor to students and in some cases, the type of space they occupied reflected this. For example, one coach had a tiny nook and saw students individually or two to three at a time throughout most of the day as her primary work. Another coach who spends most of her time tutoring had an entire classroom for space, but worked mostly with larger groups of students at a time. Tables where the coach could be surrounded by small numbers of students were present in the smaller nooks, a clear indication of the coach's work emphasis. Where the coach had been primarily a resource person, the larger classroom space housed the coach because materials had to be readily available for distribution by coaches to teachers.

The researcher's reflection journal recorded perceptions that gave insight into coaching relationships. Almost all of the participants interviewed met the researcher in the school office before proceeding to the interview location. Interactions between the staff and coach or staff and principal were positive as greetings were often exchanged. Participants were perceived by the researcher as warm, inviting, and open in the interviews, as noted in reflections. In every case but

one, coaches and principals spoke kind and positive words about one another. In that one case, nothing negative was said, but the lack of positive comments was obvious compared to others. This same coach is described below as uncomfortable with her years of experience at coaching.

Principal interviews were held in their respective offices. Often, principals were prepared for the interview as evidenced by the notes they used during the interview. Perceptions of the researcher were that principals were confident in their responses as they responded easily and with little hesitation.

With regard to the coaches, most were also well-prepared and self-assured. One of the coaches, however, seemed to be uneasy and expressed that more than one time during our interview. Interview questions were mailed prior to the meetings, and this coach had prepared all of her answers in written form. The perception of the researcher was that this coach seemed to want to give a correct answer or sought reinforcement of her answers. This coach referred frequently to this prepared set of answers and did not appear to be speaking spontaneously, as did the others. A couple of the coaches least experienced in the coaching group seemed very nervous and apologized more than once during the interview for their seeming lack of experience or knowledge. One of these two coaches noted her inexperience, but also expressed her eagerness and desire to learn and grow to overcome the lack of experience.

Findings from Field Notes and Journal

Space was a concern in several buildings, which could indicate that planning for the coaching program was not sufficient. Space reflected the types of responsibilities held by coaches. Those tutoring small groups were housed in small storage kinds of spaces, and those serving as resources were located in large classrooms so they could distribute materials needed. The secondary coach participants each had more formal office space which indicated a broader

role in the building. One secondary coach mostly worked with teachers as a co-teacher or modeled lessons in classrooms so an office served her well. The other secondary coach referred to her office as a possible barrier to the staffs' perception of her role. Since she had an office in the administrative suite, her perception was that others regarded her as an administrator and might be reluctant to seek her assistance. Throughout the interview, this coach also expressed a lack of clarity about her role.

Participants presented themselves as positive while they were with the researcher. The coaching partners were often very complimentary of one another, expressing admiration and respect for the other.

Interviews

Upon completion of the 32 interviews, the audiotapes were transcribed for analysis. Roughly 800 pages of interview transcripts were accumulated during the course of this study, presenting the challenging task of choosing the approach to analysis. Creswell (2007) describes the core elements of qualitative data analysis as “reducing the data into meaningful segments and assigning names for the segments, combining the data into broader categories or themes, and displaying and making comparisons into broader categories or themes” (p. 148). The following paragraphs detail the analytic process for the interviews with the coaching partners (principals and coaches). Following each portion of analysis is a summary of the perspectives of the three Central Office administrators. In some portions of the analysis, the administrators were not asked about the same issues so their related perspectives can not be reported.

To gain an overall sense of the data, the researcher first generally reviewed the transcribed interviews in their entirety. During these first readings, the researcher highlighted key words and phrases, making notes regarding general impressions and initial ideas about

common patterns. Electronically grouping the transcripts by interview question as a way to segment the data into like categories was the next step in the process. The researcher reread these grouped interview questions, again compiling a list of the key words, phrases, and thoughts. From these readings, codes representing meaningful categories were developed. Next, the transcripts were reread and coded using the tentative codes to see if they accounted for most of the meaningful units in the body of data. This process was followed with all of the data from the principal/coach partners.

Three main categories of codes for analysis were used: organization of the coaching program, path-goal theory of leadership, and McREL leadership responsibilities. In the first category, organization codes (not theoretically driven or associated with McREL) emerged from the data. In the second category, theoretically driven (path-goal) codes were used. In the third category, the McREL leadership responsibilities associated with second-order change provided the framework for analysis.

Main Code (A).

Recurring categories that emerged from the data included those that related to the program organization (structure and role position) (see Table 4-1, p. 72 for a summary of all coding categories). The program organization refers to structure and position. Thus, under the program organization main category (A), the two broad codes of structure (A1) and position (A2) were used. Codes and their definitions in this study are operational. Structure is defined in this study as those attributes associated with the overall program and include the following in this study:

- How the coaching program was implemented
- Definitions and guidelines provided for the coaching program

- Understanding why a coaching role was important
- Outcomes from having a person in a coaching role

Position is defined in this study as those attributes specific to the actual role of the coach as contrasted by looking at the program. The position definition includes the following:

- The qualifications needed for the coaching role
- How the coach routinely uses their work time
- What responsibilities are assigned to the coach
- What professional development is provided for the coach

Because the two codes of structure and position were still very broad, level 3 sub-codes within these level 2 codes were further used to organize the responses. For example, the level 2 code of program structure was further divided into definition of coaching (A1a), evolution of coaching (A1b), formal guidelines and goals of the program (A1c), importance of the coaching role (A1d), evidence coaching outcomes (A1e), and challenges (A1f). The other level 2 code of position (A2) was divided into attributes (A2a), qualifications (A2b), use of time (A2c), most important coaching responsibilities (A2d), and professional development (A2e).

Main Code (B).

Since the interview questions were influenced by the path-goal theory of leadership, this category was established as a second main coding category. Within the path-goal leader behavior category (B) there were eight sub-codes reflecting types of behavior: path-goal clarifying behaviors, achievement-oriented leader behavior, work facilitation, supportive leader behavior, interaction facilitation, group-oriented decision process, representation and networking, and value-based leader behavior (B1 through B8).

Main Code (C).

The 21 leadership responsibilities in the McREL Balanced Leadership Framework (Waters & Cameron, 2007) comprise the third category (C). Only those Balanced Leadership Framework (BLF) responsibilities related to positive correlations with second-order change (C1) or negative correlation to second-order change categories (C2) were included in the analysis. Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; optimizer; intellectual stimulation; change agent; monitor and evaluate; flexibility; and ideals and beliefs were assigned level 2 codes (C1a through C1g). *Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment* is described as staying abreast of current research and practice. *Optimizer* refers to the ability to offer an optimistic view of what the school is doing. *Intellectual stimulation* is defined as fostering the knowledge of best practice in research. A *change agent* is able to challenge old practices and investigate new ones. *Monitor and evaluate* is defined as establishing and maintaining a system that provides feedback on student achievement. The ability to adapt to various opinions and types of leadership defines *flexibility*. *Ideals and beliefs* are the core beliefs around teaching and learning.

Four were assigned level 2 codes under the negative correlations category (C2a through C2d): culture, communication, order and input. *Culture* refers to building a common language and norms of cooperation within a school. *Communication* describes an ability to foster clear lines of communication within the staff. Establishing routines that help establish order and predictability defines *order*; and *input* defines the opportunity staff has to contribute to decisions in the building.

Once the data were entered and coded, the researcher sorted the dataset into electronic files by codes (level 2) and sub-codes when needed (level 3) across all participants. These codes and sub-codes yielded findings under each of the level 1 (main) categories. This process allowed

the researcher to view the data by code and provided a means to determine if the data were linked to the most appropriate code.

Data for each code were disaggregated by role (either coach or principal) to determine the differences in perspectives if they existed. The participant selection process did not allow for disaggregation by other characteristics since the potential population did not contain sufficient numbers for comparison by the characteristics (age, gender, ethnicity, building level).

Data Presentation

Creswell (2007) indicates that the final phase of analyzing data includes presenting the data in “text, tabular, or figure form” (p. 154). Tables that follow each narrative description of codes summarize (tally) responses so that the number of participants expressing a particular concept is expressed. Similar meanings were grouped and tallied under each code. Findings were derived by interpreting what consistent patterns that emerged. At the end of each section (A, B, C) before the tables are presented, findings in narrative form are discussed. The data comes from the interview of the 29 participants (coaches and principals); it will be noted accordingly where the data revealed findings when disaggregated by role (principal or coach).

In this chapter, the findings are structured around each of the three categories of main codes (level 1): program organization, path-goal leadership theory, and McREL’s leadership responsibilities. The discussion of the findings uses quotes from the participants to increase understanding and provide more detailed description of the case. Quotes are verbatim with the exception of editing for grammatical purposes only.

Table 4-1 Summarization of Coding Categories

(A) Program Organization	(B) Path-Goal Leader Behaviors	(C) McREL Leadership Responsibilities
A1 Structure	B1 <i>Path-goal clarifying behaviors</i>	C1 Positively correlated with second-order change
<i>A1a</i> <i>Coaching defined</i>	B2 <i>Achievement-oriented behaviors</i>	<i>C1a</i> <i>Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, assessment</i>
<i>A1b</i> <i>Evolution of coaching</i>	B3 <i>Work facilitation</i>	<i>C1b</i> <i>Optimizer</i>
<i>A1c</i> <i>Formal goals/guidelines for the program</i>	B4 <i>Supportive leader Behavior</i>	<i>C1c</i> <i>Intellectual stimulation</i>
<i>A1d</i> <i>Importance of the role</i>	B5 <i>Interaction Facilitation</i>	<i>C1d</i> <i>Change agent</i>
<i>A1e</i> <i>Coaching outcomes/evidence</i>	B6 <i>Group-oriented decision process</i>	<i>C1e</i> <i>Monitor and evaluate</i>
<i>A1f</i> <i>Challenges</i>	B7 <i>Representation and networking</i>	<i>C1f</i> <i>Flexibility</i>
	B8 <i>Value-based leader behavior</i>	<i>C1g</i> <i>Ideals and beliefs</i>
A2 Position		C2 Negatively correlated with second-order change
<i>A2a</i> <i>Attributes</i>		<i>C2a</i> <i>Culture</i>
<i>A2b</i> <i>Qualifications for the position</i>		<i>C2b</i> <i>Communication</i>
<i>A2c</i> <i>Use of time</i>		<i>C2c</i> <i>Order</i>
<i>A2d</i> <i>Most important coaching responsibilities</i>		<i>C2d</i> <i>Input</i>
<i>A2e</i> <i>Professional development</i>		

Program Organization

This section will examine how the coaching program was organized in this school district. The researcher placed data units regarding the program organization under the level 2 codes of structure and position. Because these two codes were so broad, the researcher organized level 3 sub-codes under each of the two categories. The level 2 code of structure included how coaching was defined, the evolution of coaching, formal guidelines and goals for the coaching program, the perceptions of the importance of the coaching role, perceived coaching outcomes, and evidence of these outcomes. The findings related to structure are addressed in the following section.

Structure

Coaching Defined

Neufeld and Roper (2003) differentiate between content coaches and change coaches in their professional research. Their work describes the work of both types of coaches, but it clearly delineates the roles for both coaches and indirectly addresses the need to be clear about how the coaching role is to be structured. The participants in this study were asked to provide a definition of coaching and indicate who provided the definition. Nine coaches and 12 principals indicated that they came to the coaching position with a preconceived notion or expectation of what the coaching role included (see Table 4-2, p. 83). These predetermined thoughts came mostly from experiences with a facilitator for the Success For All (SFA) reading program. The facilitators for SFA served as the keeper of resources for the program, the meeting coordinator, and had testing responsibilities for students, so that was the expectation of the person hired for a coaching role where an SFA program existed. Eleven of the 29 participants indicated that they

believed that the coaching role was defined by building needs, and the number of coaches and principals responding that the role was defined by building needs was almost equal (six coaches, five principals). They described these building needs as specific academic areas where data indicated achievement was slipping and the coach was directed to respond to this building focus. For another example, there were a number of inexperienced staff in one building and the coach's attention was shifted to assisting teachers. Besides data indicating a specific building need, individuals indicated that the principal shaped the role by determining coaching duties. Coaches responded that the principal often made it clear the kinds of duties they could not assume, such as wiping tables at lunch or simply being an additional person in the classroom. Some reported the role was defined through a collaborative effort between the coach and the principal, indicating that the two worked together to develop the coaching structures in their own buildings. In one case, a coach said that she wrote her own job description and presented it to the principal. Only 3 participants (all principals) indicated that the district had provided a definition of coaching.

Evolution of Coaching

The definition of coaching was reported to have changed over time (six coaches, six principals) (see Table 4-3, p. 85). The role had changed to include other content areas besides reading, and those changes in the role were based on what the building needs were, as well as a desire to move into more of a leadership role. One principal spoke of her coach in this manner: "The biggest jump that we've made is just trying to break away from just being a facilitator to being more of a person that is seen as a leader within the building." An inexperienced coach described how she felt her role had changed over time, and expressed the changes in a positive

manner, explaining “ As my role is changing, I feel less confident, but more excited. And more excited about what I can learn and what I can offer and what the possibilities are.”

A veteran coach explained that early on she had tried to be a helper in classrooms, but a look at data directed them toward a role of helping struggling students. She explained that she was able to shape her own role somewhat:

“I got into a situation where a teacher was really way too dependent on me after a certain amount of time and I didn’t know how to get out of that at that time. And so I felt that I was spending my whole year just right there in that situation the entire year long and didn’t see any teacher growth from that either. So that has changed again this year and I think I was able to take back a little bit more control with that by defining my own roles a little bit better.”

One district administrator indicated that the definition of coaching had evolved:

“I think that coaching was—is defined as a way of supporting instruction across the district. And I’m not sure that coaching was absolutely in a very succinct way, defined all of a sudden. I think it sort of evolved for us. We understood more and more that it had a lot of power and we started looking at the model. And I think in some ways, maybe we haven’t still settled absolutely on a definition.”

Goals and Guidelines for the Program

Participants believed that the goals for the coaching program were determined by building need (see Table 4-4, p. 86). Several times participants mentioned that the goals for coaching were tied to building school improvement goals. On the other side of the continuum, a few were unclear of whether there were any goals, how they were established, or believed they were determined by outside programs (i.e., Success For All). In addition, a few indicated that

their perception was that coaching goals were driven by the district. One individual reported that the goals of the coaching program were established by what she read in professional materials about what coaches were supposed to be doing. An experienced principal partnered with an experienced coach replied,

“Well, I think initially they’ve been developed at the building level and again I think it’s been largely a part of the coach and I conversing about what we think her opportunities are to influence and what areas that we have the strongest desire to impact. I think we may see some district influence coming with some of the staff development that’s being provided. I think it’s interesting, we’ve been fairly comfortable with the way we’ve defined the role here at our building. I think it’s been interesting for us to kind of watch the district work in providing support to these coaches. And how some of the other buildings I think perceive that a little bit as a threat to maybe the way they had wanted to define the coaching role.”

Another experienced principal with a new coach explained,

“We found out at the beginning most of the buildings were not really all consistent, because they kind of left it up to building administrators how to utilize their coaches and how to set up their deal. So sometimes going to another principal and asking how you utilize them and how we’re utilizing them, we kind of draw our boundaries between there, what would be best for our building.”

Only the 14 principals were asked about the formal guidelines for coaching. Most said that they were not sure that there were any guidelines, they did not remember any job descriptions for the coaching position, or if there were guidelines, they were not sure where they

came from. Those indicating that there were any guidelines described them as being from the SFA program or said that the guidelines came from the district office.

Importance of the Coaching Role Position

Principals responded that the coaching position was important because of the additional support it provided to various groups within their buildings (see Table 4-5, p. 87). The overwhelming number saw the role as important because it provided teacher support. The teacher support they voiced was in the form of having a person to provide or gather resources for teachers, keeping the staff on course with professional development, and having an instructional leader for the staff. One principal indicated that teachers like to hear from other teachers: “I think sometimes that teachers really love to hear about practices from other teachers.”

Other administrators indicated that it was helpful to have a person other than the principal as someone they could go to for assistance. Two of the less experienced principals expressed that concept as well. One said, “The teachers needed somebody else they could go to besides just me. I think they see it as less threatening to go and say this isn’t working or I don’t know how to do this.” The other explained,

“Administrators are not the best people to work with the teachers because they’re afraid—especially if they’re a young teacher and they don’t have tenure yet. They’re afraid to ask for help. They’re afraid if they do something wrong or take a risk and try something that they might get evaluated bad or they may not continue at the end of the year. Where a coach is a neutral person. They’re not the ones doing the evaluation and so they can go in and observe and the teacher can feel free to take a risk and make a mistake and know that it’s not the evaluator sitting over there. So I think it’s a very valuable position.”

Types of student support provided by the coaches were helping students with reading skills through additional tutoring. Student support was also provided by targeting students in the lower achievement levels with different types of instruction, as well as additional time.

Evidence of Outcomes

Part of the measure of success for any instructional program must be that it impacts the staff or students positively. When coaches were asked what the perceived outcomes of the coaching approach were for students and staff, almost all of them had the perception that student achievement was positively impacted (see Table 4-6, p. 88). Many coaches felt student achievement gains were made and that instruction that would indirectly impact student achievement was improved. None of the coaches volunteered specific evidence to support perceptions of positive outcomes, but a few did raise the concern that they were not aware of any evidence on students. One coach saw the evidence as removed from her immediate effect on students. “It’s such a long distance from the work I do to students—that it’s hard to say and that’s one of the hard things in the job. You don’t have immediate insight into the impact you have.” When comparing coaches and principals, the perception was that far fewer principals were as confident that scores for students improved. Instead, the principals were more likely to say there was no evidence of coaching outcomes related to students at this point in time.

A large majority of the coaches responded that the outcomes for staff were related to improved learning for staff members because resources and professional development were provided. The same number of principals (11) indicated that the outcomes of coaching for staff also impacted instruction and impacted the culture of the building. Principals were more convinced that coaching had impacted teachers rather than student achievement at this point. One coach described how she had provided her staff with professional development related to

literature circles and had followed the training with model lessons in classrooms. She viewed the impact on staff through these eyes: “Literature circles carried on and that was the biggest thing. If you’re not there—if you leave and you’re not there, do they drop it or do they see the value and carry it on?”

Challenges

The term *challenge* is defined by the researcher as a test of someone’s abilities or a situation that tests someone’s abilities in a stimulating way. Only eight participants expressed that dealing with time constraints was a challenge, but *all* eight that mentioned this issue were coaches and not principals (see Table 4-7, p. 90). The challenges of time expressed by the coaches were how to manage schedules, wanting more time to spend with teachers, and being too busy to get to all of the needs in a building. The other types of challenges faced in the coaching program (three coaches, four principals) included trying to get teachers to buy into the coaching program. Related to this lack of “buy-in” from teachers were responses that may have indicated the frustration from this unwillingness to buy in to the coaching program: “I’m not there (in the classroom) to spy or to say you’re not doing this right or whatever. But just to help them.” Another one said,

“One of the books we read said, the way to get into teachers, get them to work with you is to do anything they ask. I kind of don’t know if I agree with that just because I agree with it to a point when they realize you’ll do all these other things then that might be how they use you too.”

A veteran coach expressed the same frustration: “The biggest challenge is always how to get buy-in from all the teachers.”

Two coaches and three principals said that challenges were related to a clear definition of the role. A veteran principal with a veteran coach indicated, “When you take on a different role like academic coach, you’re not a fellow classroom teacher. And she had to redefine some of her relationships, but that’s certainly contributed tremendously, I think.”

An inexperienced coach lamented the following:

“I see now why they’re (faculty) getting confused because maybe I’m semi-confused myself. I’ve only been in this building for four years. One year as a teacher, one year as an administrator and then two years in this role. And my job’s been different every year.”

All but one of the schools in this study have just one person in the coaching role. One coach expressed the isolation she felt in this role as a challenge:

“I think it’s a good idea that we now have a coach coordinator. You know, she’s excellent, but also to give us a focus. Also, that collaboration piece. I’ve talked to other coaches or facilitators and sometimes we do feel a little bit like an island.”

Findings for Structure

In summary, findings associated with the coaching program structure (level 2 code) indicate differences in the perspectives of the coaches and the principals. While the coaching definition was considered a preconceived idea or expectation based on prior experiences, principals more often indicated this was true. Other differences between coach and principal responses were found in the understanding of goals and guidelines: Coaches were more likely to indicate that goals were based on building needs. Coaches reported student improvement as an outcome of coaching more than principals did.

Principals viewed the importance of the coaching role as support to teachers and also indicated that teacher support was the outcome of coaching. The data around how coaching had

evolved was more evenly divided between coaches and principals showing that about half of each group believed the coaching role changed over time.

Central Office Perspectives on Structure

The three participants from Central Office gave responses that paralleled the majority of coaches and principals with regard to coaching definitions. Two of the Central Office participants responded that they did not believe that coaching was defined. The remaining Central Office person indicated that coaching was defined “to work with teachers” and the district was looking to models of coaching when the coaching program was started. Another Central Office administrator responded that the position was “a way of supporting and improving instruction” and said it had evolved for the district.

All three of these participants reported that guidelines were also “fuzzy” and were decided individually (buildings). The same participant that indicated that the district was looking at various models said that no guidelines were provided by design as they were not sure which model was best. That Central Office administrator said,

“We started out with very few formal guidelines. And that was again, by design because what I wanted to do was this to evolve into a final product. And even though I had access to several models, I didn’t know which one would work in the district. I really didn’t. And from my standpoint, I trust staff that as they began to work with the coaches, that a good model could be brought from that.”

The responses to determining why the role was important also aligned with those of the coaches and principals. They saw the role as a support to teachers, one recognizing that principals cannot “do it all.”

Interestingly, two Central Office staff indicated that they believed student achievement scores were on the increase and this was an outcome of coaching. One staffer pointed out that research shows the impact of coaching, but there wasn't evidence of that yet in this district.

Table 4-2 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1)

Sub-Code (A1a)	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence- examples from the transcripts
Definition of coaching – a concise explanation of the meaning of a word or phrase or symbol	The majority of participants had a preconceived idea, expectation, or definition of coaching that was connected to prior experience. (21) 9-C, 12-P	I had an idea in my head of what the coaching position would look like from being a teacher that had been coached.
	Participants believed that the definition of coaching was determined by building needs or by the building principal. (11) 6-C, 5-P	The responsibilities of the coach in the building are basically determined by our needs. I specifically asked for that position with that thought in mind (adults that could work with kids during the day).
	Participants defined coaching as a collaborative effort by the coach and the principal. (7) 4-C, 3-P	The two of us put a frame to what we thought we wanted to get out of that assignment and then after we had done that, then we shared.
	Participants believed the coaching definition was determined by district. (3) 3-P	My recollection was that we were at a meeting and [name] shared with us that we were going to begin the coaching process. And we didn't know anything about it before that until we came to that meeting and we were given that information.
	Participant defined her own job description.(1) 1-C	I wrote what I thought would be a job description and gave it to the principal.
	Participants didn't think coaching was really defined to begin with. (3) 2-C, 1-P	I don't believe coaching was defined in the district. I believe at first it was simply some extra people to support kids who needed to be tutored.

C = coach P=principal

FINDINGS:

- The majority had a preconceived idea or concept of what coaching entailed.
- Approximately one-third of the participants indicated the definition of coaching was determined at the building level.
- Those that perceived that the district had determined a coaching definition were principals.

Table 4-3 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1)

Sub-Code (A1b)	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence-examples from the transcripts
Evolution (of coaching)- a process by which something passes by degrees to a different stage	Participants described the coaching role as one that had changed from the beginning to the current in responsibilities and assignments. (12) 6-C, 6-P	I've moved into lots of other aspects of coaching that were defined in those 10 roles of coaches.

C=coach P=principal

FINDINGS:

- Nearly half of the participants perceived that the definition of coaching had evolved since the coaching role was established. The changes included new roles and responsibilities.

Table 4-4 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1)

Sub-Code (A1c)	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence-examples from the transcripts
Goals – something that somebody wants to achieve (how the goals of coaching were established)	Goals for coaching were determined based on building needs. (20) 12-C, 8-P	It’s so site-based...but I think it’s just basically on the needs of our staff and our students.
	Participants perceived that the district determined what the coaching goals were. (5) 3-C, 2-P	I think we understand it from the district. I kept getting that over and over in my mind through our meetings.
	Participants had no perception of whether there were any goals or how they were established. (3) 2-C, 1-P	For the district, I don’t know that there are clear goals established really for the position.
	Participants believed that goals were either self-determined or influenced by a prior coaching experience. (5) 5-C	I think probably our goals have probably been taken from different trainings (Cognitive Coaching, Success For All).
Guidelines - detailed plans or explanations to guide you in setting standards or determining a course of action	Participants were not sure that there were any formal guidelines for the coaching program. (8) 8-P	I’m not sure I recall any formal guidelines to this position.
	Guidelines for the coaching program came from the district (3). 3-P	I believe the guidelines were from the Center (Administration) and I just knew that my person that I thought would be the right match had those credentials.
	Guidelines for coaching came from a source outside the district. (3) 3-P	Well, initially the Success For All Foundation had the guidelines set.

C=coach P=principal

FINDINGS:

- The majority of participants perceived that goals were determined by building needs.
- Few participants believed that there were district coaching goals.
- The majority of principals responded that they were unsure if there were any coaching guidelines established.

Table 4-5 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1)*

Sub-Code (A1d)	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence-examples from the transcripts
Importance (of the coaching role) – the value, relevance of interest	The coaching role was important because it provided student support in different forms. (3) 3-P	We needed to find a way to get to the kids that we couldn't reach.
	The role was important because it offered support to teachers. (12) 12-P	I saw it as a person that has trust with staff—that could come in and make a difference with our teachers.
	The role was important because it was a support to the building principal. (2) 2-P	I don't think any principal can do it all.

*Principals only

P = principals

FINDINGS:

- The majority of participants saw the coaching role as a means to provide support to classroom teachers.

Table 4-6 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1)

Sub-Codes (A1e) (A1f)	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence-examples from the transcripts
Outcomes—an expected or likely final state, achievement, or result for students		
Outcomes of this coaching approach for students	Coaches perceived that student gains were made. (6) 6-C	Our assessment scores have continued to rise.
	Principals reported improved scores for students. (4) 4-P	We have lots of it (data).
	Some were not sure of any evidence of coaching outcomes at this point for students. (8) 3- C, 5-P	I don't know if we have any evidence right now.
Outcomes of this coaching approach for staff	Coaches felt that instruction was improved and indirectly helped students or relationships with students were improved. (7) 7-C	A majority of students are receiving better instruction across the board to where we have fewer students needing additional help.
	Coaches perceived that relationships were improved with staff. (2) 2-C	I hear teachers talking to me, with me, with each other, about particular kids and what they can do.
	Coaches perceived that learning improved through extra help with students, providing more resources, and continued professional growth. (11) 11-C	We have the resources available so that they don't have to take all the time to search for things.
	Principals perceived that coaching had impacted instruction. (6) 6-P	I attribute the success that we have specially with very young, lack of experienced educators teaching reading.
	Principals indicated that coaching had positively impacted culture of the building. (5) 5-P	She (coach) was able to tell me in multiple specific examples things that she saw that said we weren't drifting
	Coaches did not know if there was any evidence at all. (1) 1-C	I don't know if I can document a visible change.

C=coach P=principal

FINDINGS:

- Coaches indicated much more frequently than principals that improved student achievement was an outcome of coaching.
- Principals and coaches indicated that most outcomes were related to improvements in instruction for staff.
- Several participants indicated that they were not sure there was evidence that could document their perceptions of positive outcomes from coaching.

Table 4-7 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Structure (A1)

Sub-Code (A1g)	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence-examples from the transcripts
Challenges – a test of someone’s abilities, or a situation that tests somebody’s abilities in a stimulating way	Participants suggested that finding enough time for all of the coaching work was a challenge. (8) 8-C	There is never enough time in the day.
	Working to get staff to “buy-in” to the coaching program is a challenge perceived by participants. (7) 3-C, 4-P	The biggest challenge always is how to get buy-in from all teachers...how do you get those reluctant teachers on staff?
	Participants found that having a clear definition of the coaching role or redefining their role was a challenge. (5) 2-C, 3-P	I think we’ve both been struggling to clarify the role.

C=coach P=principal

FINDINGS:

- Only coaches indicated that finding enough time for all the coaching responsibilities was a challenge.
- Both coaches and principals saw staff “buy-in” to the coaching program and the lack of clear definition for the coaching role as challenges.

Position

This next section will examine data that are specific to the coaching position. These data were distinct from those that had to do with the way the coaching program was structured as the structure characteristics related to the way the coaching role was established. The position sub-codes address aspects of coaching related to the individual. These sub-codes described attributes and qualifications important to a coaching role, the responsibilities assigned to being in the coaching role, professional development that was provided to the coach as a means to improve their coaching skills, and how the coaches actually spent their work time. As stated earlier, because the two codes within the program organization main category were so broad, the researcher organized level 3 sub-codes under structure and position to address aspects relative to each. This section focuses on the coaching position findings: attributes and qualifications established for the role, the important coaching responsibilities, professional development provided to coaches, and coaches' use of time (A2a – A2e).

Attributes and Qualifications for the Coaching Role

Attributes have been defined by the researcher as the qualities or characteristics someone or something possesses. What are the attributes that a principal seeks in a coach? These attributes are important considerations when choosing the appropriate person for the coaching position.

Most of the principals emphasized that knowledge of instructional practice was important (see Table 4-8, p. 99). They wanted an individual that modeled good instructional practice, was experienced in various content areas, knew content standards, and was an “expert” with curricular matters. Relational skills, the ability to build and maintain good relationships with staff, were also considered highly important. One principal explained, “I think she also

understands that with other people you have to build the relationship stronger before she can maybe make advances into the classroom.” Interpersonal skills such as flexibility, ability to organize, being a good listener, and the ability to be positive were expressed frequently. Only one principal indicated that the belief system of the coach was very important. The only principal in the study that had two coaches in her building stated that she really looked to find a pair of individuals that complemented one another’s attributes: Where one was weaker in one area, she looked to find another to strengthen and balance the pair.

While principals were asked to identify attributes they looked for when hiring for the coaching role, the coaches were asked what qualifications were required for the position. Most perceived that experience was necessary (see Table 4-8, p. 99). Two of the coaches had very little experience coming into this position and expressed their concerns over their lack of experience. “I guess I’m not fully qualified for my job which is a little nerve-racking for me” reported one inexperienced coach, while another said,

“Honestly, if I were an administrator looking to hire someone as a coach now, I think I would choose somebody with at least a bachelor’s working towards a master’s degree, if not a master’s degree with expertise in a classroom. I was hired straight out of college and I feel like I had some good experiences and some tough classrooms. I don’t have the full year-round teaching experience and I feel like sometimes, that teachers don’t listen to me as much because I don’t have that experience.”

Several of the coaches responded that relationships with people were important qualifications for their role. They noted that working relationships with staff and good people skills were necessary. The insight from one coach was, “I think everybody has the ability to be a

learner. I don't think everybody has people skills always, and I think that you have to have those skills to make teachers feel valued and important.”

In addition, several coaches had participated in a local leadership academy offered by the school district. Leadership was mentioned as an important qualification by six coaches, but only one of the six that has been through the local Professional Education Leadership Academy mentioned leadership as an important qualification for coaching.

How the Coaches' Time is Spent

With limited amounts of time available during the school day, it is important to have a clear sense of how the coach uses their time so that it can be directed in a fashion that is agreeable to both partners in the coaching relationship. Coaches were asked to respond to how they believed their time would be spent when they assumed the role and then to assess how time is currently spent.

Early in the coaching program, many coaches believed that their time would be spent testing students, reviewing data, observing and providing feedback to teachers. Others believed they would be working directly with students in small groups or individually (see Table 4-9, p. 101). When asked to describe how the coaches' time is actually spent, half of the group responded that they were doing what they thought they would be doing when they were hired as a coach. One coach reflected that her expectation was vastly different than reality.

“I thought I would be spending time reflecting with people. Or encouraging them to reflect, kind of a warm, fuzzy relationship. I spend a lot of time doing a lot of other things. There's kind of a culture here of people are in a hurry. People have a lot to do and they don't really want to spend a lot of time reflecting, unless it's something I can do

just right quick. I'm more likely to be co-teaching or providing resources or suggesting ideas, going over data."

The principals, on the other hand, described the coaches' work relative to groups that they worked with, which could be students or teachers or both. A majority of the principals said that the coaches' work supported teachers through observations, modeling, data support, or providing resources. Fewer principals indicated that the coaches' work included time with students in activities such as small groups or tutoring individual students. One of the principals noted that her coaches' work was 90% with students in a given week. On the other side of that continuum, one coach said 80% of her time was spent with teachers.

One coaching pair indicated that the coach's time was spent differently as

They determined they did not want to put the coach in a role that took responsibility for students away from the teacher, placing it on the coach instead. An experienced coach indicated that she anticipated her work focusing on all small-group work and instruction strictly with students. Her current experience provided a different insight:

"I think one of things I had to be real careful about is the teachers thinking I'm in a position to where here's a group of struggling readers, she'll take them and fix them and then they can release that responsibility to me. And not letting that happen. You know that they are the ones ultimately responsible."

Her principal's remarks parallel her thoughts:

"We wanted some of her kid connections to be about helping others see data, see the need for intervention, see what was the right intervention and not expect her to be the one who delivers all of that and you know, be the savior if you will. Hey, we've got a tier two, tier three kid. Coach, can you fix them?"

The comments of this coaching pair indicate that they seemed to have like expectations for how the coach would use her time and were conscious that they wanted to send the right message to staff in how time might be used.

Coaching Responsibilities

Killion and Harrison (2006) described possible roles for school-based coaches, and the list was extensive. With so many possible responsibilities for the coach to assume, how can one focus on those that can benefit staff and students most? Coaches were asked to describe what they perceived were their most important coaching responsibilities and that question was followed up by asking what they believed their principal would say were the most important coaching responsibilities (see Table 4-10, p. 103).

Six of the 15 coaches responded that their most important responsibilities related to student support. The range of responses related to student support indicated everything from being there for students as emotional support to working with students to meet their academic needs. These coaches responded in a similar manner. One said, “I honestly think that working with the kids and meeting their needs in whatever capacity would be, I think that’s foremost because they have to be successful is the bottom line.”

Another said, “I think mine are making sure that students get what they need. If that means being in the classroom and modeling good, effective instruction and then seeing the teacher taking that over, then I would feel successful in knowing that the kids are getting what they need.”

In contrast, the same number of coaches indicated that they believed their most important responsibilities were those related to teacher support. According to one of the coaches that believed teacher support was most important:

“I think that teachers have an awful lot of things on their plate and if there’s anything I can do to support them, whether it’s emotional support or actually do some research, plan a lesson, do whatever else I can—I think that’s important. We want to keep our good teachers and I feel like they’re pretty busy right now.”

Other coaches felt that they had more clear direction for their responsibilities: “I would say the most important thing would be ensuring that teachers are following their curriculum, providing students with exactly what it is that, you know, the best practices that Success for All’s already figured out for them.” The response of another coach: “I think helping teachers to find ways to improve their teaching because that helps them build their own self-confidence and a confident teacher is usually a better teacher.”

When asked what their perception is of what the principals believed were the most important coaching responsibilities, without hesitation a large majority of coaches say they believed that the principal would say the same thing that coaches said. One coach said that she was very sure that the principal would agree because “we talk—if we don’t talk daily, we talk at least three to four times a week”.

Professional Development

As stated earlier, Killion (2007) noted that professional organizations such as the National Staff Development Council should provide appropriate support for school-based coaches. All of the participants were asked to describe what professional development had been provided to coaches in their roles. An overwhelming number of participants indicated some form of professional development that the district had provided for them (14 coaches, 11 principals) (see Table 4-11, p. 104). The type of professional development provided included general topics (such as those related to content areas) and those specific to coaching.

The coaches acknowledged the opportunities ranged from training not overtly tied to content coaching to specific coaching training. A few coaches described reading on their own regarding the topic of coaching. For one of the newer coaches, “I’m always reading research about reading online. And I’m always trying to learn new and better things to do with kids.” All of the coaches had been given a coaching resource book that had been reviewed as a group at an earlier time, but only three of the coaches mentioned this as a source of professional development.

Outside entities were also named as a source of professional development by comparable numbers of coaches and principals. They named trainings such as workshops by the State Department of Education, Council for Public School Improvement, State Reading Association, or the International Reading Association. A majority of principals specifically named the same professional development opportunities that coaches had named.

When asked about their perception of the professional development that had been provided, all of the coaches that responded made favorable remarks. Some of the coaches said that training had provided guidance for the role: “I think it helped me focus in on what I should have been doing. It kind of moved me in the direction of what a coach really should be doing, not just tutoring kids, but helping teachers.” “It was very specific, very research based. So it’s been a few years, but I think that was really foundational for me just coming out and not knowing what a coach is supposed to do” was the response of another coach.

Summary of Findings for Position

Principals indicated that knowledge of practice was an important attribute for the coach to have more frequently than the attributes of relationships and interpersonal skills. They see this as important to the coach’s credibility with their peers. The coaches indicate that classroom

experience and being a good teacher are important qualifications for coaching, and inexperienced coaches lamented this lack of experience as a detriment.

Coaches' expectations of how they believed their time would be spent when they accepted the coaching role and how their time is actually spent matched only about half the time. Many coaches reported that their roles and responsibilities had changed since accepting this position. Principals describe the coaches' time spent mostly with teachers more so than with students.

How time is spent and is linked with coaching responsibilities; the coaches were evenly divided over what responsibilities they perceived as most important. The majority of coaches felt that the principal would indicate the same responsibility that the coach named as most important indicating the shared common expectations.

In describing what professional development had been provided to coaches, both groups named professional development provided by the district as the major source. Less than one-half of each group named specific training related to coaching as part of the professional development. Both groups acknowledged that training from entities outside of the district had also contributed to professional development, but not as much as local training. Coaches clearly expressed that professional development was helpful.

Central Office Perspectives on Position

Central Office staff affirmed the perspectives of the coaches and the principals with respect to professional development opportunities. The Central Office staff did not discuss the variety of outside trainings, however as did coaches and principals. In addition, the Central Office staff emphasized more the efforts to provide training specific to coaching. This was most likely because the Central Office provided that coaching specific training.

Table 4-8 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under Category of Position (A2)

Sub-Code (A2a)	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence-examples from the transcripts
Attributes – a quality, property, or characteristic of somebody or something	Principals said that knowledge of practice was an important attribute for the coach to have. (9) 9-P	We were looking for someone who was... a good teacher, someone who would have credibility with teachers.
	Principals indicated that good relational skills were necessary. (7) 7-P	I think people have to trust them and feel comfortable with them.
	Principals indicated that the coach needed to have interpersonal skills. (6) 6-P	I think the organization skills are an important attribute.
	Technical skills were needed for the coaching role. (5) 5-P	Be able to review data and understand data and how to match it with curriculum.
	A principal indicated that the personal belief system of the coach was important. (1) 1-P	I think we need someone who truly believes all children will and can succeed.
Sub-Code (A2b)		
Qualifications – the skills or qualities that make somebody suitable for a job, activity, or task	Coaches indicated that having classroom experience and being a good classroom teacher were important qualifications. (8) 8-C	I don't think you can put a first or second-year teacher in my job and have them be able to be very effective.
	Coaches perceived the ability to have good relationships with people as important coaching qualifications. (5) 5-C	I think you need more people skills than academic skills.
	Leadership skills were important. (3) 3-C	I think you have to have leadership skills. I think that's very important.

C=coach, P=principal

FINDINGS:

- The principals perceived that knowledge of instructional practice was the most important coaching attribute.
- Having good relationships with staff, good interpersonal skills, and technical abilities with data were important attributes for the coach to have.
- Coaches reported that classroom experience and being a good classroom teacher were the most important qualifications for coaching.
- Having good relationships with others was also an important qualification for coaches.

Table 4-9 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Position (A2)

Sub-codes (A2c)	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence-examples from the transcripts
Time – perception of how coaches believed their time would be spent	Coaches thought time would be spent testing, reviewing data, observing and providing feedback to teachers. (8) 8-C	I thought I would be spending my time getting resources, talking with teachers, observing, and collecting data.
	Coaches thought they would be spending time working with students individually or in small groups as a tutor. (7) 7-C	I think I probably anticipated it being all small group.
How the coach’s time is actually spent	The coaching role has changed and their work includes testing students, some tutoring (8), working with data (6), providing resources, co-teaching, or helping teachers with lessons (12). 26-C	I think I spend less time in the classroom during reading blocks now because I am involved in other roles.
	Some coaches indicated that they were doing what they expected to be doing when they took on this coaching role. (6) 6-C	I pretty much do everything that I used to do (when I started).
How the principal describes how the coach’s time is spent	The principal perceives that the coach supports teachers through observations, modeling, data reviews, or providing resources. (9) 9-P	Teachers will come and ask her to step in, observe a class, see what she can develop and design for a particular student.
	The principal believes the coach provides support through their work with students. (5) 5-P	I would say 90% of her time is with students.

C=coach P=principal

FINDINGS:

- Coaches anticipated their coaching work would involve working with students or with teachers. Most in the group that believed they would be working with teachers were from the Success For All buildings (had a preconceived notion of the role).
- Principals saw the coach as a support to teachers.
- A majority experienced a change from what they anticipated.

Table 4-10 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Position (A2)*

Sub-Code (A2d)	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence-examples from the transcripts
Responsibilities – the state, fact, or position of being accountable to somebody or for something	Coaches’ perceptions indicate their most important coaching responsibilities are related to student support. (6) 6-C	I honestly think that working with the kids and meeting their needs.
	Coaches perceived that their most important responsibilities are related to support for teachers. (6) 6-C	The biggest thing would be supporting teachers and trying to give them strategies that would be successful.
	Coaches believed that principals would indicate the same responses that coaches gave for most important coaching responsibilities. (11) 11-C	I think that she and I are probably on the same page because we talk at least three to four times a week.

*Coaches only

C=coaches

FINDINGS:

- Coaches were evenly divided over what they perceived to be their most important coaching responsibilities (student vs. teacher support).
- The majority of coaches indicated their principal would concur with the response the coach gave for most important coaching responsibilities.

Table 4-11 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of Position (A2)

Sub-Code (A2e)	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence-examples from the transcripts
Professional development – extensive education or specialized training	The district provided professional development to coaches. (25) 14-C, 11-P	Last year we had some coaching sessions sponsored by the district.
	Outside entities such as national, state, and regional groups were the source of professional development for coaches. (18) 12-C, 7-P	One of the classes I took to finish my masters was related to instructional coaching.
	Coaches participated in professional development independently through book studies. (3) 3-C	I’ve read that very first one that you gave us probably two years ago.
	Coaches perceived professional development positively. (11) 11-C	It helped me focus in on what I should have been doing. Kind of moved me in the direction of what a coach really should be doing.

C=coach P=principal

FINDINGS:

- Participants (coaches, principals) agreed overwhelmingly that the district provides professional development (general and specific to coaching).
- Both within-district resources and outside agencies were used to provide professional development.

Path-goal Theory of Leadership

The reformulated path-goal theory of work unit leadership was presented in 1996, representing specific leader behaviors “that enhance subordinate empowerment and satisfaction and work unit/subordinate effectiveness” (House, 1996, p. 323). House’s reformulated theory described eight classes of leader behavior and circumstances under which the leader behaviors were likely to be effective or ineffective. House notes that leaders “will be effective to the extent that they complement the environment in which their subordinates work” (House, 1996, p. 324) by providing clarification that will enable subordinates to reach their work goals.

This section focuses on the leader behaviors that help direct, clarify, and support the coaches in their working environment and address the research question regarding how these coaching relationships are influenced by leader behaviors. Several findings emerged from the transcripts that indicate the kinds of behaviors that coaches experience from the leader of the building. The eight codes from the path-goal leadership theory and their corresponding findings are the focus for this section (see Table 4-12, p. 116).

Path-goal Clarifying Behaviors

According to House (1996), “when subordinates are highly personally involved in a decision or a task and the decision or task demands are ambiguous and satisfying, participative leadership will have a positive effect on the satisfaction and motivation of subordinates” (p. 337). This is one of the propositions presented by House (1996) under path-goal clarifying behaviors and is related to the subordinates’ perception of the task. He further indicates “path-goal clarifying behaviors can be enacted in a nonauthoritarian directive manner or in a participative manner” (p. 337) and can be very motivating for subordinates. Half of the coaches indicated that performance expectations and work procedures were determined jointly and the perception was

that this was viewed as positive. Coaches frequently noted that communication was very good within the partnership. Both coaches and principals reported that ideas were openly shared and were subject to input from both parties. One coach reported, “If I have some ideas, I’ll stop by his office and talk to him and then he’ll communicate how he feels about that or we will kind of tweak it a little bit.”

These statements were supported by principals who responded that performance expectations and work procedures are clearly detailed for coaches. An experienced principal said, “I always explain why I need them to do this, what my end objective is.” A principal who was new to the role said,

“I gave the coach my expectations. I told her that I wanted her to be in every classroom as much as possible of every teacher, to be in the new teachers’ classrooms a little bit more to make sure that they’re getting a good start and they’re getting off on the right track and finding their way in the teaching field. But I told her I also wanted her in other teachers’ classrooms, one because some of those teachers do some great things and she could see what they’re doing and get to the share with people who are struggling.”

On the other extreme, one coach said that in the first year she did not really have any idea what she was doing and had almost no communication with her principal. The coach indicated that following that first year, a weekly meeting time for the coach and principal was established.

Clarifying leader behaviors include “clarifying expectations that others hold for subordinates to which the subordinate should and should not respond (House, 1996, p. 336). In this study, sharing with the staff related to performance expectations and work procedures was indicated more widely by coaches than principals. The principals mentioned sharing about the

position only at the beginning of the school year and did not indicate more frequent sharing with staff other than this one opportunity.

Achievement Oriented Leadership Behavior

This class of leader behavior refers to leaders who “stress pride in work and self evaluation based on personal accomplishment” (House, 1996, p. 338). This reference is to the individual that takes pride and satisfaction in their personal efforts, sets personal goals, and enjoys tasks that do not rely on others for effective performance. Half of the principal participants described how their coaches accomplished goals and took pride in their achievements. They used words and phrases such as *initiative*, *goals*, *constantly changing things to make it better*, or *self-directed*. One principal said of her experienced coach,

“Our academic coach found a way to get all the information in one place, central place so then the teachers were very excited too because then we had one place to record it. We just print the button and then we come to our conferences and talk about student data, we had that information.”

Similarly another principal spoke of how the coach was goal-focused.

“She is so very goal-oriented. I mean she really works off of multiple goals that she establishes herself. You know, I wish I could take credit for sitting down and making that happen, but she’s structured that way. And I think she’s also extraordinarily adept at reflection.”

Work Facilitation

Work facilitation includes how leaders plan, schedule, and organize work, as well as how they provide mentoring, developmental experiences, guidance, coaching, counseling, and feedback to assist the subordinates in developing their knowledge and skills. Coaches expressed

that the work facilitation provided by principals was mostly in the form of providing mentoring experiences or feedback to coaches as they carried out their work.

When asked to describe how they were asked for input on how work assignments were carried out, the coaches talked about individual projects they had undertaken where the principal acted by giving direction and guidance or helping to shape the project. The findings indicate that coaches felt a great deal of independence and latitude with respect to the way in which they proceeded through their work. Three of the principals indicated that they deliberately tried to avoid scheduling teachers in order to keep their time open. One of the principals said, "I don't dictate to her how she's going to spend her time."

Supportive Leader Behaviors

In this study, all of the coaches indicated that their principal supported them in multiple ways. One coach stated the importance of support,

"I think the principal can either make or break a coaching position, I really do.

I think as a coach if you don't feel supported by the principal, you'd be walking on egg shells all the time wondering if you were doing the right thing or not. I just think if you don't feel...that principal's support [is] going to be the biggest issue."

Coaches expressed that they felt unconditional support from the principal, that they could go to the principal with any issue or question they have. "She does anything I need or would ask," commented one of the coaches about her principal. Another coach expressed appreciation for being valued for her work: "I think just by endorsing what I'm doing and treating me with an air of what I'm doing matters and that is seen by the rest of the staff."

All of the principals similarly professed that they offered support for their coaches, and all described support in more than one way. Principals spoke frequently of being a sounding

board, a listening ear, or a shoulder on which they could cry, showing the psychological aspect of support. Several principals spoke of support they provided in the form of professional development or other resources that they could offer for the coach.

The findings in this area were that the principals clearly felt that they provided support and the coaches felt supported. This is important as the professional literature indicates that the coaching role must be supported by the leader (Norton, 2007; Killion, 2007; Neufeld & Roper, 2003).

Interaction Facilitation/Group-Oriented Decision Process

The interaction process class of leader behaviors facilitate collaboration and positive interaction, communication, and teamwork. The data indicate a collaborative work group from the principals' perception, but far fewer coaches indicate a perception of the principal leading in this collaborative sense. Both principals and coaches responded that collaboration occurred on a regular basis through scheduled meetings such as faculty meetings, team leader meetings, grade level meetings, and other routine meetings. These meetings were structured times for the various groups within the school to come together. In addition to these structured meetings, emails, phone calls, and spontaneous meetings were mentioned as collaborative efforts.

Several of the coaches or principals mentioned that quarterly conferences with staff were part of the regular school routine, but only three coaches mentioned that they are invited to participate in these quarterly conferences. Quarterly conferences typically have to do with teacher-specific goals and the progress of the teacher toward their goals. If the coach is to remain a neutral party to the evaluative process, they would not want to be part of a conference that might include evaluative remarks or suggestions from the supervisor. The three coaches that mentioned attending these conferences said that they attend only *some* of the conferences.

Interaction-facilitation leader behaviors encourage close and satisfying relationships among members (House, 1996). Coaches and principals mentioned that they try to be cautious about their approach to presenting the coach to the staff so that relationships are not impaired perhaps by promoting the coach at the expense of a teacher. A principal declared, “I think she’s an integral part of planning staff development, but we’re also very careful not to make it the [coaches’ name omitted] Show. You know, ‘Here’s our expert giving you this month’s dose of reading expertise.’” Another principal articulated, “I’ve kind of weighed what that would do to the relationship between the coach and the teachers” when deciding whether to include the coach in conferences with teachers. A coach communicated that her principal “tries to convey the coaching in a really positive light. You know, how will this help the classroom teacher. And she communicates that.” Another coach said, “She really tries hard to make sure everyone is included. Everyone you know, it’s not like the [coaches’ name omitted] Show.” One coach’s insight was very revealing: “He’s very careful not to say, ‘Why don’t you work with the coach?’ Because he knows and then I confirmed it—once that happens you lose the willingness of people to be coached.” The perception left was that there is a sensitivity to how the coach is presented to the staff.

The findings related to the group-oriented decision process are consistent with findings about collaboration. Principals and coaches indicate that decisions are made collaboratively, between coach and principal as well as within the school staff. In describing how the duties of the coach would be determined for their own building, one experienced principal said, “We meet and talk about, okay, how are we going to set things up to get started? And that’s what we’ve done the last three years now.”

According to another principal,

“We listen to the needs of the teachers, especially in our school improvement meetings and at the end of the school year. We kind of see where we want to go next year, and she’s always been a big part of that school improvement plan for the following year and that results-based staff development plan.”

And even a less inexperienced principal indicated the need to be open to the group decision process:

“And then there’s not always 100 percent agreement on what direction to go, so I’ve got to be comfortable with being flexible enough to let that work itself out while people kind of weigh pros and cons and they debate what’s best and what’s not and why we—why we should keep this or—or change to this.”

Representation and Networking

“The ability of work units to acquire necessary resources depends on their relative power within their organizations and on their legitimacy in the eyes of those upon whom they are dependent” (House, 1996, p. 342). House (1996) carefully describes the needs that must be met by the leader in providing for the staff. Networking is one means of giving staff the opportunity to acquire resources necessary for their roles.

The findings indicate that participants felt that the district provided networking opportunities for coaches in some form. Coaches, in greater numbers than principals, felt networking was available to them. A district coach coordinator was hired recently, and four of the coaches mentioned the coach coordinator role as providing an opportunity for networking; seven mentioned that other coaches in the district were the networking source for them. Email was a form of networking mentioned by six of the coaches. A few of the coaches reported that they had little or no opportunity for networking. One principal of a coach who reported no

networking opportunities said, “I don’t think she does a very good job of networking with others and in fact, that’s why I told the coach coordinator she can be a part of that [meetings] if you want.” One experienced coach who responded that they had little opportunity for networking stated, “I don’t think I really felt I had a lot. I think that was my biggest problem as a coach. I kind of felt like I was alone and I didn’t know who to turn to.” Another coach indicated that she found outside networking in the form of national conferences where she learned about coaching to help her with her own coaching. Those coaches that were trained in Success For All indicated that at one time there were regularly held meetings that provided networking occasions for them at one time.

Value-based Leader Behavior

The eighth of the class of leader behaviors is related to value-based leader behavior where the leader behaviors appeal to the subordinates’ cherished values and help the subordinate identify with leader or organizational goals (House, 1996). Very few references to the concept of value-based leader behavior appeared in the interviews (only five). The researcher believes the interview question posed was perhaps not as clearly aligned with this class of leader behaviors, and thus little discussion was inspired.

Findings Related to the Path-goal Theory of Leadership Analysis

According to the path-goal theory of leadership, leader behaviors that clarify the path from the work to the goal are rewarding for those that need clarification. The findings in this study viewed from the framework of the path-goal theory of leadership are principals provide opportunities for coaches to be involved in how the work will be accomplished rather than simply telling them how the work will be done. At the same time, coaches report that

expectations of their performance are also shared with staff. Principals feel that they clearly define expectations for the coach.

Principal behaviors stressed pride in work and personal accomplishment, as half of the principals indicated their coaches set their own goals and took initiative in the work. Achievement motivated this group of coaches and the perception is that these achievement behaviors were enhanced by leadership.

The leader behaviors around work facilitation did not involve the leader creating schedules for the coaches' work, but coaches worked jointly with the principal and staff in their work. Learning experiences for coaches are derived from providing mentoring opportunities and giving feedback that develops skills and knowledge. The perception of the researcher was that coaches found this approach to work facilitation satisfactory and it engaged them in learning about leadership roles.

Support was clearly a hallmark of these relationships as all coaches described support from principals and this was reinforced by the findings that principals believed they provided support. Coaches spoke of support in many different varieties, but often indicated that they felt the principal would provide support however needed. Networking is viewed as a form of support, and coaches again clearly identified opportunities to network as a strength in these partnerships.

The interaction facilitation leader behaviors facilitate collaboration and positive interaction, communication, and teamwork. Decisions were often made collaboratively and frequent interactions with staff occurred. Those occurrences were named as faculty meetings, student improvement meetings, or focus meetings. In addition, principals consciously tried to involve their coaches in positive and collaborative interactions with staff.

The leader behaviors described in House's (1996) work detail leader behaviors that are "theoretically acceptable, satisfying, facilitative, and motivational for subordinates" (p. 335). He also includes propositions under which "each class of leader behavior is likely to be most functional or dysfunctional" (p. 336).

The leader behaviors demonstrated by principals are perceived by coaches to be just what House (1996) explained: satisfying, facilitative, and motivational. All of the leader behavior classes could be found in the interviews of coaches and principals. Those that appear to be used most often are: path goal, work facilitation, support, interaction facilitation support, group oriented decision making, and networking. While all leader behaviors may contribute in some way to the power and effectiveness of coaches, those that occur most frequently in these partnerships can strengthen the coaching role. The coach must have support to be effective in their role, and that would include opportunities to network with others. Clearly coaching would not be an isolated position that could stand apart from interaction with others. The fact that interaction is facilitated and group oriented decision making is mentioned by most participants can benefit the coaching role because it gives the coach the best chances to be productive with staff.

When examining the path-goal leadership theory disaggregated by role (see Table 4-13, p. 119) the findings are reinforced. Interaction facilitation and group-oriented decision making are received to be strengths by a greater percentage of principals than coaches. Support is perceived as high by both principals and coaches.

Data from Interviews with Central Office on Path-goal Theory of Leadership

The questions directed to Central Office staff that related to the path-goal theory of leadership had to do with leader behaviors that offered opportunities to improve and support. The findings are clearly aligned with those from coaches and principals.

Central Office staff described opportunities to improve in connection with professional development. The only difference with their perspectives on this class of behavior was their heightened awareness of district-led training. The same networking opportunities were reported by Central Office administrators, but again they were very specific. They named Cognitive Coaching (Costa, 2002) or the district's coach coordinator specifically as sources of networking for coaches.

Table 4-12 Codes and Patterns under the Category of Path-goal Leadership Theory (B)

Codes	Patterns (number of participants expressing concept)	Evidence-examples from the transcripts
Path-goal Clarifying Behaviors (B1)– leader behaviors that help clarify the subordinates’ path to goal accomplishment	Coaches perceive that the principal gives them opportunity to have influence over their work. (8) 8-C	We work out a plan together.
	Principals perceive that performance expectations for the coach are clearly defined. (10) 10-P	I always explain why I need them to do this, what my end objective is. I’m very clear about that.
	Principal clarifies expectations of the coaches’ role and work procedures for staff. (13) 10-C, 3-P	We talk about it at our [ESP] meetings.
Achievement Oriented Leader Behavior (B2) – leader stresses pride in work and self-evaluation based on personal accomplishment	Principals expressed that the coaches are motivated to make accomplishments through their own personal efforts. (7) 7-P	She is so very goal-oriented. She really works from multiple goals that she establishes herself.
Work Facilitation (B3) – leader behaviors that facilitate work that consist of planning, scheduling, and organizing work; personally coordinating the work of subordinates; providing mentoring, developmental experience, guidance, coaching, counseling and feedback to assist subordinates in developing knowledge and skills	Principals provide mentoring and developmental experiences and give guidance, coaching, and feedback more than providing a schedule. (10) 10-C	We talked back and forth about the [PLC] project...about how that was going to work.
	Principals either purposely did not schedule teachers (3) or provided collaborative learning experiences for coaches. (4) 7-P	We make sure that plenty of time is available for her to promote and plan for the things we value.

Supportive Leader Behavior (B4) - provides psychological support for subordinates. Supportive relationships increase the quality of relationships between superiors and subordinates.	Coaches felt that principals offer them unconditional support, psychological support, resources. (18) 18-C	If I need to talk about anything, if I have concerns about anything I just talk to her.
	Principals perceive psychological support, resources, and unconditional support are provided to the coach. (18) 18-P	I tell her, anything she needs, let me know. I'll get it for her.
Interaction Facilitation (B5) – leader behavior that facilitates collaborative and positive interactions consists of resolving disputes, facilitating communication, emphasizing the importance of collaboration and teamwork, and encouraging close satisfying relationships among members	Principals and coaches describe regularly scheduled meetings as a means to promote collaboration and communication. (21) 10-C, 11-P	We have monthly meetings that we have just to share where we are and what we're doing.
Group-Oriented Decision Process (B6) – the manner in which decisions that affect the group are made	Principal gives opportunities for decisions to be made collaboratively. (21)	With them being somewhat involved in the definition of the role and the assignment, I think we try to renew their awareness of that each year.

<p>Representation and Networking (B7) – the ability of work units to acquire necessary resources</p>	<p>Principals provided district-linked networking as a source of networking for coaches. (21) 13-C, 8-P</p> <p>The district provided a coach coordinator as a networking resource. (4) 4-C</p> <p>Principals provided opportunities to work with other coaches as a networking resource. (6) 6-C</p>	<p>I use Share Point.</p> <p>The coach coordinator and I talk quite a bit.</p> <p>I network with the SFA people through email on a regular basis.</p>
<p>Value-Based Leader Behavior (B8) – appealing to subordinates’ cherished values and non-conscious motives. Subordinates identify with leader or organizational goals.</p>	<p>They identify with the mission of the organization. (5) 5-C</p>	<p>We both have clear goals and we keep what’s important to the school first and foremost in both of our minds.</p>

FINDINGS:

- The most prominent classes of leader behavior include:
- path goal (31 instances), work facilitation (17), support (36), interaction (21),
- group-oriented decision making (32), and representation/networking (31).
- Achievement-oriented and value-based leader behaviors are not frequently discussed.

Table 4-13 Path-goal Theory of Leadership Disaggregated by Role

		Demographic Information (percent of participants by variable)	
	Finding	Coach	Principal
	# of participants	15	14
Leader behaviors			
Path-goal clarifying behaviors	Performance expectations are determined jointly.	53	
	Performance expectations are clearly defined.		71
	Expectations of the role and work procedures are shared with staff.	67	21
Achievement oriented behaviors			
Work facilitation	Principals provide mentoring, coaching, and developmental experiences as opposed to developing schedules.	67	50
Support	Support was provided to the coach.	100	100
Interaction facilitation	Principals provide regular opportunities for collaboration.	67	79
Group-oriented decision making	Decisions are made collaboratively.	67	79
Networking	Networking opportunities are available within the district.	87	57
Value-based leader behavior			

Note: Responses were disaggregated when both coaches and principals responded and the n was

> 10.

FINDINGS:

- Support and networking are strengths for this program.
- Interaction facilitation and group-oriented decision making are perceived to be strengths by principals more than coaches.
- Across all eight classes, the leader behaviors led to achievement of goals because of clear expectations, collaboration, support, and networking.

McREL's Leadership Responsibilities

Researchers at the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) analyzed studies conducted over a 30-year period and identified 21 leadership responsibilities statistically associated with student achievement. The results of this research led to the development of a framework known as the Balanced Leadership Framework (BLF) that provides information specific to skills and knowledge that leaders need to impact student achievement.

When examining those 21 responsibilities in terms of first-and second-order change, all 21 responsibilities were positively correlated with first-order change. Seven of these responsibilities were positively correlated with second-order change, and four were negatively correlated with second-order change. Rank ordered from greatest to least according to their relationship with second-order change, the seven that are positively correlated are as follows: knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; flexibility; change agent; ideals and beliefs; monitor and evaluate; intellectual stimulation; and optimizer. The four responsibilities that were negatively correlated to change with second-order implications were culture, communication, input, and order. The four responsibilities negatively correlated to second-order change are perceived by others as declining or as not being fulfilled as well as they could be. "This finding suggests that when leading second-order changes, principals emphasize the seven responsibilities...while struggling to fulfill the four [negative] responsibilities" (Waters & Cameron, 2007, p. 13). Waters and Cameron (2007) indicate that this is *not* to suggest that the responsibilities negatively impact second-order change, but perhaps because a new initiative is undertaken, there may be the perception that these responsibilities are not being fulfilled. This research is the basis for the second research question in this study: Using McREL's Balanced

Leadership Framework, what are the leadership responsibilities that are manifested in these partnerships?

With so many leadership responsibilities (21), the interviews could not devote sufficient time to each. Therefore, the researcher has elected to analyze only those associated with the most powerful (those associated with second-order change).

The findings when examining the positively correlated responsibilities were that knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment was named by more principals than any other responsibility of those contributing to the coaching partnership (see Table 4-14, p. 127). Nearly half of the principals said that the coach uses this responsibility, and the majority of coaches say they use this responsibility in their role as coach. One principal said this of the curriculum, instruction, and assessment responsibility:

“Curriculum and instruction and assessment are key for all of us. So she helps the teachers with the curriculum and instruction and then her and I and the other administrators work together to make sure we are giving teachers everything they need for their curriculum to be able to teach it and give the kids the proper instruction for when it comes time for assessment. So that’s kind of a partnership for all of us, for the stakeholders.”

This finding is important as knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment is the highest ranked responsibility under second-order change. It is critical that the principal and the coach recognize this in the partnership if second-order change is to occur with this coaching partnership.

Regarding the flexibility responsibility under the positively correlated responses, five of the 14 principals indicated that their coaches use this responsibility and eight of the 15 coaches mentioned this responsibility as one they use. If coaching is to be regarded as second-order

change, flexibility in this role would be important for both coaches and principals. Teachers would need to see the coach as flexible in the many roles they are called upon to perform; coaches would have to be flexible as the school setting would frequently require unexpected changes and assignments. Coaches talked more about the need for flexibility than principals did in their responses.

Four of the 14 principals indicated that ideals and beliefs contribute to the partnership; on the other hand, only three of the 15 coaches mentioned this attribute. This finding can be viewed through the same lens as path-goal's value-based leadership behavior and may be one that should be addressed since there was not a strong match between the subordinate knowing and sharing the leader's vision for the organization.

Culture, communication, order, and input were identified by how they were negatively correlated with second-order change. The McREL literature suggests that these four should be emphasized when leading second-order change, but that it may be perceived by others that these are not being fulfilled because of the significance of second-order change. It is suggested by the literature that these responsibilities might be shared with others when leading perceived second-order change (Waters & Cameron, 2007).

Only four of the principals indicated that they believed that culture contributed to the partnership, while approximately one-third of coaches felt they used this leadership responsibility. One coach stated,

“A lot of what I worked on when I started was to build a culture of the need for change. Now I think I'm more focused on contributing to a culture of we need to meet the needs of every single student.”

Another coach saw her role related to culture a bit differently when she discussed responsibilities she felt she used in her role:

“I really do think that a coach can help--if you have a good relationship with the principal, because I think the principal has to be one that, sometimes they're viewed as the one that's always trying to make those big changes, and I think the coach can be the one that can help the teachers see how they can make that change.”

Findings for McREL Leadership Responsibilities

The findings indicate principals believe that knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment contributes to the coaching partnerships. Ideals and beliefs were also frequently indicated by principals as contributing to the partnerships.

In examining the responsibilities that the principal uses, these same two responsibilities are named most often by coaches and principals. In addition, flexibility was also named by both coaches and principals. The numbers indicate that principals do not report that they use the responsibilities as much as coaches do, according to the perceptions of both coaches and principals (see Table 4-14, p. 127).

The numbers were higher in the two columns of the chart that address responsibilities the coach uses as determined by both the principal and the coach. Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment was mentioned by the majority of principals and coaches as a responsibility the coach uses. This is important since this responsibility was the highest ranked leadership responsibility associated with second-order change. Flexibility and optimizer ranked high on the list of responsibilities used by the coach. Coaches see themselves as change agents, another very important leadership responsibility. The discrepancies between the perceptions of the coaches and the principals on responsibilities used by the coach were very small.

When comparing these same columns and looking at the negatively correlated responsibilities, principal numbers are higher. According to the McREL research, the seven responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change should be emphasized when leading change of this magnitude. While principals should emphasize the four negatively correlated responsibilities, they might recognize that others may believe that these are not being attended to. When these four are emphasized during second-order change, it seems to have a destabilizing effect (Waters & Cameron, 2007).

Findings Disaggregated by Years of Experience and Levels

When examining data for coaches with 4 years of experience or less, it can be noted that these coaches view knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment as an important responsibility for them to use (see Table 4-15, p. 129). These coaches see themselves as change agents as the majority of the responses under change agent come from less experienced coaches. Coaches with few years of experience do not report the use of the responsibility of monitoring and evaluating and they also do not report that their principals use this responsibility. These inexperienced coaches see ideals and beliefs as leadership responsibilities used by their principals. A comparison of the numbers of coaches that indicate their principals use the responsibilities shows the inexperienced coach reports more often than the more experienced coach that the principal uses the responsibility of ideals and beliefs.

Examination of data for principals with 4 years of experience or less, reveals gaps where several important second-order change responsibilities are not reported as being used: Change agent, ideals and beliefs, and intellectual stimulation are common to both categories that principals report they use themselves or their coaches use (see Table 4-16, p. 130). Principals discussed that they use flexibility and monitor and evaluate responsibilities. The knowledge of

curriculum, instruction, and assessment was not discussed by the principal as a responsibility they or their coaches use. Where there is more than four years of experience, principals indicate that both the coach and principal use all of the leadership responsibilities.

Secondary level data for coaches is viewed carefully since there are two coaches out of the 15 coaches at this level (see Table 4-17, p. 131). Several of the second-order change responsibilities are reported as not being used.

Principals at the secondary level do not report that they or their coaches use any of the responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change (see Table 4-18, p. 132). Elementary responses account for the usage of these responsibilities in every case but communication.

Data from Interviews with Central Office on McREL Leadership Responsibilities

The findings for Central Office administrators show that all three named knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment as an important responsibility for the principal to use. This was the only responsibility that all three names as important. The only other similarity to their responses was that two of them indicated ideals/beliefs as important. It is clear that this district does recognize knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

Tables that reflect the data for coaches and principals follow this section of the study. Findings are reported at the bottom of the tables.

Table 4-14 Sub-Codes, Patterns, and Findings under the Category of McRel Leadership Responsibilities

McREL Leadership Responsibilities	Responsibilities the principal believes contribute to the coaching partnership	Responsibilities the principal believes the principal uses	Responsibilities the coach believes the principal uses	Responsibilities the principal believes the coach uses	Responsibilities the coach believes the coach uses	Total number that name this responsibility
Positively correlated to second-order change						
Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment	5	4	3	6	9	27
Optimizer	2	3	3	6	3	17
Intellectual Stimulation	1	3	0	2	2	8
Change Agent	1	3	2	1	5	12
Monitor and Evaluate	3	2	2	2	4	13
Flexibility	2	4	3	5	8	22
Ideals and beliefs	4	3	4	3	3	17
Negatively correlated to second-order change						
Culture	4	3	4	2	5	18
Communication	5	7	4	5	1	22
Order	2	3	2	1	1	9
Input	0	1	3	1	2	7

FINDINGS:

- Principals noted that knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment contributes to the partnership, along with ideals and beliefs under those responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change.
- Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment is named most often by principals and coaches.
- Culture and communication were also named frequently and are correlated negatively to second-order change.
- The perception is that coaches use the leadership responsibilities more often than principals.

Table 4-15 Coaches (8) with < 4 Years of Experience Compared to Those (7) with > 4 Years

	Coach indicates coach uses this responsibility		Coach indicates principal uses this responsibility	
	< 4 years	> 4 years	< 4 years	> 4 years
McREL responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change				
Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment	44%	56%	33%	67%
Flexibility	37%	63%	33%	67%
Change agent	80%	20%	50%	50%
Ideals and beliefs	67%	33%	100%	
Monitor and evaluate		100%		100%
Intellectual stimulation	100%			
Optimizer	67%	33%	33%	67%
McREL responsibilities negatively correlated to second-order change				
1. Culture	60%	40%	50%	50%
2. Communication	100%		50%	50%
3. Input	50%	50%	67%	33%
4. Order	100%		50%	50%

FINDINGS:

- Knowledge of curriculum and instruction is a responsibility reported by less inexperienced coaches as being used.
- Inexperienced coaches see themselves as change agents.
- Less experienced coaches did not report that they or their principals use the monitoring and evaluating responsibility.
- Inexperienced coaches see ideals and beliefs as a responsibility the principal uses.

Table 4-16 Principals (3) with < 4 Years of Experience Compared to Number of Responses

	Principal indicates the coach uses this responsibility		Principal indicates the principal uses this responsibility	
	< 4 years of experience	> 4 years of experience	< 4 years of Experience	> 4 years of experience
McREL responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change				
Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment	17%	83%		100%
Flexibility	20%	80%	50%	50%
Change agent		100%		100%
Ideals and beliefs		100%		100%
Monitor and evaluate	50%	50%	50%	50%
Intellectual stimulation		100%		100%
Optimizer	17%	83%		100%
McREL responsibilities negatively correlated to second-order change				
1. Culture		100%		100%
2. Communication	40%	60%	14%	86%
3. Input		100%		100%
4. Order		100%		100%

FINDINGS:

- Principals with 4 years of experience or less reported that their coaches used knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, flexibility, monitor and evaluate, and optimizer responsibilities.
- Principals with 4 years of experience or less report that they used the responsibilities of flexibility and monitor and evaluate.
- Principals with 4 years of experience or less do not report that they or their coach use several of the responsibilities negatively correlated with second-order change.

Table 4-17 Coaches (2) at the Secondary Level Compared to Elementary Level

	Coach indicates coach uses this responsibility		Coach indicates principal uses this responsibility	
	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary
McREL responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change				
1. Knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment	11%	89%		100%
2. Flexibility	13%	87%		100%
3. Change agent	20%	80%	50%	50%
4. Ideals and beliefs		100%		100%
5. Monitor and evaluate		100%		100%
6. Intellectual stimulation		100%		100%
7. Optimizer		100%	33%	67%
McREL responsibilities negatively correlated to second-order change				
1. Culture	20%	80%	25%	75%
2. Communication				
3. Input				
4. Order	100%		50%	50%

FINDINGS:

- Coaches at the secondary level report using three of the seven responsibilities positively associated with second-order change.
- Coaches at the secondary level report that their principal uses two of the seven responsibilities associated with second-order change.

Table 4-18 Principals (2) at the Secondary Level Compared to Elementary Level

	Principal indicates coach uses this responsibility		Principal indicates principal uses this responsibility	
	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary
McREL responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change				
1. Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment		100%		100%
2. Flexibility		100%		100%
3. Change agent		100%		100%
4. Ideals and beliefs		100%		100%
5. Monitor and evaluate		100%		100%
6. Intellectual stimulation		100%		100%
7. Optimizer		100%		100%
McREL responsibilities negatively correlated to second-order change				
1. Culture		100%		100%
2. Communication		100%	14%	86%
3. Input		100%		100%
4. Order		100%		100%

FINDINGS:

- Principals at the secondary level did not discuss the use of responsibilities positively-correlated to second-order change.
- One secondary principal reported that they use the communication responsibility.

Themes Across All Findings

After examining the large amount of data through three different analytic frameworks (organization, path-goal, McREL), 35 findings emerged. A final step of analysis was to examine the findings across all three frameworks to determine themes that are consistent across all findings (see Table 4-19, p. 136). Theme one consists of the need for clarity around the topic of coaching in this district so that all partners in these coaching arrangements are clear about the coaching position and the role of the coach. The preponderance of findings can be connected to this lack of clarity. Theme one is supported by findings 1-13, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22. Theme two consists of qualities that make these good partnerships where both agree about the kind of persons that should be in these roles, where strong support for the role is provided through professional development and networking, where decisions are made jointly, and where there are many opportunities for learning on the job. Theme two is supported by findings 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, and 26. The third theme speaks to leadership responsibilities that are critical to second-order change and the need to bolster this area if the coaching role is to be effective for all. There are strengths in leadership that are supportive for the coach as indicated by findings such as 25, 27, 29, and 32, but coaching is a second-order change meaning departure from the current way of doing business and learning new skills and knowledge. Findings 27, 29, 30, and 32 are responsibilities positively-correlated with second-order change, and these are strengths (see Table 4-20, p. 138).

Under the first main category of program organization, there were many responses that indicated participants were not clear about how to define coaching, who defines it, or what goals and guidelines were foundational to this coaching program. Principals saw the role as a way to support teachers, but coaches were not in agreement on whether they were supporting teachers or students. It is hard to determine what the outcomes will be if the program is unclear about any

goals from the start. The program is relying on preconceived ideas or concepts that came from prior experiences as opposed to a clearly defined picture and approach to how coaching will be implemented. Some Central Office administrators indicated they wanted to make the coaching program their own.

The second theme speaks to the many strengths upon which the program can build. Coaches feel supported through many professional development opportunities provided both by the district and outside entities. Recognition of instructional practice resonates through this theme and into the leadership theme. Principals recognize its importance, and coaches recognize that being a good teacher is important as well. The strong agreement between what the coaches thought their most important responsibilities were and the belief that principals would say the same also indicates the support the coaches feel. The data from the field notes and reflection journal supports this as the researcher saw evidence of these positive interactions in the field. The leadership supports such as jointly determining responsibilities or collaborating on decisions as a staff are also strong assets for the partnership. Participants described opportunities for learning that were alongside principals as opposed to being scheduled to carry out their work.

The third theme describes very clearly where the strengths related to these positively correlated responsibilities are. While knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment was the responsibility mentioned most often, flexibility was also ranked high. It was noted that responsibilities that the coach uses are also at higher levels than the principal. The principal is not reporting that they use the responsibilities to the extent that the coach is. The principals report they are using the negatively correlated responsibilities more than the positively correlated responsibilities.

There were key differences between the responses of experienced and inexperienced coaches that are helpful to know. Principals and experienced coaches mentioned knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, but the inexperienced coaches mentioned this responsibility less often. There are noticeable differences at the secondary level with both coaches and principals that should be addressed. In comparison with the elementary responses, far fewer secondary responses (or none in some cases) indicated that these responsibilities are being used.

In summary, these themes represent the aspects of this coaching program implemented in this school district. The next and final chapter presents a discussion of the implications of these themes, conclusions drawn from the themes, and recommendations for those that are implementing coaching programs.

Table 4-19 Themes Across All Findings

Theme:	Findings that contribute to each theme:
<p>Theme One: Need for Clarity and Definition of Coaching</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The majority had a preconceived idea or concept of what coaching entailed based on prior experiences. (21) 2. Approximately one-third of the participants indicated the definition of coaching was determined at the building level. (11) 3. Those who perceived that the district had determined a coaching definition were principals. (3) 4. Nearly half of the participants perceived that the definition of coaching had evolved since the coaching role was established. The changes included new roles and responsibilities. (12) 5. The majority of participants perceived that goals were determined by building needs. (20) 6. Few participants believed that there were district coaching goals. (3) 7. The majority of principals responded that they were unsure if there were any coaching guidelines established. (8) 8. The majority of participants saw the coaching role as a means to provide support to classroom teachers. (12) 9. Coaches indicated much more frequently than principals that improved student achievement was an outcome of coaching. (13) 10. Principals and coaches indicated that most outcomes were related to improvements in instruction for staff. (22) 11. Several participants indicated that they were not sure there was evidence that could document positive outcomes of coaching. (6) 12. Only coaches indicated that finding enough time for all the coaching responsibilities was a challenge. (8) 13. Both coaches and principals saw staff “buy-in” to the coaching program and the lack of clear definition for the coaching role as challenges. (7) 18. Coaches anticipated their coaching work would involve working with students (8), or with teachers. (7) Most in the group that believed that they would be working with teachers were from the Success For All buildings (and had a preconceived notion of the role). 19. Principals saw the coach as a support to teachers. (9) 20. A majority experienced a change from what they anticipated. (26) 21. Coaches were evenly divided over what they perceived to be their most important coaching responsibilities (student vs. teacher support). (12) 22. The majority of coaches indicated their principal would concur with the response the coach gave for most important coaching responsibilities. (11)

<p>Theme Two: Leader Behaviors Create Supportive Coaching Environments.</p>	<p>15. Having good relationships with staff (7), good interpersonal skills (6), and technical abilities with data (5) were important attributes for the coach to have.</p> <p>16. Coaches reported that classroom experience and being a good classroom teacher were the most important qualifications for coaching. (8)</p> <p>17. Having good relationships with others was also an important qualification for coaches. (5)</p> <p>23. Participants (coaches, principals) agreed overwhelmingly that the district provides professional development (general and specific to coaching). (25)</p> <p>24. Both within-district resources and outside agencies were used to provide professional development. (18)</p> <p>25. Networking opportunities for coaches is a perceived strength. (21) The most prominent classes of leader behavior include: path-goal (31 instances), work facilitation (17), support (36), interaction (21), group-oriented decision making (32), and representation/networking (31).</p> <p>26. Achievement oriented (7) and value based (5) leader behaviors are not frequently discussed.</p>
<p>Theme Three: Leaders Use Certain Responsibilities More for Second-order Change (both positive and negative)</p>	<p>25. Networking opportunities for coaches is a perceived strength. (21) The most prominent classes of leader behavior include: path-goal (31 instances), work facilitation (17), support (36), interaction (21), group-oriented decision making (32), and representation/networking. (31)</p> <p>27. Principals noted that knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment contributes to the partnership (5), along with ideas and beliefs (4) under those responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change.</p> <p>29. Principals noted that knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment contributes to the partnership (5), along with ideas and beliefs (4) under those responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change.</p> <p>32. Inexperienced coaches report that principals use ideals and beliefs. (4)</p>

Table 4-20 A Summary of All Findings Leading to Themes

Program Organization (A)
Structure (A1)
Coaching defined (A1a)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The majority had a preconceived idea or concept of what coaching entailed based on prior experiences. (21) 2. Approximately one-third of the participants indicated the definition of coaching was determined at the building level. (11) 3. Those who perceived that the district had determined a coaching definition were principals. (3)
Evolution of coaching (A1b)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Nearly half of the participants perceived that the definition of coaching had evolved since the coaching role was established. The changes included new roles and responsibilities (12)
Formal goals/ guidelines (A1c)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The majority of participants perceived that goals were determined by building needs. (20) 6. Few participants believed that there were district coaching goals. (3) 7. The majority of principals responded that they were unsure if there were any coaching guidelines established. (8)
Importance of the role (A1d)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. The majority of participants saw the coaching role as a means to provide support to classroom teachers. (12)
Outcomes and evidence (A1e)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Coaches indicated much more frequently than principals that improved student achievement was an outcome of coaching. (13) 10. Principals and coaches indicated that most outcomes were related to improvements in instruction for staff. (22) 11. Several participants indicated that they were not sure there was evidence that could document positive outcomes of coaching. (6)
Challenges (A1f)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Only coaches indicated that finding enough time for all the coaching responsibilities was a challenge. (8) 13. Both coaches and principals saw staff “buy-in” to the coaching program and the lack of clear definition for the coaching role as challenges. (7)
Position (A2)
Attributes (A2a)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. The principals perceived that knowledge of instructional practice was the most important coaching attribute. (9) 15. Having good relationships with staff (7), good interpersonal skills (6), and technical abilities with data (5) were important attributes for the coach to have.
Qualifications for the position (A2b)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16. Coaches reported that classroom experience and being a good classroom teacher were the most important qualifications for coaching. (8) 17. Having good relationships with others was also an important qualification for

coaches. (5)
Time (A2c)
<p>18. Coaches anticipated their coaching work would involve working with students (8), or with teachers. (7) Most in the group that believed that they would be working with teachers were from the Success For All buildings (and had a preconceived notion of the role).</p> <p>19. Principals saw the coach as a support to teachers. (9)</p> <p>20. A majority experienced a change from what they anticipated (26).</p>
Most important coaching responsibilities (A2d)
<p>21. Coaches were evenly divided over what they perceived to be their most important coaching responsibilities (student vs. teacher support). (12)</p> <p>22. The majority of coaches indicated their principal would concur with the response the coach gave for most important coaching responsibilities. (11)</p>
Professional Development (A2e)
<p>23. Participants (coaches, principals) agreed overwhelmingly that the district provides professional development (general and specific to coaching). (25)</p> <p>24. Both within-district resources and outside agencies were used to provide professional development. (18)</p>
Path-goal theory of leadership (B)
<p>25. Networking opportunities for coaches is a perceived strength. (21) The most prominent classes of leader behavior include: path-goal (31 instances), work facilitation (17), support (36), interaction (21), group-oriented decision making (32), and representation/networking (31).</p> <p>26. Achievement oriented (7) and value based (5) leader behaviors are not frequently discussed.</p>
McREL Leadership Responsibilities (C)
<p>27. Principals noted that knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment contributes to the partnership (5), along with ideas and beliefs (4) under those responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change.</p> <p>28. Culture (4) and communication (5) were also named frequently by principals, but are correlated negatively to second-order change.</p> <p>29. Knowledge of curriculum and instruction is a responsibility used by less experienced coaches. (4)</p> <p>30. Inexperienced coaches see themselves as change agents.(4)</p> <p>31. Monitoring and evaluating is not reported as being used by less experienced coaches nor do they report that their principal uses it. (0)</p> <p>32. Inexperienced coaches report that principals use ideals and beliefs. (4)</p> <p>33. Principals with 4 years or less of experience do not report that they or their coaches use change agent, ideals and beliefs, or intellectual stimulation. (0)</p> <p>34. Coaches (2) at the secondary level report using three of the seven responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change themselves; they (1) report that the principal uses two of the seven responsibilities.</p> <p>35. Principals at the secondary level do not report using any of the responsibilities positively correlated to second-order change.(0)</p>

CHAPTER 5 - Discussion and Recommendations

The previous research on the topic of coaching focused on the range and variety of coaching roles in different contexts, as well as important kinds of support needed for coaching. There is also a large body of professional literature related to leadership, but studies around the intersection of coaching and leadership are lacking. This study sought to better understand leadership in the coaching partnerships in one district's program.

There were three frameworks (organization, path-goal leadership theory, and McREL leadership responsibilities) used to analyze the data from this study. The research questions developed around the theoretical framework of the path-goal theory of leadership and McREL's Balanced Leadership Framework. These research questions provided the framework for the interviews. Both leadership frameworks then offered an opportunity through which the interview transcripts could be examined. The third framework emerged from the data and captured understandings not apparent using the first two analytic categories.

By examining the findings from this study within the analytic frameworks of program organization, path-goal theory of leadership, and McREL's leadership responsibilities, a total of 35 findings were supported. The 35 findings were then examined to identify themes that appeared across all three analytic frameworks. Theme one describes the need for clarity and direction in establishing a coaching program in a district. It highlights the importance of goals and guidelines that provide clear direction for a coaching program. Theme two addresses those components of partnerships where the parties work in tandem with each other and with the goals of the program. These components are the leadership pieces that build a framework for programs to operate within and create cohesive work units. The third theme affirms the leadership responsibilities needed in a coaching program that require second-order change of

significant magnitude. Of the 11 leadership responsibilities correlated to second-order change, there are essential leadership responsibilities that have been established in this study, but these need to be strengthened for the change in this district to be sustained.

Findings and Interpretations

Theme One: Need for Clarity and Definition of Coaching

Walpole and Blamey (2008) report that their experiences with coaching in schools reveal that the coaching role is not particularly well defined. This is in part because the incidence of coaching is increasing and the research is working to keep pace with this educational trend. This district is a good example of the lack of definition surrounding the coaching program and the effect it has on the participants. Some of the participants described coaching as working with students and some described it as working with teachers. Participants indicated that they were not clear who defined coaching or how it was defined, or what the coaching program guidelines and goals were; thus, they created the program building by building based on needs within their respective buildings. Neufeld and Roper (2003) make it apparent in their research that the more clear a district can be about the reforms it is initiating, the better it is for coaches and teachers.

Of first importance is determining the intention of the coaching program. Coaching, as defined, is somebody who trains. In the professional literature, coaching means a trainer who is working with other adults. Killion & Harrison (2006) describe the 10 roles for teachers and coaches in their work and none of the 10 refers to working directly with students. However, several of the participants in this study spend the majority of their time tutoring students and consider this “coaching” according to the responses. The definition of coaching is not clear.

One of the principals indicated in her comments, “I think our kids are at the highest point we are going to get the kids when it comes to passing the assessments until we raise the level of

the teachers. I think we have to get the teachers' ability to move up so that the kids will move up. I think we are kind of at a stagnant point with our kids until we can build capacity in our teachers and build leadership in them and get them to take initiative and look for different ways to teach and not just the same old thing that they have been doing.”

Some of the principal participants indicated that the coach's responsibilities included support for the classroom teacher. If the idea of a content coach is to improve instruction through coaching, that must be the primary goal that is presented by leadership. One of the Central Office administrators voiced that they had looked at several models of coaching, but were not sure which one they wanted to use and wanted to just get started with one. The participants did not describe any type of commitment to any particular coaching program. It is somewhat surprising that formal coaching programs were not explored prior to starting a coaching program in this district.

Various models and forms of coaching are reported in the professional literature. Costa and Garmston (2002) distinguish “four categories of functions intended to support teacher development: evaluating, collaborating, consulting, and Cognitive Coaching” (p. 9). The categories are not hierarchical, but are categories associated with teacher need based on their experience as a teacher. For example, the beginning teacher might need a great deal of consultation as they start their careers. Cognitive Coaching supports the teacher as a self-directed learner through planning and reflection of their teaching.

Showers and Joyce (1996) have been long-time advocates of peer coaching, which is the process in which teams of teachers collaborate together to observe one another and provide feedback that will help improve instruction. The model is one that has a deep research base and should be explored.

Russo (2004) discusses large-scale models such as America's Choice Coaching Program™ that provide systematic professional development for coaches. While the intent is not to advocate for any coaching model or program, the district should determine that there is a model or approach that they intend to follow. The definition of coaching must be a common one to all participants in these partnerships.

Theme Two: Leader Behaviors Create Supportive Coaching Environments

This study highlighted the intersection of coaching skills with leadership. There were many positive aspects that can be identified for replication in coaching programs.

The professional literature is abundant with regard to what coaches need in the way of skills to be an effective coach. (Kowal & Steiner, 2007; Walpole & Blamey, 2008; Borman & Feger, 2006). The literature also describes support that can be provided to the coach. Norton (2007) described a statewide initiative to support coaches through ongoing professional development. Killion (2007) shared that professional associations must provide support for school-based coaches at the national, state, and local levels. Each of these levels offers its own unique type of support to the coach. Finally, Knight (2007) discusses support for building a coaching program and professional development is mentioned again, but offering coaches time to build relationships through collaborative practice is also considered a support.

The path-goal theory of leadership (House, 1996) describes the behaviors of the leader in meeting subordinate needs in specific ways that promote satisfaction for the subordinate. There are eight leader behaviors identified in this theory, along with specifications about conditions under which the leader is likely to be functional or dysfunctional. In studying these coaching partnerships, the leader behaviors that are provided are clearly a source for providing an atmosphere of collegiality, trust, and risk taking.

Coaches and principals describe professional development, work facilitation, support, interaction facilitation, group-oriented decision making, and networking as supports offered to the coach. These responses provided insights into the leadership behaviors that strengthened these partnerships. While one of the coaches did speak to her discomfort with her own lack of experience, she did not indicate any lack of confidence from her principal. Other coach participants provided stories that indicated the satisfaction and motivation they have from their work.

***Theme Three: Leaders Use Certain Responsibilities More for Second-order Change
(both positive and negative)***

The McREL research around leadership responsibilities gives helpful information and guidance for school leaders. Of the 21 school leadership responsibilities identified as being statistically related to student achievement, 11 were identified as those positively or negatively correlated to change. When participants were asked to talk about which responsibilities are used in the coaching partnership or which they use, data provided specific insights. Two of the responsibilities named that were positively correlated to second-order change were flexibility and knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Coaches and principals alike named these responsibilities.

The differences that emerged were that the principals were not using the responsibilities to the extent that coaches were. Principals also tended to use the negatively correlated responsibilities more frequently than the positively correlated responsibilities. Inexperienced coach responses indicate that monitoring and evaluating is not a responsibility they use. Inexperienced principals did not indicate that they use knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and

assessment, which is the highest ranked responsibility positively correlated to second-order change.

The findings in this study suggest that this school district has some significant aspects in place from which they can start to develop the coaching program more fully if the goal is supporting and improving instruction in this district. Several factors point to this emphasis on instruction for this district. Central Office participants indicated that supporting and improving instruction was a goal. The interviews indicate that many believe teacher support is an outcome of coaching. The leadership responsibilities that were indicated by participants also reinforce this focus on instruction. The combination of defining the coaching program, instilling and building on the leader behaviors already present in the coaching approach, and addressing leadership responsibilities can create a quality content coaching program.

Results

The overarching research question is: How does formal leadership influence a district content coaching program? The impact of formal leadership and its influence on a district content coaching program is evident in many aspects of this research study. The impact can be both positive and negative to some extent, but is certainly a factor.

In studying the implementation of this coaching approach, the leadership did not provide clear guidance or direction in establishing this coaching program. The lack of clarity resulted in buildings making their own determination about how the role would be defined and structured. When asked about how the goals related to the coaching process were established, six people asked the research for clarification or an explanation of what was meant by goals, indicating that some might be unclear about the question or needed additional information to understand the question.

Leadership from the Central Office could have established a vision for coaching which would have helped provide structure, determined need, and facilitated professional development on a district scale. Building-based decision making is a good approach in many cases, but from interviews with participants the researcher's perception was that the district was now attempting to define the coaching role in a more specific manner and was finding it difficult to do so. Because so little direction was given at the outset, there was no common vision for the coaching program. Knight (2007) indicates that "when coaching programs are designed well, the chances of making a significant difference are greater and the potential of coaching can be realized" (p. 27).

Research subquestions will be addressed in this section. Recommendations will follow the report of the research sub-questions.

Research Sub-Question 1: Using the path-goal theory as an analytic framework, how are these coaching relationships influenced by leader behavior?

- Communication between the coaches and principals was open and coaches had a great deal of input about their work.
- There were many opportunities for staff to have input into building decisions and plans. House (1996) suggests that subordinates who want clarification of responsibilities find this leader behavior to be satisfying.
- There has been a climate created that promotes a collaborative work unit.

What are the areas for which the coach feels individual responsibility and control? How is the coach's work planned, scheduled, and organized?

- The coaches felt a great deal of responsibility and control for their work.

- These coaching partnerships reflect the respect that the principal has for the coach and their abilities, as efforts were made on behalf of the coach's time in several cases.

What supportive leader behaviors are manifested in the partnerships?

- Support was a hallmark of these coaching partnerships. Every coach described numerous ways in which the principals provided support, and each principal indicated that they tried to be supportive in a variety of ways. Support ranged from lending an ear when needed to providing resources of every type to opportunities for professional development in just about every case.
- Principals saw it as their responsibility as a leader to be supportive and worked very hard to see that coaches understood that.

What are the leader behaviors that facilitate collaborative and positive interactions?

- Grade-level team meetings, focus meetings specific to academic areas, school improvement meetings, and planning meetings are some of the structured ways that were described by participants that collaborative interactions were facilitated. Unstructured ways were the spontaneous meetings that occurred in hallways, phone calls, emails, and even blogs that were used for collaborative purposes.
- There was a true sense of collaborative work as the culture in these partnerships. Leaders found these structured and unstructured methods to communicate this spirit of working together in a meaningful way.

How are decisions for the work unit made?

- The majority of participants indicated that decisions were made collaboratively as well. Examples of how decisions were made for the work unit included one

building plan for coaching being developed as a staff. In this case, the “coach” was used as a tutor because there was no direction indicating that the role was to be used specifically for true coaching. Others established how the coaching responsibilities would look in their respective buildings.

What networking opportunities are available?

- Participants expressed numerous opportunities to draw from a networking system, and almost all of the coaches indicated that they benefited from access to necessary resources. The majority of the coaches indicated that they used in-district resources such as other coaches, meetings of the coaches, the coach coordinator, or a blog provided by the coach coordinator.

Research Sub-Question 2: Using McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework, what are the leadership responsibilities manifested in these partnerships?

What leader responsibilities and practices emerge across levels?

- When examining secondary coaches’ responses to the leadership responsibilities that they use as coach, four of the seven positively correlated responsibilities are not mentioned: ideals and beliefs, monitor and evaluate, intellectual stimulation, and optimizer. The coaches indicate that the principal uses the responsibilities of change agent and optimizer only.
- Secondary principals did not indicate that the coach or the principal use any of the positively correlated responsibilities, so all of the responses come from elementary principals.

What leader responsibilities and practices emerge when years of experience in the position is examined?

- When examining the data for coaches with 4 years of experience or less, it is encouraging to note that half of them name the knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment as a responsibility that they use.
- These same coaches also saw themselves as change agents.
- There were a lack of responses to the use of monitoring and evaluating as less experienced coaches did not report that they or their principals use this one.
- All of the coaches indicate that the principal uses the responsibility of ideals and beliefs.
- When examining the responsibilities negatively-correlated to change, indications are that the less experienced coaches rely on these more often. When comparing their responses to the total number, they were likely to represent at least half of the negatively-correlated responses.
- Principals with 4 years of experience or less were lacking in their responses on knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; change agent; ideals and beliefs; and intellectual stimulation. They often reported that their coach did not use these same responsibilities.
- When separating these individuals from their peers with experience, their lack of experience correlates to low usage of responsibilities related to leadership.

What leader responsibilities and practices emerge in these partnerships when position within the organization is examined?

- Principals acknowledged that the following leader responsibilities contributed to the coaching partnerships: knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; ideals and beliefs; culture; and communication. The first two listed are those that

have positive correlations to second-order change, and the last (culture and communication) two are negatively correlated.

- The percentages of principals indicating these responsibilities were low.
- When examining the leadership responsibilities the coach uses, as indicated by both the coach and the principal, the results highlight knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment once again.
- Flexibility is identified by half of the coaches as well.
- The results indicate that coaches use the responsibilities to a greater extent than the principal is using them. The data is important because it shows a lack of attention to leadership responsibilities.

Research Sub-Question 3: In what ways does this formal leadership influence the outcomes of these coaching arrangements?

Because the concept of coaching was not clearly defined, it is not clear that any outcomes were ever established for these coaching arrangements, making it difficult to determine the influence of leadership.

Theme number one related to the ambiguous approach to coaching. The outcomes from this lack of direction or leadership led to some confusion, loose interpretations by building leaders of coaching, and a coaching program that needs an identity.

Theme number two addresses the leader behaviors that create a coaching environment. Leaders modeled the types of behaviors that create an environment that is motivating, satisfying, facilitative, and collaborative.

Theme number three is related to leadership responsibilities and is the most unclear.

Leadership responsibilities that emerge show both positive and negative influence. There are specific responsibilities that are mostly high, such as the knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. This responsibility was the one that participants most commonly reported being used.

Recommendations

1) *Determine the value of having a shared vision, common formats, and an articulate philosophy.* The leader will be “effective to the extent that they complement the environment in which they work by providing necessary clarifications to ensure that subordinates expect that they can attain work goals” (House, 1006, p. 326). Clarity around what primary responsibilities the coach will have should be articulated clearly to coach participants. The leadership in the district should determine that there is a specific model that all principals and Central Office administrators can support. There should be a widely shared philosophy about coaching. The supports for professional development were evident in this study, and leadership can take advantage of what has already been contributed to the discussion about coaching. The district recently hired a coach coordinator, a luxury in these times of budget reductions for schools. This provides them with an opportunity to direct the program toward a common goal as they have a position devoted to this program. By articulating a particular model or approach that the district will embrace, common language around the coaching program can be developed and the respective supports needed for the coaching program can be established. Professional development is one of the resources, and while many participants mentioned training, few named any specific coaching training.

2) *Continue range of support, opportunities for networking, and professional development specific to coaching model selected.* House specifies leader behaviors that are “theoretically acceptable, satisfying, facilitative, and motivational for subordinates” (1996, p. 335). This district has established foundational elements that serve these partnerships well. Leadership has been established in this district that creates a culture where growth can occur. It is important to understand these leader behaviors in light of the culture that has been created.

The professional research clearly describes the need to provide support for coaches, and this study is evidence that strong partnerships are present because of the support provided by the district. This support comes in the form of the principal providing open dialogue with staff where one can express opinions and take risks. Communication needs to be established that gives all these opportunities to be part of decision making.

Because people need to feel that their needs are being met, networking must be available to coaches. Providing set times for coaches to meet together is an important function of networking. Providing time sends a clear message that the work is valued.

Professional development is also necessary and should be specific to the model of coaching that the district adopts. This reinforces a planned approach to coaching. This district had given numerous opportunities for professional development, but few participants recognized that it was job specific. In a coach’s world, a variety of content professional development activities are important, but there should be specific coach training provided to strengthen the coaching role.

3) *Engage in district-wide discussion regarding responsibilities and their influence on second-order change.* “If leaders fail to understand or acknowledge that some changes are second-order change for some or all of their stakeholders, they may struggle to get support for

the successful implementation of these changes. As a result, their initiatives may fail to improve student achievement” (Water et al., 2004). This is a powerful statement and gives a clear message for practice. Coaching has the potential to impact instruction significantly in this district. There is a strong research base established around these 21 leadership responsibilities identified in the McREL studies. Those responsibilities are also correlated to second-order change providing a clear path for leaders.

4) *Assess outcomes of the coaching program.* The district needs to insure that partners in these coaching arrangements have the knowledge and skills to teach these leadership responsibilities. This includes a way to assess these responsibilities on a continual basis.

Recommendations for Future Research

1) Investigate outcomes of coaching programs in a systematic way or with particular models. Because of the increased interest around the topic of coaching, the professional literature is also increasing. It would be helpful to identify specific coaching programs and investigate whether any have established outcomes.

2) Study differences in elementary versus secondary settings. Because of unique differences in elementary and secondary levels, it would be helpful to study these settings collectively. In this study, there were differences in the physical settings of the coaches in the elementary level compared to those at the secondary level. What do those differences show? This study was small, but showed that there might be some patterns specific to each of these settings that would benefit from further study.

3) More carefully examine second-order change resulting from coaching. Coaching can be described as a second-order change because it requires more than just simple adjustments being made to an existing program. What are the adjustments that are made in coaching

programs that have been successfully implemented? How are these linked to the McRel leadership responsibilities? Schools often undertake programs on a large scale without understanding what needs to change on a grander scale; coaching programs could be well-served by studies that examine change related to coaching.

4) Study cost-effectiveness of coaching versus outcomes. It is important for schools to make wise investments with the dollars committed to education. While it may be difficult to establish direct student achievement outcomes related to coaching, schools that have coaching programs could be compared by examining student achievement data. The following would be helpful guides:

- How to implement without additional costs or minimal costs. Is it possible that the structures within the school allow for coaching to be implemented at minimal costs? For example, could a peer coaching program accomplish the same outcomes but use existing staff?
- Does each school need a coach? Many schools are sharing coaches to make better use of funds. Can a structure be created to assign coaches a caseload where they have a certain number of new teachers and fewer experienced teachers?
- Do coaches work with individual teachers or with teams of teachers? It would be important to know where schools have coaches working with teams of teachers and the effects of this practice. Can the same goals be met by meeting in teams?

5) Study the impact on coaches. Coaching may have an impact on the coach in a number of ways ranging from growth as a leader, knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and personal skills. It is important to know what the impact of coaching is on these individuals

in order to better provide for their growth and to further sustain the potential of coaching programs.

6) Study the achievement of students in schools where coaching has been implemented.

What are the differences in achievement for schools where coaching has been implemented?

What about the schools without coaches? Little professional research is currently available that indicates the impact of coaching related to student achievement. Since student achievement is the ultimate benefit of coaching, studies must be conducted around this topic.

Conclusions

The participants in this study provided a glimpse into how a coaching program was implemented in one district and, in turn, provided the researcher with insights that can be helpful to others seeking to develop coaching models.

The objective of this researcher was to understand the influence of leadership in a coaching program, and this objective was met. The coaching program was perceived to have a difficult beginning because no framework for the program established. Principals were glad to have an extra set of hands to help with the work and they called that person a “coach,” but the term meant different things to all. As the district learned more about coaching and its potential impact on adult learners, they tried to recapture the role and change course, resulting in confusion for participants in these partnerships. Planning and open discussion of how the approach would be implemented could easily have steered this program in a common direction and strengthened its impact more immediately.

In spite of the challenges to implementation, understanding the influence of leadership related to the path-goal leadership theory provided a very positive picture of this district. The culture of collaboration and mutual respect was apparent. Leader behaviors were provided in a

manner that enhanced the subordinate's work in so many cases. The stories provided by participants describe leaders who lead by offering support in a variety of ways. Principals spoke of coaches who were good learners, who valued ongoing professional development. The partnerships were truly partnerships.

The McREL Balanced Leadership Framework was not fully explored due to the limitations of time for the interviews. What responsibilities were discussed did point to a potential challenge to belief systems regarding positive versus negative impacts on second-order change. Where the leadership responsibilities were so strongly related to partnerships, they lack by some standards in these responsibilities correlated with student achievement and change. For these participants who are working so closely with this second-order type of change (coaching), these leader responsibilities should be given an emphasis going forward from here.

Finally, one of the Central Office administrators captured much of the current thinking about coaching programs:

“I think this is one of the most exciting things relating to instructional improvement since Madeline Hunter. Coaching gives people a place to go when it doesn't go well. You know, without such an individual, you have to rely on your next-door neighbor. And if your next-door neighbor isn't of that same mentality when you come with either your excited tale of how well it went or your sad tale of how poorly the lesson went, they respond to you in various ways. And if somebody shares your enthusiasm for getting better or is even willing to make suggestions or give you an idea and not just pass it off as well, you just had a bad day or it's the fault of the kids, then you know, you really can -- you can really grow from something like that. So it kind of reinstalls that notion [that] doing some things are better than others. Now I know in the cognitive coaching, it's

more of a discovery because we're also understanding you don't change anybody but yourself. But absent any of those kinds of supports, if you're up and down the schoolroom halls with a lot of different doors with nobody understanding where to go when things don't go well instructionally, then it's probably gonna remain the same. So this has a chance to really help us.”

This is the bottom line for why coaching is implemented—it is a chance to help instruction, and in doing so, to help students. The nature and degree of effectiveness of the programs and how the most effective are implemented are still a subject of discussion.

Prior to conducting this study, the professional literature made clear that coaching was on the increase across the country and studies showed the need for support for coaching in a variety of ways. The abundance of professional literature specific to leadership was also available. What was not studied in the research was the intersection of coaching and leadership: The role of leadership in coaching partnerships has not been studied.

This study examined these coaching partnerships through analytic leadership frameworks and provided insights into the role that leadership plays in these coaching partnerships. While it is not a surprise that leadership makes a difference in schools, it was apparent in this study that leadership from Central Office to the building impacts coaching partnerships. From shaping the coaching program at its onset to the roles that the leaders take with leadership responsibilities in these partnerships, the coaching program is directed by the leader. From this study, we learned that formal leadership influences coaching arrangements and we learned that specific behaviors provided by leaders provide can positively influence these partnerships.

References

- Borman, J., & Feger, S. (Winter, 2006). *Instructional coaching: Key themes from the literature*. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance at Brown University.
- Cassidy, J., & Cassidy, D. (2008, February/March). What's hot for 2008. *Reading Today*, 25, 1-10.
- Costa, A.L., Garmston, R.J., (2002). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Danielson, C. (2006). *Teacher leadership that strengthens professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (2007). The many faces of leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 65(1), 14-19.
- Dole, J., Liang, L., Watkins, N., & Wiggins, C. (2006). The state of reading professionals in the United States. *The Reading Teacher*, 60, 194-199.
- Dozier, T. K. (2007). Turning good teachers into great leaders. *Educational Leadership*, 65(1), 54-59.
- Feger, S., Wolcek, K., & Hickman, P. (2004). How to develop a coaching eye. *Journal of Staff Development*, 25(2), 14-18.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

- Hawley, W. D., & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development. in L. Darling-Hammond, & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as a learning profession* (pp. 127-150). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7 (3), 323-352.
- International Reading Association. (2004). *The role and qualifications of the reading coach in the United States: A position statement of the International Reading Association*. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Jennings, J., & Rentner, D. S. (2006). Ten big effects of the No Child Left Behind Act on public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 88(2), 110-113.
- Katz, R.L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Journal*, 33(1), 33-42.
- Killion, J. (2007). Web of support strengthens the effectiveness of school-based coaches. *Journal of Staff Development*, 28(Winter), 11-18.
- Killion, J., & Harrison, C. (2006). *Taking the lead*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.
- Killion, J., & Harrison, C. (2007). Selecting coaches. *The Learning System*, 2(7), 5-7.
- Knight, J. (2004). Instructional coaches make progress through partnership. *Journal of Staff Development*, 25(2), 32-37.
- Knight, J. (2007). 5 key points to building a coaching program. *Journal of Staff Development*, 28(1), 26-31.
- Knight, J. (2008). *Coaching: Approaches and perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kowal, J., & Steiner, L. (September, 2007). Issue Brief-Instructional coaching. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement.

- Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Literacy coaching retains its heat, is proving its value to educators.(2008, February/March, Reading Today, *Reading Today* 25 (4), pp. p. 10.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Moran, M. (2007). *Differentiated literacy coaching: Scaffolding for student and teacher success*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2003). *Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity--promises and practicalities*. Washington, D.C.: Aspen Institute Program on Education and the Annenberg Institute for School Reform.
- Norton, J. (1999) Teachers get help from "the guide on the side." *Changing Schools in Long Beach*, pp. 7-15.
- Norton, J. (2007). Adding layers of support. *Journal of Staff Development*, 28(1), 20-25.
- Northouse, P.G. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pankake, A., & Moller, G. (2007). What the teacher leader needs. *Journal of Staff Development*, 28(1), 32-36.
- Patterson, J. L., & Kelleher, P. (2005). *Resilient school leaders*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Poglinco, S., Bach, A., Hovde, K., Rosenblum, S., Saunders, M., & Feger, S. (2003). *The heart of the matter: The coaching model in America's Choice schools*. University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Rainville, K.N., & Jones, S. (2008). Situated identities: Power and positioning in the work of literacy coach. *The Reading Teacher*. 61(6), 440-448.
- Russo, A. (2004). School-based coaching: A revolution in professional development--or just the latest fad? *Harvard Education Letter*, April 15, 2009.
- Showers, B., & Joyce, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. *Educational Leadership*, 53(6), 12-16.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sunderman, G. L., & Orfield, G. (2007). Do states have the capacity to meet the NCLB mandates? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(2), 137-139.
- Walpole, S., & Blamey, K. L. (2008). Elementary literacy coaches: The reality of dual roles. 62(November), 222-231.
- Waters, J. T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2004). Leadership that sparks learning. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 48-49,51.
- Waters, T., & Cameron, G. (2007). *The balanced leadership framework: Connecting vision with action*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Appendix A - The 21 Responsibilities and Their Correlations (r) with Student Academic Achievement

Responsibility	Correlation with student academic achievement
1. Affirmation	.19
2. Change Agent	.25
3. Contingent Rewards	.24
4. Communication	.23
5. Culture	.25
6. Discipline	.27
7. Flexibility	.28
8. Focus	.24
9. Ideals/Beliefs	.22
10. Input	.25
11. Intellectual Stimulation	.24
12. Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	.20
13. Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	.25
14. Monitoring/Evaluating	.27
15. Optimizer	.20
16. Order	.25
17. Outreach	.27
18. Relationships	.18
19. Resources	.25
20. Situational Awareness	.33
21. Visibility	.20

The chart represents the 21 leader behaviors that are referred to as “responsibilities” of school leaders identified in a meta-analysis. The average correlation column refers to the correlation between student academic achievement and leadership. The general finding was that .25 correlation is compelling. (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005, p. 42-43). Adapted by permission of McREL.

Appendix B - Participant Invitation Letter

Date

Name, Title
School

Dear

I am writing to invite you to participate in a study of the implementation of coaching in our school district that I am conducting for my doctoral dissertation at Kansas State University. The focus of my study is to look at the range of coaching arrangements in the district and how they are enacted. In our situation, the coach may be referred to as an academic tutor, instructional coach or academic support person. Each school that has a coach that has at least one year of experience is being invited to participate.

For this study, I am most interested in the characteristics of the coaching assignment, the work setting, and leadership responsibilities related to both the coach and the principal.

The study is qualitative in nature and therefore involves a personal interview that asks you a set of questions based on your experiences and your perceptions. You will be provided a list of the questions in advance of our interview and the interview should not take longer than 60 minutes.

If you are willing to participate, please complete the short questionnaire and return the document to me in the enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope by (date).

Thank you for your time and consideration of participating in this important study. It is my hope that the information provided through this study will strengthen the coaching arrangements. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Beth Hudson
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University

Appendix C - Intent to Participate Form

Identification and Background Information Study of Coaching Arrangements

The following questions ask general background information that will be used to confirm that you meet the criteria for participation in this study. Please return the completed form back to me in the enclosed envelope by (date).

1. Name: _____
2. School: _____
3. School Phone Number: _____
4. Years as coach or principal guiding the coach: _____
5. Have you been employed in this position in another district? _____
6. When is the best time to contact you? _____

Appendix D - Interview Protocol

Interview Questions for the Coach:

General Overview:

1. How was coaching defined? By whom?
2. What qualifications are required for this position? Level of schooling?
3. When you accepted this position, how did you think you would be spending your time?
4. Is that what you do now?

Path-goal Theory:

5. How does the principal communicate/define performance expectations of your role and work procedures for you? How does the principal communicate that information with others? (Path-goal Clarifying Behaviors/Value Based)
6. What are your perceptions of how the goals of the coaching process related to your responsibilities are established? (Achievement Oriented)
7. Describe how the principal asks for your input on how your work assignments are to be carried out. Tell me about how a responsibility related to coaching was carried out. Did you talk back and forth? (Work Facilitation/Group Oriented Decision Process)
8. Describe the kinds of support you feel the principal provides to you. (Supportive Leader Behavior/Work Facilitation)
9. How does the principal facilitate collaboration and communication related to coaching among the staff? (Interaction Facilitation)
10. Describe opportunities you have for networking. (Networking)

McREL-Framework:

11. Tell me how specific leadership responsibilities from the Framework are used related to this role? (Provide a list of McREL responsibilities to the individuals in advance)
12. Describe the leadership responsibilities from the Framework offered by the principal that are helpful to you in this role.

Outcomes:

1. What are the outcomes of this coaching approach for students? For staff? Others? Challenges?
2. What evidence do you have this coaching has impacted the students? The teachers?
3. What professional development have you completed in this role? What are your perceptions of the professional development you were provided?
4. Tell what you think you think are your most important coaching responsibilities and why.
5. What do you think the principal believes are the most important coaching responsibilities?

Interview Questions for the Principal:

General Overview:

1. How was coaching defined? By whom?
2. Why did you think this was an important position for your school?
3. What were the formal guidelines describing the qualifications for position holders?
Where did the guidelines come from?
4. What attributes did you look for when hiring for this coaching role?

Path-goal:

5. How do you share performance expectations of the coaching role and work procedures with the coach? With others?
6. What is your perception of how the goals related to coaching responsibilities are established?
7. Describe how input from the coach is sought on how the coaching assignments are to be carried out. Describe how one responsibility related to coaching was carried out as an example.
8. What kinds of support do you provide to the coach?
9. How do you facilitate collaboration and communication between the staff and the coach?
10. What networking opportunities are provided for the coaching role?

McREL Framework:

11. Which of the McREL principal leadership responsibilities and practices do you believe have contributed positively to this partnership?
12. Describe the leadership responsibilities from the McREL framework that you feel the coach uses in that role.

13. Which of the leadership responsibilities do you use related to the coaching program and the coach?

Outcomes:

14. What professional development has been completed by the coach?

15. What evidence do you have this coaching has impacted the students? The teachers?

Interview Questions for District Office staff:

General Overview:

1. How was coaching defined? By whom?
2. Why do you think these positions are important to add to building staff?
3. What were the formal guidelines from the district describing the qualifications for position holders?

Path-goal:

4. How do you provide opportunities for the building coaches to improve?
5. How are the goals for coaching positions established?
6. What networking opportunities does the district provide for the coaching role?

McREL:

7. Which of the McREL principal leadership responsibilities and practices do you believe have contributed positively to your coaching program?
8. Describe the leadership support for the coaching program provided by the district for the principal. For the coach directly.

Outcomes:

9. What professional development related to coaching has the district provided to the coach?
To principals?
10. What do you believe are the outcomes of this coaching approach for students? For staff?
Others? Do you have any evidence of these outcomes?